

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 1 April, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. PHIL EYLER (River East):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves:** Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met on Thursday, April 1, 1982 and appointed Mr. Eyler as Chairman.

Your Committee agreed that a quorum for all future meetings of the Committee should consist of ten members.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 3) - An Act to amend An Act Respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in Regard to Statutes. Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'application de l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba aux textes législatifs.

Bill (No. 5) - An Act to amend The Law of Property Act.

Bill (No. 7) - An Act to amend The Arts Council Act.

Bill (No. 9) - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill (No.11) - An Act to amend The Highways Department Act.

Bill (No.13) - An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. MURIEL A. SMITH (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement regarding Manitoba Government support for Credit Union and Caisse Populaire.

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make on behalf of

my colleagues, the First Minister and the Minister of Co-operative Development.

Canada's economic recession and the large increase in interest rates have put great direct pressure on the local Credit Unions and Caisse Populaire in Manitoba; an indirect pressure on their centrals and their stabilization funds.

These locally owned and controlled institutions have supported the federal, provincial and municipal governments through purchase of long-term bonds and debentures. The high interest rates have resulted in considerable financial pressure on the two systems. The Government of Manitoba has received requests from the credit union and Caisse Populaire systems for loans of \$25 million and \$4.5 million respectively.

The first request for financial assistance for the Credit Union Stabilization Fund was received in June, 1980 and the first formal request from the Caisse Populaire system was received in January, 1982.

In addition to the request for these loans, the two systems have proposed significant restructuring and redefinition of roles and responsibilities for the government, the stabilization funds and for the centrals.

The two systems have proposed to strengthen provincial government role in terms of examination of local institutions and in terms of their respective stabilization funds. The systems also propose significant rationalization of local service outlets to reduce overhead costs and to permit adoption of technological measures designed to improve services to members.

This government supports the co-operative philosophy and believes that credit unions and Caisse Populaire have provided good services to Manitoba citizens. This government believes that with assistance the two systems can continue and improve such service and make a significant contribution to economic recovery in this province.

Accordingly, the government has advised the two systems that the government intends to advance \$25 million to the Credit Union Stabilization Fund and \$4.5 million to Le Fonds de Sécurité on an interest-free basis for a period of five years. The government intends to take an active role in the supervision of the credit union and Caisse Populaire systems and will be significantly involved in working with them to assure continued growth of the system. This is all part of a suggested, comprehensive financial package recommended by the credit union and Caisse Populaire systems.

The stabilization funds will in turn advance funds to credit unions and Caisse Populaire; funds designed to improve their financial position. An appropriate Loan Bill will be introduced in the Legislature soon.

As well, you will be asked to consider amendments to the legislation regarding credit unions and Caisse Populaire to clarify the roles of the government, credit unions and Caisse Populaire, the respective centrals and the stabilization funds.

The total package proposed by the two systems and endorsed by the government will enable the systems to stabilize and expand their services to members. It

will assure members that quality-competitive services will be available from their locally-owned organizations.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House welcome the announcement.

As the Minister pointed out in her statement, the government will be introducing a Bill in the Legislature, a Loan Bill, to deal with the advances that will be made to the Caisse Populaire and the Credit Union systems. We at that time, will be discussing some of our concerns.

I stress again, as I did the other day, that this party is committed to the long-term viability of the Credit Union and Caisse Populaire movement in this province and we want to ensure that anything that this government does, as the previous one would have done, is of such a nature that it will strengthen the system; in other words strengthen the system of the membership to allow them to run their own credit unions in this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Interlake):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make to this House.

I'd like to say that all the honourable members enjoyed themselves at the Brandon Fair yesterday. They enjoyed the exhibits of cattle and swine and all the other exhibits. I have a statement to make, Mr. Speaker.

The beef industry in Canada has been passing through difficult times for the past year-and-a-half. The cow-calf sector has been particularly hard hit as it invariably is the most vulnerable and least able to adjust to continuing inflation on costs and outrageous interest rates.

While it is generally recognized that the responsibility for providing income stability to the agricultural industry rests with the Federal Government, its efforts in this regard have been quite inadequate despite persistent prodding by producers and provincial governments.

In the absence of an effective national stabilization program for beef producers, the main beef-producing provinces, except Manitoba, had assistance programs in effect or in the final stages of development by the middle of last year.

I am pleased to announce a program that will provide Manitoba's cow-calf producers with long awaited assistance that will be meaningful without imposing unduly on the province's limited financial resources.

The program is designed to realize three related objectives: to provide our cow-calf producers with an opportunity to ensure themselves against downward fluctuations in the prices of slaughter beef; to encourage the transformation of the cow-calf sector into a slaughter cattle producing industry, thereby increasing the level and stability of returns to producers; and to encourage the future viability of the meat packing industry in our province by increasing the volume of

slaughter cattle available for processing in our province.

The basic features of the Stabilization Plan are:

The plan will be voluntary and available to all cow-calf producers in the province who market slaughter animals; producers will enroll in the Income Stabilization Program for a six-year period to ensure the financial soundness of the plan; both producers and the province will contribute to a stabilization fund, the provincial share will be 2 percent of the gross sales value of market animals, while the producers' contributions will vary; participating producers will market all slaughter cattle through a Beef Marketing Commission; conditional grants and low-interest loans will be available to assist producers in feeding more of their calves to slaughter weight.

The first step in the development of the plan will be the appointment of a Beef Producer Advisory Committee which will consult with the beef producers throughout the province and will make recommendations of specifics of the Income Stabilization Program, the Agency Marketing Plan, as well as the nature and timing of programs to encourage increased slaughter cattle production.

The Manitoba Government will provide up to \$17.5 million in grants during the first year of the program, as well as low-interest loans for up to \$24 million. It is anticipated that, upon enrolment this spring, producers will receive a grant of up to \$50 for each cow enrolled in the plan. The Agency Marketing Plan is expected to go into effect in October.

We are convinced that this comprehensive approach is absolutely essential in order to provide a reasonable level of stability to our operators of our beef cow herds now and in the future.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister and the government for finally getting around to making this long-awaited statement which the beef producers have been waiting for since the days of the election campaign. I am somewhat disappointed that there's no retroactivity clause in the legislation. If the farmers go back and listen to the words and wisdom of the members opposite during the campaign, I'm sure they thought that gold was there and all they had to do was vote for the NDP and it would solve all their problems.

Unfortunately, our agricultural critic today, Mr. Downey, the Member for Arthur, is in Brandon at the Winter Fair where he should be this day, and we will be responding to this announcement today in more detail with the Minister's Estimates and next week during the question period in the House. I thank the Minister for the announcement and I hope the cattle producers are satisfied.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. EUGENE M. KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks):** Pursuant to Subsection 113 (1) and Section 114 of the Insurance Act, Chapter 140 of the Revised Statutes of

Manitoba 1970; I have the honour to report that no Orders-in-Council were made pursuant to the fore-mentioned Subsection and Section of the Insurance Act during the year ending March 31, 1982.

## MESSAGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on this particular item on the order to carry out, with your permission, a happy task. I rise today on behalf of the Premier and all members on this side of the Chamber to pay tribute to one of the most loyal and diligent public servants that this assembly and this province has known, George Maltby.

Mr. Maltby completed yesterday the second of his terms as Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba. He was, as I think we all know, Manitoba's First Ombudsman and served for 12 years. Mr. Maltby worked quietly, yet with great persistence and great distinction. I believe that it can be said fairly that those who served in this Assembly since 1970 have unanimously regarded Mr. Maltby as fair, straightforward and careful in his work. Under Mr. Maltby's direction the office of the Ombudsman has served thousands of Manitobans promptly and effectively. He has sought results, rather than the limelight, and, Mr. Speaker, the record would indicate that he got results. It is impressive to note that at the conclusion of his first year in office Mr. Maltby had 27 cases pending, still to be dealt with; at the conclusion of his final year, with a significantly larger caseload, there were only 17 pending.

For the benefit of the members who may not know Mr. Maltby personally, and I do Mr. Maltby personally, I will mention briefly that he came to the position of Ombudsman with 34 years of police experience behind him, 25 of them in Hull, Yorkshire and 9 in St. James-Assiniboia where he rose to the position of Chief Constable. During World War II he served with distinction in the Royal Air Force and was stationed in Canada, Europe and Southeast Asia; a fine service indeed.

I knew Mr. Maltby when he was the Chief Constable in St. James. I had occasion to have to deal with him in a very difficult case — the details of which are not particularly important — but I came to know him then as an eminently fair, a highly experienced, very careful police officer and he carried those attributes into his work as Ombudsman.

Mr. Speaker, George Maltby was never a man to seek public fame and honours yet Manitoba, I believe, was truly fortunate that he agreed to serve as the Province's First Ombudsman. I'm sure that all members will join me in thanking him for a job well done and wishing him many happy and productive years to come.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G.W.J. MERCIER (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is pleased to join, on this occasion, to pay tribute to Mr. Maltby. We would certainly extend to

him best wishes in his retirement years and extend our thanks to him for the 12 years of excellent service to Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, it was our pleasure while in government to amend The Ombudsman Act to allow Mr. Maltby to extend his service to Manitobans beyond the retirement age, to complete his full 12 years in this function.

I believe his successor will, indeed, be challenged to carry out the same role in the high manner that Mr. Maltby has done for so many years and we certainly do wish Mr. Maltby and his family all the very best on this occasion, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, while we perhaps have a sense of occasion I'm sure that all members of the House would like to join me in welcoming — although not back to this House — the return of the Parliamentary Conscience of Canada, Mr. Stanley Knowles, to the House of Commons and wish him well as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Minister of Health wish to speak on the same issue?

**HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** No, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask leave to recognize and thank the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society, if I may.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before the Minister does, may I say to the House that I will undertake to forward the remarks of the last two speakers to Mr. Maltby and inform all members of the House that an inscribed presentation was made to Mr. Maltby, on behalf of all the Members of this House, at a reception held yesterday.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Minister of Health, and I'm sure it's speaking for all the members of this House, I'd like to thank the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society for the gift of the beautiful daffodils that we are sporting, the Flower of Hope. I'd like to thank them for reminding us and the public, I hope, through the media, that today is the official kick-off of their annual fund raising drive.

I would like, or sure it is my wish, that those of us who are fortunate enough not to be faced with this crippling disease will show our generosity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, the Opposition would like to ally itself with the sentiments expressed by the Honourable Minister of Health and with the spirit reflected in the daffodils that we so proudly wear today, and to join with the Government in congratulating all those in the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society who have worked so hard in the past and will continue to do so in the future in the fight against cancer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction

of Bills . . . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of the members to the guests in the Loge to my right, a former Member of this House, the MLA for Logan, a former Deputy Speaker of this House, Mr. Bill Jenkins.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I wonder, can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House if he has intervened, on behalf of the Manitoba Cattle Producers, regarding the Government of Canada's intent to charge livestock grading fees back to the packing houses and thence to the producers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have corresponded and I have telexed the Federal Minister of Agriculture, not only on the very issue that the member raises but on all other aspects of inspection and fees that are to be passed on in terms of vegetable processing plants and representations that we've had from other producer groups. We have made our views known in terms of the costs that would have to be passed on to producers, and we have certainly made those views known.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact of this and other costs being asked to be borne by the producers in our province, and likely with beef and agriculture, I wonder if the Minister maybe wouldn't think it was time that all the members of this Legislature stand up and support our No. 1 industry. The feds again are trying to impose costs on the cost of producing grain in this province which I think is untimely and uncalled for.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member and his members on his side will certainly have that opportunity because one of the greatest costs that will be imposed on producers will be the abolishment of the Statutory Rates on grain; and we will look forward to the support of all members of this House against the moving away from the Statutory Rate and Crow Rate which will reduce net farm incomes in this province by hundreds and hundreds of dollars and we look for their support.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I regret the nonanswer which is common practice in this government. When you ask a question you don't usually get an answer, they stray off. Can I ask the Honourable Minister now if grain is supposed to be included in the charges, the costs of grading the grain, is that to be included in the package by the Federal Government?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, there are charges imposed in terms of the handling of grain. I will have to check the specific announcement whether grain is included in it. But, Mr. Speaker, the member spoke about the costs that are faced by producers.

Mr. Speaker, the losses of income to Manitoba producers by the one single move, the removal of Statutory Rates, will be phenomenal on the agricultural and the rural communities of this province, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, that's typical of the socialists. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House what he or his government has accomplished in the last two weeks regarding the re-opening of the Manco plants at Rossburn and Pilot Mound so that those 25-or-so employees can go back to work?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question before to the honourable member. We have attempted to assist that plant on request to market their supplies of cheese. We have also had our door open to proposals that they may wish to submit to us, both the Minister of Co-op Development and myself.

There was an appeal made to the Manitoba Marketing Council dealing with the price of milk which the Marketing Council has ruled on. We are awaiting for further, if the Board of Directors of Manco feels that we can be of further assistance in this respect, we are only too pleased to await some proposal from them in terms of assistance, over and above what we have already been involved in.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, can the Minister advise the House why the surplus cheese stocks that are in place in Rossburn and Pilot Mound today cannot be sold when millions of people in this world are going to bed hungry tonight?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a good question. There may need to be an improved marketing system in terms of the selling of cheese, not only in this country but across the world. We have certainly seen evidence that the moves made by the National Government in terms of speaking about feeding the Third World and yet, Mr. Speaker, we have problems of moving cheese in this country. Certainly we have tried to assist them in that vein but ultimately, it's a matter of developing a long-range marketing strategy in terms of producing, in many areas, what kind of product sells and to what part of the country that should go, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, could the Minister advise the House and various producers in the province if any ongoing meetings are scheduled with Manco, the General Manager of Manco, Mr. Teillet and his executive to bring these two plants back into production at the earliest possible date?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, at our last meeting that I had with the General Manager in my office concerning this problem we indicated that we would be pleased to assist them if they would have some further proposals to make to dealing with the viability of those plants and we have yet to have anything back

from them. But we have assisted since then, with respect to the marketing of cheese but the door is open and we are waiting for them to make their views known to us.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, can the Minister then advise the House if he has met with the dairy producers in these communities and made some arrangements with them for the disposal of their milk which, at the present time I understand, is being transported to Yorkton, to Silverwoods in the city, to St. Claude where they are producing powdered milk, and is there any continuing future for the dairy industry in these communities when these plants are closed and their product is sitting there and not being utilized?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the milk industry and in terms of the distribution of milk, falls under the auspices of the Milk Producers Marketing Board of Manitoba. They have been in continuous discussions as well with the Board of Directors of Manco and as well with other provinces to deal with the problem that the member raises. Indeed, it's a concern of ours but the specific handling of the problem is directly handled by the Milk Marketing Board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. DONALD W. MALINOWSKI (St. Johns):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. In view of the announcement which the Honourable Minister made on Monday in this Chamber regarding the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement Program, can the Honourable Minister indicate to the House if the Main Street is included with the Core Area Initiative Program.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, Main Street was not included directly in any of the programs under the Core Area Initiatives. There was street-scaping programs set for Provencher, Osborne and the Chinatown development but Main Street was not included. I communicated, shortly after assuming office with the City of Winnipeg about the inclusion of Main Street as one of the projects under the Core Area Initiative, specifically the street-scaping project and I'm pleased to report that the City of Winnipeg has also taken the same position and will be discussing that specific proposal with the Federal Government with the view of having Main Street included under the street-scaping projects of the Core Area Initiative.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** A supplementary question to the same Minister.

I got from this information which you are giving now to ask that it is possible that Main Street will be included. If so, how soon?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated both the City and the province have agreed to its inclusion and I will be meeting with the Federal Government and I

would not at this time be able to say when that program would be approved but it is under active consideration by the Core Area Initiatives at the present time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

In view of the Core Area Initiative announcement, Mr. Speaker, that Air Canada will pay no more than \$3.5 million for the new piece of property which is being expropriated, could the Minister advise as to the estimated cost of expropriation of the additional property and whether or not the Core Area Initiative will have to assume the cost over and above \$3.5 million which I'm given to understand is the limit on the amount to be paid by Air Canada.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, as announced when the announcement was made with respect to the Air Canada development north of Portage Avenue, the cost of the additional land for the park development on Portage Avenue is estimated at \$1.8 million which would be directly paid by the Core Area Initiative in order to establish the park on Portage Avenue and as part of the overall development of Air Canada into the north of Portage site.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, do I have gather from the Minister's remarks he does not anticipate the cost will exceed \$3.5 million so that Air Canada will be paying the full cost of acquisition of the additional property for their site?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** The cost, the firm price to Air Canada for their property in the area is \$3.5 million. Any additional costs with respect to the overall development as indicated; it's estimated at \$1.8 million; will be absorbed by the Core Area Initiatives. There are some properties in that overall development that are owned by the City of Winnipeg and it's my understanding that the City of Winnipeg will be putting forward those properties on the development at no cost to the Core Area Initiatives as part of the overall package in bringing the Air Canada development north of Portage.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, dealing also with the Core Area Initiative, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not the Winnipeg Free Press intend to expand on their existing site or have they advised him whether or not they intend to relocate and expand elsewhere in the city?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Winnipeg Free Press has advised us of concerns with respect to the development; the park extension from Central Park down to Portage Avenue and there was some indication from the Free Press that they were concerned that they had possible plans for expansion at the area and that they may be curtailed on the basis of what happens to that development. I haven't been informed that either directly that the Free Press is continuing with expansion nor that they have decided not to expand and move to another area.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, one final question to the Minister in his other capacity as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Having received, Mr. Speaker, a telephone call from a constituent this morning who advises me that he and other senior citizens in his block are facing a proposal to increase their rents by some 18 percent or over and they are very concerned and uncertain as to what to do, could the Minister indicate when he will be introducing his legislation in the House and what he would advise senior citizens in this position to do?

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite pleased to hear the concern by the Member for St. Norbert for the introduction and concern with respect to rent increases. The Rent Regulation Act is on the Order Paper to be presented on Monday and I would hope would receive, with the support of the Member for St. Norbert and other members opposite, speedy passage in the House so that the Rent Regulation Bureau can be in place and start dealing with the excessive rent increases that have been occurring in the last few months.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up with one question on the line of questioning of the Member for Roblin-Russell to the Minister of Agriculture.

Earlier this week the Manitoba Marketing Council handed down its decision on the appeal by Manco respecting the pricing of industrial milk. Can the Minister tell the House how that decision will affect the operations of Manco?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, obviously all the factors that were presented to the Council would have been taken into account and their recommendations and their findings are such as have been made public. I understand that the appeal was not only launched by Manco but by several other people involved in dealing with milk. The Board has made its rulings based on the information that they obviously obtained from both sides who are involved. I presume that they would have asked the Marketing Board. I'm assuming that they would have asked information from all the processors who are involved in the processing of cheese. All the processors in Manitoba as I understand are not in dire straits in terms of financial difficulties, however, the decision that was arrived upon; I am assuming that the board would have taken all factors into consideration that were presented to it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct one question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I note from a very quick look at the statement that he made today with respect to the Beef Stabilization Program that it would appear, and I ask for clarification, that participating producers will

market all cattle through a Beef Marketing Commission, is that the question, that is compulsory, there is no voluntary feature with respect to the marketing of those cattle?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the program is designed to pay a level of subsidy on the slaughter animals, and the slaughter animals that the producer raises will be marketed through the plan.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister, of course, must be aware of the fact that this is at variance with tradition and practice and, indeed, legislation under The Natural Products Marketing Act under which all producers of a controlled product have had an opportunity to vote as to the advisability of entering that kind of a marketing scheme, whether it's chickens, eggs, vegetables, potatoes; we've had many such producer votes. This is then a case, and I ask the question to the Minister of Agriculture, at variance with the legislation, The Natural Products Marketing Act that's still on the books, a back-door way of introducing a marketing structure with respect to beef.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the program - and the member himself when I announced the program - and he made it hear, hear when I said that the program would be voluntary, the program - the producers wish to join the program, come into the program; and in order to handle the program, to be able to make the payments of support, can only be made through one agency and that is the Commission and that will be made when the beef are marketed in a finished state.

**MR. ENNS:** For my haste in showing appreciation to honourable members opposite, I should know better by now.

Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, March 29th to be exact, the First Minister in response to a question by my leader indicated, and this had to do with the auditing of the Liquor Commission, and I read the First Minister's words: "We would have been very unwise in this instance not to have followed the Provincial Auditor's advice or the advice of the Provincial Auditor that indeed he could do the work involving the Liquor Control Commission without, I understand, additional staff, without additional cost so why would we have insisted for doctrinaire reasons that the Leader of the Opposition would appear to have liked us to have pursued to have continued to employ a private firm when all that there was needed could have been done in-House?" Now, Mr. Speaker, I read the report in the Free Press today which indicates that indeed a private firm by the name of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. has indeed been appointed to do the auditing of the Liquor Control Commission. My question to the Deputy Premier is, who is doing the auditing of the Liquor Control Commission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the President of the Treasury Board to answer that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is no inconsistency at all in what was said to this House by the First Minister — (Interjection) — wait for it, wait for it — and the statement in the paper. No. 1, the First Minister said that the whole question is up for review. That was accurate, it has been discussed in Treasury Board; Treasury Board has made a reference to Cabinet; Cabinet has it on its agenda; it is up for review.

Secondly, with respect to audits which have to be completed for the existing year-end obviously, the appropriate allocations of appointments had to be made for the completion of audits ending March 31, 1982, and those were made to outside firms. We didn't want to in any way pre-empt the decision which has to be made and it's not a decision that we're going to make in haste or in any knee-jerk kind of way.

Pending that review, as the First Minister said to this House, we asked the Provincial Auditor to undertake the responsibility for the particular review or for the particular audit mentioned, namely that of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. The Provincial Auditor, and quite sensibly, so looking at the resources he presently has available, made the decision to contract out that particular audit and it was contracted out in the way described in today's paper to Peat, Marwick because the previous auditor belonging to a firm which had dissolved, a Mr. Fred Harrison moved over to Peat, Marwick, and it was a sensible thing for the Provincial Auditor to do clearly, and I conclude my answer with this point. When we have the matter before Executive Council and look at the report which we do have from the Provincial Auditor, if there is a decision, and I repeat if there is a decision, if some or all of the auditing is to be done in-House, we are apprised of the fact that the Provincial Auditor would need resources; and at present he does not have those resources, so again not to pre-empt the matter — (Interjection) — just listen for it, if you'd listen carefully, you might be instructed rather than being dogmatic — that in order to complete the audit in question, the Provincial Auditor acting within his jurisdiction and acting properly and responsibly and not listening to the baying of the hounds, decided to contract it out. I think he acted wisely.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, without implying that I've had a long love affair with the Winnipeg Free Press, but let me understand this correctly; in this instance, the Winnipeg Free Press statement was accurate and the First Minister's statement was wrong, is that right?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 25th, the Member for La Verendrye asked me a question whether we would support Falcon Lake and Gimli applications for obtaining the same type of service as Thompson has, and I might advise the honourable member there were

hearings by the CRTC in early November when the honourable member was in government, and I believe the government of the day filed no intervention one way or the other.

The company that was operating this service at Falcon Lake and Gimli received Satcom signals, I believe has now gone out of business and we're not aware of what the plans of that company will be in the future.

The Member for Pembina also asked a question on March 29th whether the Satcom signals received in the north were the same as those being received in Westman region and the answer is yes, either system is capable of receiving, of course, the Satcom package, but the distribution of the Satcom signals is a decision made by the cable operator so there are variations from one community to another, but the decision is made by the cable operator.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Well, Mr. Speaker, just one follow-up question to the Minister who has just provided that information. He still hasn't answered whether the channels in Westman differ from the channels in Thompson and Flin Flon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. EVANS:** I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that both systems are capable of receiving the Satcom package. In the case of the Westman system, I understand that they are distributing the three super stations, that's their decision; and in Flin Flon, for example, the decision by the operator, at least at the present time, I believe they are receiving and distributing three super stations plus home box office; in the case of The Pas at the present time, I believe, it's three super stations plus home box office; and then Thompson, I believe, will be distributing only three signals. The point is that there are variations but the basic package they receive is the same. The decision to distribute is a decision made by the cable operator.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the cameras that I'm just right behind the plant here. My question is to the Honourable Acting Premier, in light of the fact that the New Democratic Party of the Province of Saskatchewan has loaned personnel to the New Democratic Party of the Province of Manitoba during the last provincial election in Manitoba, can the Acting First Minister advise if a reciprocal agreement exists with the Province of Saskatchewan for loaning paid election workers during political campaigns?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on a Point of Order.

**MR. PENNER:** The question which was addressed to the Acting First Minister was a question relating to the practice or policy of a political party; it has nothing to

do with —(Interjection)— yes, that's exactly the way the question was phrased. In view, the question said, of some alleged understanding between one provincial section of a party and another, will the provincial section of the party here reciprocate, or something of that kind, it has nothing to do with the functioning of government or with any department of government and therefore it is out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wasn't clear that the honourable member's question had to do with anything within the responsibility of the government. Does the member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. KOVNATS:** Well, yes, rather than rephrase it I'll ask a supplemental question of the Honourable Acting First Minister. Can the Honourable Acting First Minister advise whether the former Member for Radisson, a Mr. Harry Shafransky, was hired by the Province of Manitoba, and paid for by the people of the Province of Manitoba at a salary of \$26,000, for the purpose of being loaned to the Province of Saskatchewan during their election campaign?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa raised the question of the employment of the person in question and I answered last week that person was hired by the Department of Highways and his duties are within the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was aware that he was hired by the Department of Highways through an Order-in-Council but his duties were not specified. Can the Acting First Minister confirm that the New Democratic Party of the Province of Saskatchewan has rejected, or accepted, the services of one Harry Shafransky, or is the hiring by an Order-in-Council of Harry Shafransky a cruel April Fool's joke?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I am left with a rather sad conclusion and that is that standing close to or behind a plant does strange things to the logic of the honourable member opposite. However, as is the custom in this House, even though the question was somewhat unclear, I am undertaking to answer the question that I think the honourable member opposite wished to ask, and that is whether any individuals from the Province of Manitoba have gone to Saskatchewan to assist in that election, and it gives me great pleasure to announce that there are some persons who choose to volunteer their services to go and help their sister province. I also would like to add that it's not at all unusual for our political party to share and co-operate across the boundaries. That is the way we function rather than spend our time on local squabbles or national squabbles.

However, I can assure all the members opposite that no one while under salary or receiving any expense from this government will be going to Sas-

katchewan. If they do go it's entirely on a voluntary and unpaid basis.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him, in view of the fact that this is April 1st and therefore there is no longer any agreement between the Manitoba Medical Association and the Government of Manitoba, whether in effect, not by letter of the law, obviously but in effect, Manitoba now has 1,700 doctors practicing outside Medicare?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to correct the statement made by the honourable member. There is an agreement, the agreement will be in force, until and unless one of the parties notify the other party that they wish to terminate the agreement, and that would be done after giving them notice for a period of 30 days.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether, in view of the fact that there is no fee schedule, a contract which expired, expired on March 31st, what fees the professionals in Manitoba are now charging and what guidelines they are going by for charging those fees?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, again I would like to refresh the memory of the honourable friend, there is a fee schedule, the fee schedule hasn't been changed so it carries on until there is a change or until the contract is terminated.

**MR. SHERMAN:** In view of the fact that the negotiations on a fee schedule for 1982-83 have not proceeded beyond an initial proposal by the Manitoba Medical Association, can the Minister advise whether the Manitoba Medical Association membership, in total, to the extent of those who were in Medicare, which was some 94 percent of the total, are proceeding during the present circumstances of the Job Action Program charging according to that fee schedule that was in effect in the two-year contract that expired on March 31st?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, again I wish to remind my honourable friend that the contract is still in force. Now, I would hope and I would believe that the only legal way would be for those that are still working in the plan, that have opted in, would continue until there is a change.

It is not — I might say also of my honourable friend — it is not our intention to penalize the medical profession or to see anything that might place the plan in jeopardy. We will announce probably fairly soon some method by which we will look at the fees and maybe change it this year some way or other. Before doing anything further, certainly we still hope that the medical profession and the MMA will see fit to resume the negotiation after the guarantee that we give them, that we would be able to give them an answer on the



questions that they wish to discuss in plenty of time for next year's contract — should there be a contract — and were an agreement arrived at in the meantime.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Labour. Could the Acting Minister of Labour inform the House as to the status of current contract negotiations for the grain handlers at the Port of Churchill?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice and reply to the Member for Pembina at a later time.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I thank the Minister and I raise this matter because I'm interested in knowing whether the present administration might make the parties to that negotiation and the mediator aware of the importance of completing those contract negotiations very quickly, Mr. Speaker. I raise the matter today since the Minister of Labour is in Ottawa and in view of the fact that the mediators and the two parties are to be resuming negotiations on Monday, April 5.

I think it would be opportune for the Minister of Labour to make known the importance of successful contract completions with the grain workers in the Port of Churchill so that no parties potentially using the Port of Churchill, might use the lack of a finished agreement as an excuse for not using the Port of Churchill for movement of prairie grain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** Yes, having just had the opportunity to return from the community of Churchill and having an opportunity at that time to speak to both the Port manager and to the president of the union which represents the workers at the Port, I am pleased to inform the Member for Pembina that the negotiations are ongoing.

As he is aware, this is a federal matter and therefore the provincial role is somewhat limited, but I can assure him that we are interested; I can assure him that we are watching the situation; I can assure him that we took the time to speak personally to the main parties involved in the negotiations and I think if we can maintain that type of presence, which is firm but kind in respect to dealing with these parties, those negotiations can be undertaken in a positive way.

I also want to put on the record the fact that the Port of Churchill has one of the best labour-manager relationships of any of the Ports and therefore every indication is, that they will be able to build upon that very fine record and be able to successfully conclude these negotiations as we all hope they will to the benefit of both labour and management at the Port of Churchill.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the

Minister has had recent discussions with both sides involved in the Port of Churchill negotiations, could the Minister advise the House that a sizable export from the Port of Churchill is on hold now, pending successful negotiations of the labour contract in Churchill and that our interest in the opposition is in ensuring that that labour contract is indeed completed posthaste so that that sizable new use of the Port of Churchill may begin to be negotiated again?

**MR. COWAN:** Well, of course, we'd like to see the most effective use of the Port of Churchill accomplished this year. We are involving ourselves to the extent that we are aggressively promoting the use of the Port among the different parties which have historically used the Port of Churchill in the past.

As well, we are extending that promotion into areas where we feel there is potential for the use of the Port of Churchill and I am certain that the labour-management negotiations which are ongoing at this stage are not having a negative influence on the negotiations for the use of the Port as that is the case with most ports.

When people take the time to look at the use of the Port of Churchill from a labour relations perspective and compare it with the other ports — and I don't mean in any way to denigrate the other ports — but I do mean by doing this and by saying so, to promote the Port of Churchill even more, they will find that the Port of Churchill has one of the most consistent, one of the best and one of the most admirable labour relations of any port in this country or in any other country.

So I am somewhat concerned that by the line of questioning which the Member of Pembina is pursuing at this point, that he may be aggravating and causing concern in other persons' minds as to what is happening in respect to those labour-management negotiations which are ongoing now. So let the record be quite clear in this regard.

They have a good record in the past. There is every reason to believe that they will continue on with that good record. The negotiations are ongoing at this time and there is no reason to believe that those negotiations won't be successfully concluded in time to have a full use of the Port of Churchill this season. I think those persons who are interested in this matter should know those facts, that they should be made very clear and distinct to them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Can he advise whether he has yet been able to make a decision with respect to returning the abandoned rights-of-way to the landowners through whose land those rights-of-way run?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the members opposite on a number of occasions now that that's an interdepartmental area of discussion

involving policy review and when that policy is established, it will be announced.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister inform the House when he hopes to have that review completed?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the Member for Minnedosa some time ago that if there was a matter of urgency, a particular case that required attention, I would be prepared to deal with it on an ad hoc basis. But the review is ongoing and I'm not certain as to when a decision will be made.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to that issue, the number of people involved in my constituency, I believe all regard the situation as urgent. Can I ask the Minister then, is he advising that all of those people who feel in their judgment it is urgent, that they simply write to the Minister and that they will get a decision?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the honourable member that to date I don't believe, although I may be wrong, but I don't believe there has been one letter from any individual out there suggesting that there is some urgency with respect to that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs; and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

#### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

##### SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas):** The Committee will come to order. We are in Natural Resources, page 93, Article 1.(a)(1) Minister's Salary. The Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, earlier on in the Estimates the Minister undertook to provide further information on a road project on PR 240 which involves the construction of a road through a major ravine in the Tobacco Creek with the idea in mind that that road could be so constructed as to retain a fairly

substantial body of water during spring runoff and help alleviate some of the downstream runoff problems in the spring.

Could the Minister indicate whether he has that information available?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. ALVIN H. MACKLING (St. James):** No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't. As the honourable member will recall that Mr. Weber, who is head of that section of my department was on holidays — we brought him back from his holiday on one occasion — I think he's back now but I didn't admit, ask him about that and I haven't got that information at this time.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I raise the matter again, I would have raised it during Item 13 but other matters came up.

Recently the steering committee that has been meeting on the Tobacco Creek Watershed Project — which is joint federal and provincial as the Minister well knows — at a March 23rd meeting Natural Resource Departmental Staff did provide some estimated costs for road and dam construction which would provide some 2,647 acre feet of storage at the road level if constructed in a given manner. Since the staff has indicated that kind of information, would the Minister undertake to provide to myself the report that his staff had presented at that meeting so that I might further pursue this with the Minister in the next couple of weeks?

**MR. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I've made note of it. If the honourable member would appreciate I would like him to confirm maybe to memo and then I'll refer it to Mr. Weber and get a report in writing. He did on the occasion of the honourable member's question as I recall, intimate to me that the costs appeared prohibitive in respect to the proposed work. However, it is the kind of development that I'm interested in, as the honourable member has quite rightly noted, and I don't know what design structure was used and whether or not it's possible to carry out this kind of a development at much reduced cost, if the costs were too high, and I am prepared to look at that kind of thing.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I am encouraged to hear that, Mr. Chairman. In the Highways Department Capital Construction Budget there is a carried over figure on construction for that last two miles which will take up certainly, a fairly sizable portion of the estimated cost that I have been given and it might well be that it's not nearly the kind of major expenditure that the Minister has indicated.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, what was the PR again?

**MR. ORCHARD:** 240

**MR. MACKLING:** 240. Okay.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Just, Mr. Chairman, if I might make

some general comments on the Minister's Salary and note with the Minister that during the course of these Estimates which I think we have had a most invigorating series of debates upon several topics, I just want to indicate to the Minister that I still have a certain amount of concern about the Minister's approach which I believe does reflect the government's approach on several issues, one of them, Mr. Chairman, of course being Garrison which we substantially discussed at the outset of the Estimates and then just recently, I believe on Tuesday night, we further discussed Garrison.

Our concern and my concern, particularly, is that this Minister may well be taking this government on a route on the whole Garrison issue that's quite different from that pursued by the Schreyer administration and by the Lyon administration. And, you know, we have been anxious to see the kinds of funding levels that this government will propose for the increased Garrison lobby effort. We still, even though announcements have been made as to the appointment of certain members of the legal profession going to represent Manitoba in Washington and carry out what would seem to be a direct lobby effort there on behalf of the province, we still don't have any indication of what those estimated costs will be to the taxpayer and we do have some disappointment on that because it was a major campaign plank of the N.D. Party during the election that they would not only provide direct Manitoba office in Washington, but would step up the efforts on lobbying against the Garrison project. We still don't have any evidence of that increased lobby through either the first run of Estimates or through supplements that we've seen to date. I just want to indicate to the Minister that that to me, as I indicated earlier on, may provide the American proponents with the kind of hope they may have to carry out the project in that this government has not made public yet what their lobby efforts are going to entail and what kind of costs they are willing to put towards that lobby effort. As was indicated the other night when the Minister was questioned by my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, on his acceptance of the International Joint Commission, the Minister's answer was quite different from answers of previous Ministers of his responsibility and the past two provincial governments. That does cause some concern as to the integrity of the provincial position when indeed they seem to be questioning International Joint Commission recommendations.

The second area of concern that I have, Mr. Chairman, about this Minister and his newly taking over of the Natural Resources Department, is the total review that he is undertaking on behalf of his government on the sale of agricultural Crown lands.

I will say it as briefly and succinctly as I can. I greatly fear that this government will halt the sale of agricultural Crown lands to the lease holders, a policy which was instituted by our government in response to a recognized need by those lease holders to own the land, to make further improvements on it under ownership and to become more solid citizens in the agricultural community.

This Minister in this government appear to be not willing to recognize that request, that need, that desire by the agricultural Crown land lease holders

and appears willing to go back to continued Crown ownership with no potential of sale of that agricultural Crown land to the lease holders.

If that is the policy change that this Minister is going to recommend and this government is going to undertake, it will meet with considerable opposition by ourselves in the Opposition and considerable resistance in the farming community who have over the past three or four years availed themselves of the option to buy agricultural Crown land.

The Minister also announced a significant change in government policy regarding the construction of flood protection facilities in the Red River Valley, an area which traditionally for the past 20 to 30 years has been provided flood protection works with the capital cost being picked up entirely by the two senior levels of government, the Federal and Provincial government, and no-cost assignment to the municipalities.

This Minister has carried out a change in that policy as was given to him by his Treasury Board and Cabinet who approved a new policy whereby those municipalities in the Red River Valley will now be required to pay 10 percent of the capital costs. That is a policy change which we do not support. We realize that the Minister is making the argument that it is equitable to do so because other communities such as Carman, Ste. Rose and Gimli are required to make a capital contribution, I submit that that argument will not suffice because those three communities of Carman, Ste. Rose and Gimli are in a substantially different position than the communities in the Red River Valley.

The policy developed for them was one in which it was the only way that they could receive flood protection with any senior level of government participation in the funding. So he cannot attempt to play the have communities — shall we call them in the Red River Valley — against the have-not communities in Carman, Gimli and Ste. Rose because the factors under which he is going to base that kind of an argument just are not borne out by any departmental analysis that he will receive and to make that argument is to mislead the communities, I submit, Sir.

So we are deeply disappointed that this Minister has initiated the change in policy in the Red River Valley and we are hopeful that this Minister in his wisdom will recommend to Cabinet that the Red River Valley policy of requiring 10 percent Capital contribution will be reversed and that those communities will continue to receive this year and next year, flood protection at no-cost to the municipalities.

We understand that the Minister is discussing that with Cabinet at this present time and the Opposition will give him full support to revert back to the long-standing policy of some 25 to 30 years of providing that flood protection at no cost to municipalities. We hope that the Minister will fight for the rights of those communities in the Red River Valley and not attempt to secure monies from them that have never had to be paid before under any established funding program for flood protection, and I suppose the last area that I am personally quite disappointed in the Minister and although he attempted in some ways to reduce the impact of what he said in tabling the Capital Estimates on Thursday of last week, I am still disappointed that this Minister leaves with the committee the impres-

sion that even though we approved the Capital Works and the listed projects in committee today, that he still reserves the right to politically analyse and make further decisions. That has not been the modus operandi, shall I say, of our government when we were there during the Lyon administration, nor do I believe it was the method of operation by the Schreyer administration or any administration prior to the Schreyer government.

It is my understanding that when Capital Works outlines are presented not only in Natural Resources but in Highways and in the Health Care facilities and in the Education field, that those intended undertakings have received all of the Treasury Board and Cabinet scrutiny necessary to allow them to become a printed program. What the Minister has indicated is of course that the printed program is an indicator, but is certainly subject to further political scrutiny by himself as a Minister and by Cabinet. That's a divergence from past policy, a divergence that we don't believe is proper. We would like to be able to think that the list of Capital Works projects has had the political as well as the technical input before it arrives before us at the committee stage to be voted upon, and I would urge the Minister to proceed with those projects without further political scrutiny. They are all, as I see them, worthy and needed projects for the citizens who reside in those various areas and necessary to the future well-being of those parts of rural Manitoba under which they will be undertaken.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a number of concerns — I have a number of concerns. The four of them that I have listed will sum them up. I hope that as we approach the Estimates for Natural Resources next year that the Minister will have realized the wisdom of some of the suggestions that we, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, have made to him and will see fit to follow along the co-operative lines that we would very much enjoy working with him, his staff and his department, for carrying out the functions of the Department of Natural Resources for the betterment of the Manitoba economy and the rural Manitoba farm community and resource using community.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's comments break no new ground and perhaps I'll reserve and hear other statements or comments and answer them in one response rather than take up the Committee's time in individual responses.

**MR. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'd like to concur with the comments made by the Member for Pembina. In saying that, I won't rehash many of them but I'd like to ask specifically two questions regarding the funding proportions. We've been told that it's under Cabinet review but I'm wondering if the Minister, this being our last occasion which we can possibly pose some pointed questions, can the Minister be any more definite as far as a timetable as to when he believes Cabinet will make the final decision in this particular question?

**MR. MACKLING:** Which question, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. MANNES:** Regarding the funding proportions

of the diking question.

**MR. MACKLING:** I assume the honourable member means the Red River community dikes?

**MR. MANNES:** Correct.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I've indicated, and my staff have communicated directly, hopefully by this time to the Mayors and Reeves that I had talked to earlier, that the work being carried on in my department to enable myself and my colleagues to review the basis of funding has not been completed. I have not received that from my department. I am hopeful that I'll receive that fairly soon so that I can review the recommendations made by my department with my colleagues and then I'll be having another meeting with those Reeves and Mayors of those communities affected.

**MR. MANNES:** This is the last question I'll ask on timetabling, but do you see that happening in the month of April?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly am hopeful that it all can be completed in April; that is the review can be completed and I can have an opportunity to meet with the community representatives in that time.

**MR. MANNES:** One final question, Mr. Minister. Will you table the internal research dealing with the secondary diking costs in Winnipeg? I feel that's going to be the basis, at least, for part of your decision. Would you undertake to table that information, or that research, in the House?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the request is to table the City of Winnipeg costing of dikes and pumping and that sort of thing. Surely, I'll be happy to provide that information.

**MR. MANNES:** Fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to a point that's been made repeatedly in the committee about whether or not the Minister and the government has the right to modify a list of Capital projects by citing a number of examples. It is my point, I think, that the Minister in any department reserves the right to modify or adjust any program approved by the Legislature and/or the Cabinet, and I would go further and say that any modification or any alteration, of course, is sometimes done at the cost of a political price. But I don't think anybody can challenge the principle that the government and the Minister has the right to make adjustments. When you want to come down to specific programs I think one can then debate the pros and cons of implementing a program or modifying a particular program. I want to give an example to members of the Committee and to the Member for Lakeside, who was sitting here the other day with the Member for Pembina ranting and

raving on this particular matter, and I want to remind him that when — (Interjection) — well, how about singing and dancing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** Perhaps the Honourable Member for Elmwood is just about to prepare to withdraw that last remark, if we just encourage him a little bit.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I know the Member for Lakeside sings, I don't know whether he dances, I didn't see the family concert the other night but I gather that he certainly sang.

I want to remind him, however, that not only did his government and he himself modified programs but also in some instances have played around with programs that were almost completed — and I go back to 1977 — when the government seriously considered scrapping or significantly altering programs that were already approved.

For example, the Provincial Garage in 1977 was 90 percent completed in terms of construction and when the government came in, in spite of the fact that there was that size of an investment made, held up the project for a considerable period of time at a cost to the taxpayer in terms of heat, light and security, then at a much later date put in the money and then at a much later date then leased the building out in effect, to government departments.

Similarly, when the Conservatives came into power in spite of the fact that there was a Provincial Lab on Logan Avenue for which the property had been expropriated and for which the foundation had been poured — the contract let the building design — the government apparently considered selling the property at a point in time when no money practically, could be recovered for the concrete foundations that were poured which — if my memory is correct — I think were as high as \$700,000.00. Now if it wasn't that high then it was at least half of that figure. There were hundreds of thousands dollars invested in the foundation, let alone in the expropriation of the property and in the design of the particular project.

So I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, the programs were significantly modified and the programs were in fact considered in the first realm by the government to be scrapped in spite of the fact that considerable monies were invested, despite the fact that it had been approved by Cabinet, passed by the Legislature and construction was well on its way.

The law courts property was expropriated for the law courts, the government saw fit to change the location and then just before the election gave the property to the Chinese community as a gift and in the case of MPIC, decided to not proceed with a printed program and not proceed with a building that was on the verge of being designed and constructed in the core area. Then the government went out and rented — (Interjection) — and, pardon?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. I believe the Honourable Member for Elmwood has cited one example and I would remind him that we're on Natural Resources so I hope that we would get back the subject

of the discussion.

**MR. DOERN:** As you'll recall, Mr. Chairman, one of the issues we're discussing is whether or not the government can modify a printed line Estimate or a capital program and I'm giving examples and illustrations where the very people who have said that did, in fact, significantly modify or attempt to kill printed programs of the previous administration and of course they do so with some particular risk to themselves in the sense that if a change is made and a significant program is deleted, or altered, or killed, then they do so at a political risk, especially when monies have been expended in that regard.

I give two final illustrations from my own constituency where a senior citizens' housing project was killed even after monies were appropriated for that purpose, even after it was a printed line estimate. The property was acquired, the architect was appointed, the working drawings were completed and the contractor was in fact sitting on the site with his equipment ready to begin construction and in spite of that the project was cancelled.

In another instance, the Refit Centre at the old Concordia Hospital property was in fact approved and was proceeding in regard to design.

So I simply say that these were projects that were approved by the previous administration and they were killed in these instances by the incoming administration. So I simply say that it's not a valid point that's been made over and over again by the hour by a number of opposition members that they want the assurance that the Minister will not alter one iota the projects that he has presented. I simply say that he has the long-established right to modify any program that he has. He has that right in principle and he also has the right in detail or in specific. But on the latter point, I say that of course any government modifies programs at its own peril and takes a certain risk in modifying an announced program. But all things considered, that is something that they are fully within their rights to do.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wish once again to review two issues here that I brought to the Minister's attention during these Estimates and one was the senior citizens of our area, how it was brought to my attention that they find it very difficult to arrange the transportation to and from the park areas surrounding Portage over the weekend. They apparently are being asked to leave their area, having to return then at the first of the week with their trailers.

I'm wondering if the Minister will entertain the thought of increasing the percentage of lots designated — if I may use that word — designate it to the use of senior citizens in such areas as the Lynch's Point camping grounds and also the Norquay area? I believe if this could be undertaken, it would certainly be a big help to those who do enjoy some of the outdoor facilities that the province has.

I'd like to mention too, once again, the Delta Marsh area. I mention to the Minister suggesting that I believe and they are the thoughts of people who were

born and raised in that particular area, that it would be such an improvement if we could get back to the system of the free flow of water from Lake Manitoba to the marshes and return.

This first step has been taken by clearing the channel in these past few months and I do believe it's in your consideration to look at the Clandeboye Dam and if that is the case, I would urge you to give every consideration to the possible free flow of waters through that opening. Going back in history, apparently that was the case that the free flow improved the ability of the fish to spawn in the marshes and therefore it would help in the reproduction of our famous fish, the pickerel of Manitoba.

Mr. Minister, I want to just make note and refer to the Garrison just for a moment, it's been spoken of at great lengths. I believe Portage la Prairie probably has just as big a concern as any city or town in the Province of Manitoba when it comes to referring to the Garrison. Our present Mayor and the previous Mayor and Councils, the Reeve of Portage la Prairie, members of the Manitoba Fishermen's Association have all spoken on their concerns about the Garrison.

You are quite aware, I'm sure, that today Portage is one of the forerunners in the production of the food processing business, and if they don't have ample supply of fresh waters available to them, we as a center of the food processing business, we'll have troubles that we just will not be able to cope with.

Firstly, Mr. Minister, I doubt very much whether an office in Washington is going to help the cause or even an office situated in the basement of this building. I doubt very much if that is going to be the answer to our problems. I believe, Sir, that the International Waters Agreement between the United States of America and Canada will be our strongest point working for us on this issue. I thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I've indicated I'm prepared to respond. I don't think any new ground is being broken in these comments and I'll be prepared to make one answer by way of a kind of a wrap-up, if that's the member's wish.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to re-emphasize one or two points that I made to the Minister earlier in his Estimates.

One was to do with the report that he has on the poaching of our wildlife and the loss of our freshwater fish by overcatch or illegal catch, whatever may be the particular term used, the serious loss of this resource obviously by highly organized groups, is something of grave concern to those of us that are concerned with wildlife in the province; and as I mentioned to the Minister in remarks earlier in his Estimates, the fines in my estimation for the charges under this particular section of the Act are far, far too lenient and we won't, I don't think, really come to grips with this or get some teeth into it unless these fines are changed.

Another item that I've mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, was the permission required to hunt on

private property which we feel is good legislation, although to make it successful and make it the good legislation that it was intended to do, I think requires some common sense application by the CO's and other people involved. A case has come to my attention over the weekend, and it wasn't a conservation officer involved; it was the other force. The farmer who was allowing a chap to trap on his property along the river indicated that he would be putting his cattle out into the area shortly gave him ample time to move his snares or traps or whatever he may have in the area and he did that. He took them up and moved them further down the river area where they would be out of the particular reach of the animals who were being turned out and consequently was charged with trespassing because he hadn't had time to go and get permission of the - and that is being a little overzealous, I think, on the part of the arresting officer and I think these things are going to damage the benefits that I think are available to all of us under that section of the Act that was passed. I think it's a good section and can work very very well as long as it's applied with some good common sense. I know the Minister is concerned with the poaching. Hopefully the people involved are carrying on with their work to apprehend the people responsible and I know he will be working with the Attorney-General's Department to possibly increase some of the fines under these particular sections to make it a little more meaningful and make it a little more of a deterrent for those that are caught with illegal game for sale in their possession.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I want to express appreciation on the part of the members of our group for the opportunity of the extensive debate that we've had on the Estimates in the Department of Natural Resources. I think, Mr. Chairman, it has become evident to the Minister that partly by reason of geography and also interest, the members in the Opposition have an immediate and an intimate knowledge of the effect the implications of what happens in the Department of Natural Resources, whether it involves water conservation projects, whether it involves drainage projects, whether it involves wildlife regulations, forestry, timber and all the many facets of your department, and so I think it becomes evident to you that while the temptation may well be to look at us through your political glasses and suggest that in some of the further reviews of proposed programs that they may colour your decisions, I remind you that the department and its programs affect — but I'm sure you are convinced of some of the very vital and important aspects of what makes Manitoba not such a bad place to live in.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to repeat the arguments and debates that were instigated, as I understand it, the other evening in my absence. I do just want to make this one comment and that has to do with the Garrison situation. The entire position over the past decade, the Canadian and Manitoba position has been based, anchored on the IJC Report. This report which took several years to compile authored by both American and Canadian experts, the best in the field in terms of the subject matter at hand, that has formed the basis of the Canadian-Manitoba posi-

tion with respect to Garrison. It's been reported to me that you are and your government is proposing to deviate from that position. I say to do so has its perils. I'm not suggesting and certainly it's entirely to your prerogative or the government's prerogative not to accept all the recommendations, concerns contained within that IJC document.

However, the strength of the Canadian position has been that we have relied on that objective scientific report to form our basis of expressions of concern and our position to proposed developments that could affect Canada as pointed out by that report. To deviate from that position leaves us open to the charge of interfering and meddling in another nation's affairs. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it detracts from the validity of the Canadian-Manitoba position. That position is acknowledged to be an appropriate one. It has integrity. It is understood by lots of people that aren't necessarily wrapped up in the overall question of Garrison, but when people see that the position that Canada and Manitoba takes is supported by perhaps one of the most exhaustive studies ever undertaken on a matter such as this, they say yes, Canada has a right to take the position they are. They're not simply being a dog in the manger and opposing for opposition sakes or indulging in what Canadians unfortunately more frequently like to indulge in, simply expressions of anti-Americanism. Our opposition is based on the best of possible scientific evidence that has been put together in this situation, and for us, and I just put this on the record, Mr. Minister, for us to deviate from the recommendation of the IJC Report in my judgment has grave perils for us. It could detract from the soundness of our opposition to those matters that concern us about the Garrison; it could detract certainly in the eyes of more distant observers, but who have in the final analysis fairly influential positions in this matter. I'm speaking about federal people and within our own External Affairs Department; I'm speaking about the federal people in the national government of the U.S. in Washington. If we now simply begin to oppose because we don't like some of the aspects of the Garrison and it is not based and it's a deviation from the IJC Report, I suggest we are putting that position in jeopardy; a position I remind you, Mr. Minister, that was carried forward in a nonpartisan way by successive governments, held fast throughout the Schreyer years, held fast too throughout the Lyon years; and I must say, I was extremely disturbed to learn that as a result of some revelations made the other night in the committee that it is not necessarily the position of this government to hold to that position. I say it has its perils for us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments the honourable members have made. I will resist the temptation to respond in detail to matters that already really have been addressed during the course of the review of the Estimates in respect to the innumerable areas that have been discussed, including Crown lands. I think that there has been an indication that I, as Minister, and I believe my government, my colleagues, are being pragmatic. I can indicate that there isn't, I suppose, a Cabinet

meeting that has taken place during the course of these Estimates that I haven't been presenting to my colleagues documentation in respect to sale of Crown lands that were in the work and has continued. However, I have indicated my concern and I think it's a concern of my colleagues that we are going to look very carefully at Crown lands with the point of view of making sure we husband these resources very carefully.

In respect to the concerns of the honourable member regarding the poaching and misuse of wildlife and fisheries; that is a genuine problem and as I've indicated, I sympathize with the concerns that perhaps we have to ensure that there is a greater deterrent value in fines or the disposition when we finally after great difficulty do bring someone to justice in this area.

In respect to the problem that the honourable member brought forward, I have no detail on that and if a conservation officer was involved in a charge of trespassing that was too quickly laid or really wasn't well thought out; I'd certainly like to have the details because it's the kind of thing that I want staff to use good and careful judgment in respect to areas of activity like that.

In respect to the Honourable Member for Portage, his concerns about camping - I think he had indicated those concerns while staff were here and I think it's a matter of record now that he is concerned about those things and he also mentioned the Clandeboye Dam structure and I believe I heard that or my officials did hear that as well.

In respect to the Capital items, I think I've said perhaps overmuch in respect to that. I think that the record is fairly clear on that question.

Now, the one area, Mr. Chairman, that I feel constrained to say something more on is in respect to Garrison. Now, there is some concern on the part of members and I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the manner in which his remarks are addressed; not in a bellicose manner but in a manner indicating much more, I think, of the kind of attitude we need in respect to Garrison and that is a much more bi-partisan approach to the problems we face as Manitobans.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been provided with record as to some past activity in respect to Garrison and there's no question but there was a strong bi-partisan approach followed in respect to this matter in the recent past. I have had the privilege of looking at the record, at Hansard, and I note that a resolution was introduced by the Premier, then the Leader of the Opposition in respect to this matter and that resolution was given a unanimous approval by the House at that time. The then Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Ransom, referred to the problems involved in respect to Garrison and referred to the ongoing activities of the Provincial Government through the Federal Government and I would like to quote from the record of Hansard, Thursday, June 19, 1980 at Page 4921. He's referring here to a diplomatic note that was sent by the Canadian Embassy; a diplomatic note and he reads it into the record as follows: "The Canadian Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honour to refer to previous exchanges of views

between the Canadian and the United States Governments on the Garrison Diversion Project. The Embassy wishes to express a serious concern of the Canadian Government that important new funds may be appropriated for the Garrison Diversion Project, which as currently authorized, would have a seriously damaging impact in Canada. The Embassy understands that such funds would not be spent on portions of the project with potential direct implications for Canada. Nevertheless, in the absence of any significant project redesign which would fully protect Canadian waters and reflect the recommendations of the International Joint Commission, such continuing construction momentum could well result in actions that could lead to a violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty. The principal reason" — and I underline this, Mr. Chairman, — "the principal reason for this concern remains the Lone Tree reservoir and various connected works. The Canadian Government therefore considers that satisfactory resolution of the serious bilateral implications of this project should precede decision aimed at completion of the Lone Tree reservoir or works whose operation under the authorized plan is dependent on the reservoir. In the Canadian Government's view, the serious issues raised by the project require a deliberate process of review which fully addresses both the well documented Canadian concerns and the International Joint Commission's recommendations."

So, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the position of the Manitoba Government in 1980; the position of the Government of Canada in 1980 was that no work should be proceeded with, including Lone Tree, until the Department of State could satisfy the Canadian Government that those works would not result in an impairment of water quality and a damage to Canadian water. That was the position of the government in 1980: That is still the position of this government.

Now, since there's been much said about Garrison, I'd like to refer to, Mr. Chairman, to the document, the International Joint Commission's decision; its review of this question in 1977 and it's entitled Transboundary Implications of the Garrison Diversion Unit. I read from Page 102. I'm going to read some passages into the record because they are important, Mr. Chairman. Reading from the last paragraph: "For all of these reasons the board insisted that the interbasin transfer problem be examined in great depth. The United States Bureau of Reclamation had already recognized the necessity of controlling such introduction by proposing the use of fish screens as an early modification to their first plans. The ability of these screens to prevent the transfer of foreign biota was thoroughly reviewed and the Biology Committee found that among other things the mesh size was large enough to allow some larvae to pass through. Moreover, as the board pointed out in their report, fish eggs, fish larvae and perhaps even small adults could pass around the screens because of spaces between screen panels. This is important because the impact of such a transfer would be irreversible and would become apparent in about 10 years, with full impact in 25 to 50 years. If it were to occur, the undesirable foreign species which have a high reproductive potential could successfully compete for food and space; could replace indigenous forage fish; could

alter the balance between existing predators and their prey; could carry parasites and could destroy some of the valuable present species. The interbasin transfer could also introduce fish diseases by water medium. In addition to the general aquasystem destabilization that could occur, the population of Whitefish, Walleye and Sauger could be reduced by 50 percent in Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba. This would in turn cause an annual loss of \$6 million Canadian to the commercial fishing industry of Manitoba and could possibly eliminate it. The Manitoba sports fishery could experience an annual loss of 26,000 recreation days and \$130,000 in related revenue. Although some of these foreign species may eventually have some value, the Commission cannot assess their stability or their economic potential. The board emphasized and the Commission agrees that with the development of the magnitude of the GDU - that's the Garrison Division Unit - "it is inevitable that some impacts will not have been identified. It is clear, however, that the overall biological impact, through the introduction of foreign fish, fish eggs, fish diseases and parasites from GDU, as envisaged, is potentially severe. The Commission notes with concern that historically actions by man which have substantially changed or altered the natural environment often produced results not contemplated when the action took place. Once these changes are made they may be irreversible."

Then, Mr. Chairman, there are so many passages that are very significant in this document, but I'm reading merely highlights, Mr. Chairman. At the top of Page 107: "Nevertheless, overland flow from irrigated fields and accidents present an unacceptable danger of biota transfer that, in the Commission's view, must be eliminated or disposed of in a way satisfactory to both countries before the project proceeds. The Commission believes that the McClusky Canal Fish Screen, as envisaged, would not be an effective barrier against the transfer of foreign biota to the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin."

Bottom of Page 108. "The Board has reduced the risk of a biological time bomb but not eliminated it. The Commission is concerned that, even with the best engineering talent available, and with the best operating practises possible, the very complexity of the scheme, the immensity of the physical features, the large numbers of human beings involved in carrying out the responsibility and the possible mechanical failures, what cannot happen, will happen. The Commission believes it must advise the two governments to be conservative and proceed very cautiously with new and untried engineering works, the failure of which might seriously affect the equilibrium of a large natural system, such as, the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin that has been achieved over many centuries."

Then further on, on Page 109: "Nevertheless the criteria at the present time should be the one expressed by the Biology Committee. There must be a 100 percent assurance of fish passage prevention over an infinite time. The Commission concludes that the McClusky Canal Fish Screen, even if modified, together with the closed system, cannot be relied upon to prevent the transfer of biota from the Missouri River to the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin. The Commission further concludes that the predicted impacts of a biota transfer are so potentially damaging that the



closed system does not provide a sufficient guarantee against such an occurrence." Now those are findings, Mr. Chairman.

Then at the top of Page 110 entitled, "Lone Tree Reservoir." "With respect to Lone Tree Reservoir located in the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin, concern was expressed at the hearings about the possibility that Missouri River water would be transferred into the Cheyenne River and tributaries of the Souris and Red Rivers, either intentionally or by failure of a dam. While the Commission recognizes that there are always risks in the construction of any reservoir, it believes that the possibility of failure of the Lone Tree and Wintering Dams is very remote. The Commission further believes that all the outlet works from the reservoir should be relocated so that they discharge only into the Missouri River Basin. Moreover, to prevent inadvertent transfers of biota, fishing in Lone Tree Reservoir should be forbidden. These actions would reduce the likelihood of the introduction of foreign biota into the waters of the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin." Then, Mr. Chairman, this is key. "The Commission concludes that Lone Tree Reservoir and its dams could be constructed," - could be constructed, and I'm repeating, I'm not quoting here, could be constructed - "without unacceptable risk to Canada, if all outlet works from the Reservoir are located so as to discharge only into the Missouri River Basin; and if fishing in the Reservoir is forbidden."

Now I digress from my commentary, my review of extracts from this report, to say that the proponents of Garrison have never said that they will irrevocably give up the thrust of the various phases of that project which is to irrigate lands in North Dakota. They have agreed to postpone certain phasing of that development, phasing that involved irrigation of lands in North Dakota from that Lone Tree Reservoir, but they have never said that they're backing away from the ultimate use of that full Reservoir, the Lone Tree Reservoir.

We have taken the position, Mr. Chairman, that the International Joint Commission's findings are sound and valid. We say, however, that the conditions that the Commission has placed on the Lone Tree Reservoir, the conditions that no water will be discharged anywhere in the area north of the Divide, or that there will be no fishing in Lone Tree, make Lone Tree impossible, in fact, for the proponents of the Garrison Diversion complex; make it impossible. And we are just indicating the reality of the findings of that Commission when we say that because, in effect, that's what happens, and we are not taken light the position of the previous government, the position of the Federal Government is that there ought to be no transfer of water from the Missouri Basin to the Hudson Bay Basin; we have not departed from that.

Mr. Chairman, in respect to our increased opposition to Garrison, I want to put on the record that in July of 1981 there was a Congressional Hearing and there was an opportunity there to further block funding for Garrison, and we have the words of Mr. Conte, who was the representative from, I believe, Iowa, Massachusetts - my colleague, the Member for Inkster supplied me with this copy of the Congressional Record, for which I thank him - and, Mr. Conte, the representative for Massachusetts used very, very

strong language in connection with the criticism of this project - I'll read a portion of it into the record so that we understand, Mr. Chairman, some of the deep feeling and resentment in the United States on this issue which we should understand.

He says, "Mr. Chairman," - this is Mr. Conte speaking - "those members who are supporting this bureaucratic boondoggle clearly are grasping for straws. A recently distributed 'Dear Colleague,' by the Member for North Dakota, would have you believe that the Congress owes the proponents of this special interest project something for their patience. The author of this 'Dear Colleague' states that one of the reasons for this water diversion project is to provide a 'counter balance' for the negative impact that other aspects of the Plan, the Garrison Dam itself, and other mainstream dams, would have on the State of North Dakota."

He continues, by saying in his letter - and I won't read all this, Mr. Chairman - but he goes on and indicates his knowledge of the concern in Manitoba about this Garrison project. And then, later on, a proponent, a Mr. Myers, Congressman, indicates in the Congressional Record that we do not hear anything from the Parliament of Canada. I'm paraphrasing now, to say, he's indicating to that Congressional Committee that there was no vigorous representation obviously from the Parliament of Canada in respect to this. We are concerned, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that Congressmen in the United States, when dealing with any other appropriations, will know that we are vigorously opposed to Garrison.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to put that on the record.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)(1)—pass.

Resolution 101. BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$360,500 for Natural Resources for Executive Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, before Committee Rises I would like to indicate to all members — I wish there were more of the members here who patiently bore with me during the many moments we had together here — and let me indicate that although we spent a good deal of time together and all of it wasn't as happy and as accommodating as some of us may have thought it might have been . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Point of Order.

**MR. RANSOM:** What item are we dealing with now?

**MR. MACKLING:** We are not dealing with a formal item.

**MR. RANSOM:** Is this open for debate now?

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, if the member wants to protest my indicating just a general part of the wrap-up speech —(Interjection)— all right. I will take back the nice things I was going to say, Mr. Chairman. I will respect the honourable member's

viability of his position.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** As Chairman of the Committee, I'd like to thank the Chairman and I'd like to thank all the members for the patience and understanding that you have exercised with the new Chairman.

We'll now move into Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

### **SUPPLY - FITNESS, RECREATION AND SPORT**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas):** Now we'll officially start on Fitness, Recreation and Sport, page 60, Item No. 1. General Administration.

The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, if we may just wait a moment or two for our chief critic to arrive, he was just in the other Committee. I would in his absence ask the Minister to indicate his intentions. Would he be making some brief statement as is the practice in some of the Estimates?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I intend to, Mr. Chairman, very brief, so we'll wait for the member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to present the Estimates of the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport in this first year of our operation to say how pleased I am to have these responsibilities.

You will recall that I had the privilege of serving in this capacity in the Seventies and found it particularly rewarding to observe how Fitness, Recreation and Sport activities affected the lives of the people within our province.

Only recently I had the opportunity of visiting Bois-sevain where hundreds of athletes were gathered to participate in the Manitoba Games and on the same weekend of travelling to Flin Flon to see some of our most skillful athletes competing in the Canadian Junior Cross-Country Ski Championship and then a week later to attend the exciting opening ceremonies of the Brier of 1982. It was very gratifying to see the enthusiasm and dedication of people in both the smaller and larger centres.

I am also aware that our recreational activities are not just for the highly skillful or for those engaged in more sophisticated competitions but for all Manitobans. We know how important it is that people have the opportunity to engage in leisure time activities regardless of where they may live, their age, or their particular level of skill. We accept that recreation is an essential community service and contributes to the physical and mental health of our people to bring happiness, improve family relationships, community solidarity and many other values.

As we review the Estimates you will see that there is a strong agreement in the types of programs and services offered as many of them were initiated in the Seventies, were continued by the former administration and are still in place for this next fiscal year. We believe in the principle of assisting people to assist themselves and know that this is best achieved by

supporting municipalities, community organizations, recreation agencies and sports associations.

The district recreation program which enables smaller communities to combine their resources to hire full-time recreation directors will be continued and we anticipate that we will have as many as 30 full-time district recreation directors this year. These recreation directors will be strengthened by the presence of their recreation consultants working out of the regional offices and we will continue to link up the resources of the provincial sport associations and the recreation and cultural organizations interested in the promotion of community recreation activities.

In dealing with fitness we want to continue with a corporate challenge program and to encourage fitness in the workplace. At the same time we recognize there is a need for fitness leaders in communities throughout the province and we'll provide instructor training for people interested in conducting fitness activities.

As many of you know, this is the International Year of the Senior, and we will be co-operating with the Manitoba Society of Seniors and other groups concerned in providing fitness, recreation and sport activities for the older adult. That's for you, Dave.

You will be interested to know that we just completed a training course for fitness instructors over the age of 60 as we believe it is very appropriate that senior citizens give leadership to their own programs. In keeping with the International Year of the Senior we will be offering senior olympics which is an outstanding event coordinated by a department which encourages senior citizens to participate in a series of physical activities such as swimming, bowling, cycling and walking.

For many years the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport has engaged in summer activities which provide excellent working experiences for university students and at the same time, offers leadership programs such as the Birds Hill Day Camp, the Norton Swimming and Water Safety Program, the summer recreation activities in rural communities and special instruction in sport.

We are particularly grateful to the Department of Labour and Manpower for the excellent co-operation offered in providing in these opportunities. We believe that the most important component in providing leisure time opportunities is the coordination and efforts provided by municipal councils, recreation and community organizations. However, it is really essential that municipalities and the community organizations are given substantial backup by provincial recreation agencies and the provincial sport associations.

We are pleased to report that we have a very strong working relationship with the 64 provincial sport bodies and other related groups such as the Manitoba Parks and Recreation Association, Manitoba Camping Association, the Manitoba Hostelling Association, the Manitoba Naturalist Society and others that are contributing to the development of leisure services. In co-operation with the Manitoba Sports Federation, provision has been made to provide a home for these many agencies at the administrative centre for sports and recreation.

The department will continue to provide direct

assistance to the provincial sport associations for sports development programs as grants are available for clinics, teaching certification, athlete aid, travel to and hosting major events. Then of course we will continue to place some emphasis on regional sport development by working co-operatively with regional sports councils and local organizations.

I am pleased to report that the 1982 Manitoba Games have been very well received in all regions of the province and that the participation has been far beyond our expectations. While the Manitoba Games have been tremendously successful we have also been busy preparing young athletes in 18 sports which form the program for the 1983 Canada Winter Games to be held in Saguenay, Lac St. John, Quebec, next February.

Again, observing the principle of assisting groups to assist themselves, we have assigned funding to the sports bodies but I've given them the assignment of selecting and training their athletes.

I will be considering the re-establishment of the Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport which was made up of knowledgeable citizens who act in an advisory capacity to the Minister and who may from time to time be assigned special projects for study in council.

Several weeks ago, members of our caucus enjoyed a weekend retreat at the Gimli Leadership Training Centre and I am pleased to advise that the Centre will continue to serve as a residential training site for recreation, sport and cultural groups as well as other agencies if they wish to engage in the training of their leaders.

In conclusion, I would like to confess that fitness, recreation and sport is very close to my heart and I have enjoyed many personal benefits by engaging in activities and have many life-long friends in sports and recreation. I sincerely believe in the values of most programs that are being offered by communities, organization and municipal-provincial governments.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the staff of my department and here I'd like to say that I believe that the Deputy Minister, Mr. Al Miller, the Director, Mr. Ron Pozernick, Gerry Maurice, Harry Sirett, Don Stone, Bobby de Pencier, Sid Glenesk and of course, the Chairman of the Manitoba Lottery Commission, Garth Manness. I believe that they've given good and loyal service to the former government and I expect and know that I will receive the same from these people. I think that they are professional. I think that they're well qualified and I have no hesitation in working with them at all.

I would also pay tribute to the army of volunteers who dedicate their time, energy and talent to helping others enjoy sport and recreation in our province.

Thank, you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, as one could gather from the Minister's opening remarks this is one of the departments of government I think that is, if one wants to use maybe a slang term, it's a little more fun to be in than many of the others. You're dealing with people right across Manitoba who are

concerned about the well-being of recreation and fitness in the province, many of them volunteers who give a lot of their time and efforts very unselfishly to the development of sport. As a result, what happens is that one finds that it is a department of government which I think is a more enjoyable one from a personal standpoint than many others. I can see why the Minister of Health, in dealing with the problems of Health wanted one portfolio that might not give him the kind of headaches and maybe give him a little more of a — how should I put it? — a little more — (Interjection) — yes, like my colleague says, I should choose my words carefully, but may be a little more rewarding them some of the others because we have in the last number of years seen some very positive results in the field of recreation and sport in the province and I think that while the Member for Dauphin says four years ago, I think what the Minister has indicated in his opening remarks is that there has been a progressive development in the last number of years, 10 years, some of the programs started by the member when he was the Minister, some five, six years ago; some that have been started now. I think that the development in this particular area has been good and beneficial to all the citizens of Manitoba.

In dealing with the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I think we can deal with them fairly rapidly. Maybe we should move from item to item. I think that from time to time we might roam them a little bit but I don't think that should present too big a problem in these particular Estimates; if that would meet with the Minister's approval. Since I guess many of us — and I'm one — seeing that it's very hard to differentiate very often between fitness, recreation or sport; pursuing a particular sport can be a recreation as well as keep you fit and to deal with many of these items even though it might say sport under the one particular item, it could include some fitness aspects as well as some recreation aspects. If that meets with the Minister's approval we could start line by line and if we miss on anything, we can probably come back to it in the Minister's salary when we're finished.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that at all. I think we should try to, if at all possible, discuss things in the line but if it's forgotten, I don't mind at all, providing, of course, that the lottery is discussed together. I wouldn't want to jump from that because I think it is separate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** So we're on 1.(b)(1), Salaries.  
The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** I just wanted to ask a general question of the Minister and that concerns a track and field complex that was looked at and considered by the previous administration. There was an inquiry established headed by Warren Steen and they gave some reports and there was some discussion that went on. I wonder first of all am I correct in assuming that this complex is in fact under this department?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, it isn't. I think that this department is certainly very interested and we would wish and insist that we work very closely with the Minister of Education. Now, the report that was given

at one time, I think that they looked at the possibility of satisfying the University of Winnipeg and also the public, the people in that region. I think that this is still a concern. I think that we should be realistic; not to expect too much. The university will occupy that special gym or whatever the facilities and I'm led to believe, in fact, I know that the track and field people are still pushing. They would like their own facilities. If I'm not asked to say anything about the funding at this time, I certainly like the idea very much. The funding is something else; with the priorities we would look at it but I certainly encourage it. That would, of course, be the direct responsibility of our department as far as the province is concerned. I don't mean necessarily the funding or all the funding or any part of it.

As far as the university, we tried to establish an interdepartmental committee that would look at these things. It would be wrong for instance to have have different gyms and facilities in the school divisions that do not meet with the requirement when probably you can do that for practically the same cost. I think that we have the expertise to determine whether these things could be used and we also encourage as much as possible that these facilities would be used by the community. We hope that there'll be more of that.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that a track and field complex would not be directly under his department but that he would have a major input in it?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, I said the one at the university. The one that the member is speaking about, that was a study made trying to combine both. I think it's pretty well agreed that could be done only to a limited extent; that the first choice of course would be the university. I'm saying that from all reports that I have that the track and field still feel that this would not answer their need. It might answer the need of some people. They are pushing and they've made representation to the Opposition in the days of the former government that they want to proceed with them. I say that in principle, I'm for it very much. I encourage that. I think it is needed but then we have to look at the priorities and our department is not funding; our department has never built these facilities on our own. We've had different programs and it would have to be something that would have to be looked at by the Cabinet and the government if there's anything, and of course, the City and the sport itself might want to participate.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then I do want to address a few remarks to the Minister on this particular complex because there was first of all an appeal made to the government by the track and field community for a facility. I think somebody then decided that maybe they could kill two birds with one stone and they would take the need and the interest of the track and field community, which numbers all the high schools in the province and the junior highs and people out of school and at the university, and so on, and try to kill two birds with one stone, so they combined it with the request of the University of Winnipeg, in terms of providing a facility that would also meet their requirements, and they sort of rejected that.

So I just want to address a few remarks to the Minister on the track and field complex which is still left hanging because I gather that the U of W is going to proceed with a facility and that this is not that so-called combined-use project. I simply want to say to the Minister that I think this thing got fouled up a couple of years ago when the previous government got involved in the Steen Enquiry. They were given specific terms of reference which limited the facility to the downtown area and to the old St. Paul's College site. I want to say to the Minister that I believe that, when he meets - and maybe he has already met - with the track and field fraternity and so on, we have in our city all sorts of indoor arenas, all sorts of indoor swimming pools, we have various outdoor facilities. We spend millions of dollars on public golf courses and not enough on tennis, I might add - maybe I'll speak to the Minister on that question later in his Estimates - but I think the need can be demonstrated and the interest in the community can be demonstrated for a large track and field complex.

I remind the Minister of the success of the Pan American Games that were held in our community and I remind him of the fact that the 1984 Olympics are looming on the horizon in Los Angeles and that we've had track meets over the years, unfortunately the recent ones were sponsored by the Winnipeg Tribune which is now out of existence. So we have that particular problem of a sponsor for professional meets and high school meets, but there still is an annual indoor high school meet. There was a decision taken by the Schreyer Administration to fund an indoor track for track and field. I remember a figure of \$90,000 in conjunction with the Knights of Columbus, and so on, so the basis there. I simply want to encourage the Minister to support that particular project.

I also want to say to him that I don't think that he should limit his vision to the downtown area the way that the previous government did. They were too specific and too zealous about satisfying the U of W needs and the track and field needs; the track and field needs are separate. I also want to remind him of the fact that in the mid-'70s a decision was taken by the Schreyer Administration to locate the Reh-Fit Centre, Rehabilitation Fitness Centre, on the old Concordia hospital site. That was proceeding, that project would have been very beneficial to the citizens of Elmwood and to East Kildonan, North Kildonan, St. Boniface, Transcona, as well as the whole city and as well as the whole province. But it would have had a particular value to that area because Elmwood is in fact a core area, part of the core area, and doesn't have some of the amenities and facilities that are located in other parts of Winnipeg. It's also close to Elmwood High School, close to the Mennonite Brethren Bible College; and could have been accessed by the whole community, people who were heart attack victims, people who were senior citizens, students, etc., etc. That project was slated to go there and was pulled and built on Taylor Avenue. My objection to that is that I think public facilities should be built, in principle, in areas of the province and in areas of the City of Winnipeg where it's beneficial to the average citizen or maybe even people who are disadvantaged, as opposed to areas where people are in a better income bracket and have access to other facilities.

ties. I fought years ago, before I was in government, to try to have the Pan Am pool located in Elmwood. That, of course, never went there, it went into the Taylor Avenue-Grant area and, unfortunately, this facility went there along with many other private facilities, tennis clubs, etc.

So I simply say, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the need for a track and field complex I think is well established. If you're ever going to have a track program you have to have an indoor program. One of the advantages nowadays is many schools and universities and even buildings, commercial buildings, are putting indoor tracks in and so on. But to properly develop a track and field program you need, which is of course largely an amateur sport, you need a proper facility. Indoor tracks and portable tracks are good, but they are only a half measure. So I want to say to the Minister that I hope he will fight for funding and also fight for a track and field complex which I think is overdue in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I think I should respond to that because I don't want to leave the member with false hopes.

First of all, I think in all fairness, we should talk about the University of Winnipeg project because it wasn't first a track and field and then the University latched onto it; it was the other way around. I have no quarrel with the Committee that was set up to see if they could combine it and use it as much as possible. How can I, because I did the same thing with the Rehab Centre, but it was found there also, the Rehab Centre, that they would use it an awful lot. It's used much more than I thought it would be or anybody thought, they had to restrict the membership and I think that it was felt that it could not combine, it could not do both.

It was the same thing with the University and I think we must be fair because the money for the University doesn't come from our department at all for the construction of that. Whatever money that comes from public funds at the provincial level comes from the University Grants Commission. So it is something that they have a certain responsibility at the University, the same as schools have responsibility in gyms. I think this is the important thing.

Now the member, of course, and I don't say this to criticize, he wants to see things located in his constituency and I think that any MLA that is fighting for his constituency would feel the same but, unfortunately, you can't build everything in all the constituencies. The honourable member said that the University of Winnipeg, not to just worry about downtown. Well, it's got to be very close to the University of Winnipeg or it won't serve the purpose. Now, as far as the Rehab is concerned, the honourable member mentioned all the people who are in partnership, but he forgot one. He forgot the City of Winnipeg and that is why the facilities were built on Taylor because that is the property that the City of Winnipeg gave.

There is no doubt that I would have liked to have personally seen it at the old Concordia because of what the member said because I felt with a project that had been submitted to us by the Knights of Columbus, I think that they wanted to help in — well, their main thing again was to take care of their needs and

have the facilities and they have them very close to that now if not on the same property but what interested me that they were going to have a centre for the well elderly and use the facility outside, but you can't argue with success and I think the Rehab Centre where it is, is doing very very well. It is not meant to answer the need of only one part of the community. It's all Winnipeg and there are people from all over the place that are going there and it seems to be working quite well.

Now, the track and field — the member talks about track and field and tennis and I know for a fact that those are his main interests in sports and again I think that he should fight for these things. He has a better chance of doing that of selecting one and fighting for it than the Minister responsible for all sports and fitness and recreation. Now, I don't want to disillusion the member and this is why I stated that as far as I'm concerned, I like the idea very much and I'd like to see it happen and I would want to co-operate with them as much as possible, but there is no way that our department with the limited funds that we have can select one sport and say here, this is what we're going to do. The only program that our department had that was started eight years ago and it was continued was our Capital Program, and there the people have to apply for it, the sponsor. They go to the municipality to make sure that the municipality understands that the government will not accept maintenance or operating costs and also they have the privilege — I don't imagine it's changed that much, correct me if I'm wrong, I think that they have the right when it's the turn of the municipality and the cities of joining together, like I remember Bonivital Swimming Pool was two municipalities getting together and saying we're going to put our \$20,000 each in there and then it was participation. That was at the time — I think it's a little enriched now, but it was 25 percent. The Provincial Government was meeting \$1 for \$3, and the maximum was \$20, so I think that if I'm right, the sponsor, the municipality that put \$60,000 in got \$20,000. I think it's changed somewhat, it's not the same percentage.

Now, as I say, we are limited. We have a certain responsibility. The rest is left to the sports themselves. We are doing everything we can with the administration centre. I think there are valuable services that are rendered to these groups and we assist them also in the different games that we have at certain levels, that is for excellence to try to train and develop good athletes such as the Canada Games and the Olympics, of course, and the British Empire Games and the others. The Manitoba Games is something completely different. It is not something that the sports bodies would select as their No. 1 priority and it is for that reason mostly that the government has to be responsible. It is there that we're looking for mass participation for training of leadership in these different areas, for more volunteers, giving volunteers a chance to come and work together and it has been a real success and we intend to continue that, but I wouldn't want the member or anybody here to think that we can select one sport and say we will build your facilities. We cannot build this at this time. They will have to accept the responsibility. They will have to find ways and means and we will bend over back-

wards to try to help them doing that, but there is no way that we're going to say yes, we are going to build these facilities.

The member talks about arenas; that's the way the arenas were built, the municipalities or so — there are some private facilities that are going on especially in racquet ball and tennis or some of those. There are other areas where — well, tennis courts, it's the same thing; the municipality have some, the province has some in provincial parks which is something a little different. I think there's one at Hecla Island and there's one in the Falcon Lake area. I don't know if there are any more. So we will, in principle, we would love and I personally would love to see it, it's one of the sports that I think is needed, I think that a lot of that could be done in the winter. Just a couple of weeks ago, I was fortunate enough to go to Gimli and see the Manitoba Games, the track and field part of it, in a hangar out there which certainly served the purpose — there was the portable track and it worked quite well. Now, I repeat, I'll do everything possible but there is no way that the government will accept the responsibility and assume the cost of building these facilities.

**MR. DOERN:** One final point, Mr. Chairman, and that is, as I say, the Minister, and he knows that I have a long-standing interest in this sport and that I intend to encourage him in that line of thinking to finally arrive at a situation where a proper indoor facility will be built for track and field in Manitoba. I think that's something that is logical and overdue. I also want to say to him in passing that I think one of the reasons I can make a case for such a facility to be located in my riding as I could for many other types of facilities is there are, first of all, a large number of athletes in the area. There are a large number of active community clubs in the area. There is a long tradition of sporting excellence, you know, the Elmwood Giants and so on and so on — baseball, hockey, lacrosse, etc.; and in spite of a long, well established record in sports in the area, there are no indoor hockey arenas or skating arenas. There are no indoor swimming pools in the area. There are no private sporting clubs or any prospects for such clubs. For those reasons, I think there is a long overdue need for facilities that would provide the people with some indoor public recreation facilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether there is funding in his Estimates to continue the Athletes' Award Program which was I think announced about a year ago for university athletic scholarships?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, there is. I think we're reviewing the program. I think we're requesting participation from the university. Most of our programs have been cost-share. We want to encourage people to try to help themselves. The first year, that was waived if I remember right, but we intend to keep on with the program.

**MR. MERCIER:** I think that's right, Mr. Chairman. The way the program was announced was that the Provin-

cial Government would absorb the full cost of the athletes' awards in the first year and from then onward I think it was 50-50 if I'm correct. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the universities involved are successfully mounting their own funding arrangements to provide their share. I know that the University of Manitoba has embarked upon a fund-raising program to raise their share already.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well I haven't got such a fantastic memory that I can remember. I was showing off. I gave you the answer because I happened to sign a letter just today, or yesterday, going to the different Universities asking them to meet with our Director of Sports to discuss exactly that point, so I expect to hear from them through my Director of Sports fairly soon.

**MR. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it's a good program to help retain Manitoba athletes in Manitoba and that are in our universities here and I hope it works out successfully.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** If I may, Mr. Chairman, the critic for the Opposition warned me that there would be some jumping around but we're really jumping and we haven't even started the Administration, we're in the Programs. I would hope that we will try to follow the line as much possible. As I say, it doesn't create that many problems for myself but for the staff, it might. Let's try to go on the line by line, if at all possible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass; 1.(c)(1) Salaries—pass; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 1. Research and Planning, (d)(1) Salaries.  
The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Just to raise something at this point in time, something that's always bothered me and unfortunately I wasn't able to do anything when I was Minister, but that doesn't say that this Minister won't be able to.

It's a problem that I know is not easily solved. There's many problems involved in this, but one of the things that bothers many people is the facilities which we have with regard to gymnastic facilities, gymnasiums, in schools right across Manitoba, not only in Winnipeg but in the urban centres, also in rural Manitoba. I know for janitorial reasons as well as problems with some of the Department of Labor people dealing with boiler operators, many of these facilities are just not open to the public in the evenings and the co-operation sometimes that I think should exist between school boards and recreation commissions and that, just isn't there.

The difficulty that we have these days, the Member for Elmwood raised a problem with the track. I think one of the things with the very high cost of building things and the problems then of running them, we're talking about building something but you have to have an eye on the ongoing maintenance of these particular facilities because that very often costs more than the construction in the final analysis.

I think it becomes of paramount importance that we try to encourage, in whatever way is possible, the joint

use of some of these facilities because there are some pretty nice ones out there and I would urge the Minister that anything he can do along with his Minister of Education, that they do try and promote, wherever possible, the joint use of any facilities.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I expect that the member knows that I couldn't agree more with his statement. It is something that has been difficult. I think there's a movement in that direction. I could say that one of the first things that I did in taking office is, I've asked and received the co-operation of other departments and other Ministers, and set up different interdepartmental committees that will look at exactly that.

I think that my dream, as far as the Department of Health and this department, is that we have more life centred around the school. It's absolutely true that it's the same people that are paying for that, maybe not the same level of government, but the same people, and to be told at 3:30 that you can't use the gym because there are white tiles and you'll dirty it, I think that they probably have some legitimate complaints, concerns. I think to the School Division there might be some added costs, it might be that another department of a government might have to pick up these costs, but we certainly agree 100 percent and we're going to make a real effort to make this work and not only these facilities.

I would hope that more community centres would be built around the schools, I say especially in the city because of the high cost of real estate. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Well, all right. If there are any other schools or in the schools that are there, fine. You're talking about schools being built but there are schools that are being closed, and it might be that you might use some of these facilities for an area. Get a wall across them and use a skating rink in the yard that is not used all through the holiday period in the summer and winter and also on weekends and at 4 o'clock. I think I understand the concern of the member and I can assure him that I'm with him 100 percent and we're going to make a real effort to change that thinking.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 1.(e)(1) Lotteries and Gaming Licensing Board. Salaries.

The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** I know the Minister announced the other day the review of, in particular, the licensing and the distribution of tickets within the province, but I think that, subject to what the Minister's intent is, I think I would like to deal with some of the concerns as I see them, some of the problems that we face as a society in dealing with many of these problems, and some of the solutions which, maybe . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister on a point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** On a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, if I may, so there is no misunderstanding. I have the responsibility of the Manitoba Lottery Commission and the Lotteries and Licensing Board. Now the Commission deals with mostly the products of West-

ern Canada Lottery Foundation, and there's no line here at all. So, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the members of this Committee, I would like to cover both.

I think we should have a far-ranging subject that as far as I'm concerned, I'll try to answer any question dealing with all the gambling, licensing, casino or any of these areas, we should cover under this if it's the will of the members of the Committee.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that would be fine with us. As the Minister knows, and he faced the same problem I did when I took over the one wing of the particular lotteries field. I think one of the biggest moves, if you want to call it that, was the Act which we put through two years ago which really brought the two together, the licensing and the lottery side of it, so I think it's a case now where the left hand knows to a certain extent, what the right hand is doing and before it was in two different departments and I think, was not in the best interests of the Manitoba public.

The problem I think we face in lotteries, and this is from my brief stay as Minister responsible, is one that is very similar, I guess, that the CRTC faces in Ottawa. What is happening very often, we are reacting to things as they happen, not before they happen, or after they've happened.

When you look at the whole history of lotteries in the Province of Manitoba I think in retrospect, if we could have crystal-balled everything that was going to happen, both governments, both the previous Minister and this past administration that I was part of, would have been able to go ahead and head off some of the problems that have arisen.

One of the things you find out very quickly is, there is no such thing as a one-time-only grant. There is no such thing as a one-time-only license. What happens is when we do go ahead and provide funds on a one-time-only basis, and I think we can all look through Orders-in-Council dating back to '74 where the previous Minister had one-time-only grants, I know it happened under our government, where we were helping a particular group out, you could bet your bottom dollar that next year they'd be back and they'd incorporated that particular amount of money in their operating budgets and it became almost an ongoing annual grant because if you didn't give them the money it was virtually deemed a cutback. The only place where that has not happened is the sports facilities grants which have gone towards the capital construction of facilities and, as the Minister mentioned, implicit in that was that we would not pick up any of the operating costs, which I think is a posture that the government has to maintain otherwise you are getting into the kinds of money that we all haven't even dreamed of seeing.

So having said that I think that one has to weigh very carefully and to this extent I welcome the review that the Minister is doing. When you do give somebody a bingo licence, when you give somebody a casino licence, the amounts of money that are involved are of such a large nature that these groups will incorporate this in their annual budgets, they use it for ongoing programming, a few of them do go ahead and use those funds for some special projects but the majority of them, whether cultural groups or non-

profit groups get used to spending that money and the next year they're back and they need a licence. And this is part of the problem that we face. The thing that I personally was concerned about is the number of licenses that were issued in casinos. We tried to keep them at 12 and I think that we kept that over the last number of years and I personally feel that we should not have any more than 12 casino licences issued in Manitoba. And I'm dealing with Winnipeg, I know there are a few issued for the Winter Fair in Brandon, and a few others. What I'm trying to say is that by limiting the number of licences we have maintained a certain amount of control on what happens.

The other thing, of course, and I'm pleased to see the Minister has included that in his Estimates is an increased amount which will be going towards providing more compliance officers and I suggest to him that part of the review that he has asked to be done probably what'll come back - they'll probably ask for even tighter controls because the casinos and the tear-open tickets - the amount of tear-open tickets, the dramatic increase in that field as well as the dramatic increase in the casino field particularly in the field of casinos such as the Buffalo Casino, where you have almost a permanent — (Interjection)— bingo, I mean, a permanent bingo facility, is something that we have to watch and that has happened and I think we're going to have to deal with it. To that extent, again, I say that we welcome the review.

The other thing I have to say is that the thing we also have to watch is that when we allow somebody a licence. Let's take for example now the St. Boniface research people have now been more or less given the licence, and I know it's an interim until, I believe, end of April or something. I think there was an extension to allow them to sell tickets in the hotels. One of the problems that one has to watch in this game is that you don't know at the time that you issue a licence what's going to happen to that particular product. There might be a very small amount of money involved but what we've seen happen here with this particular licence is we've seen a dramatic increase in those particular sales and that means that particular group now will really be receiving more money, I think, than they thought they'd ever get. And I think we're going to have to be very careful and reserve the right to change that and, to this extent, I say that government has to be involved to then control the amount of monies that are being made so that the other groups that are involved, i.e., the Western Lotteries, a Manitoba Distributor that they aren't left holding the bag with fewer sales because of another product taking over. So there has to be a degree of flexibility involved.

I'd like to ask the Minister, dealing directly with the tear-opens, what the breakdown is on, let's say a 50¢ ticket, in other words, what is the prize money, what is the commission?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, on this question of the lottery I don't want to go into detail because I don't want to prejudice the Commission of Inquiry that is going through. But nevertheless I think in all fairness I should address the subject and let the members know in what direction we would like to go. First of all, I want to say that, we will be introducing

legislation at this Session fairly soon. The legislation that will be introduced will bring in the licensing board which now is part of this department, will cease to function and the responsibility, the powers of the licensing board, will be assumed by the corporation, that is what was known as the Manitoba Lotteries Commission. It's unusual, I guess, to tell you about legislation at this time, but I think in all fairness I should tell you something about that.

Now the corporation, then, will have the right to deal and to play any part need that we feel that it has to play in the running of lotteries. We are not predetermining that, this legislation will make it possible to go in that direction. Now, the reason why we set up this inquiry, the main reason is we feel that probably there is too much of the total money, there is roughly \$100 million that will be spent on those that we know, so far, on the legal one, and, I'm not talking about horse racing or the people going to Vegas or betting on games or illegal betting or even stock and bonds. I'm not talking about that at all. I'm talking about just these facilities that we are licensing under these two groups and that's the first way to determine where that money goes. And then, of course, as the member states we are very worried about the lack of control that we have on all these promoters and sellers and distributors, and so on. Because we do not license them. We license, at the time the charities. The charities then go to these promoters, well most of the time it's the promoters that come and see the charity and say here you can make so much money, and then if you want to do anything you're meeting with the charities dead on and these people are hiding behind the charities. Unfortunately, it is like the member stated, you know, once they start it's only for one time to catch up, to build something that was destroyed by fire or some other reason. But then when they've tasted that kind of easy money they don't want to go. And then they want to close their eyes to what is happening and the end justifies the means and it is quite difficult.

Now, what we want to see is to make sure, at the first probably, is maximize the returns, the money, maximize the returns to the charities. That's the main thing that we want to do, and certainly protect the public. There are some inferior products on the market that we're really concerned, I'm not accusing anybody of doing anything illegal or criminal or anything like that or dishonest. Some of them might not even know that the products are inferior, but they are. There is no doubt that there is inferior products. This is one thing that we want to do. Now, at this stage we are not going to talk about the distribution of funds, I think, one thing at a time. Strengthen it, protect the public, more inspectors, and then to see what the government, and I can assure you it's not socialism or any of these ideas. It's something that I think we can agree on, that if there is going to be any kind of gambling, there's going to be a pretty tight control if you want to keep it aboveboard and if you want to protect the public. So, that is the direction that we want to go.

We're also quite concerned with the break-open tickets. There is no doubt in my mind that if we keep on licensing everybody for break-open instant game — and I would say that the intent was never to do that — the intent when the Western Canada Lottery Foun-



dation was formed was to stop the proliferation of lotteries. It was a technicality because it was a new game; it was an instant game; so it did meet the guidelines and then they were allowed one, two and now you've got so many of these things and there's no doubt that what is still there reduces the profit of the distributors that are certainly non-profit organizations, as you know, sports, the Arts Council and the United Way. There is no doubt that instant games will affect their sales.

These are the concerns that we have. Right now the main thing we're going to look at is all the people that are coming in and that are delivering the service or doing all the work. At one time the charities were coming in and saying, here give us a chance; we want to help ourselves. They actually in many instances are not helping themselves at all. You're just giving them a license to go and get some money because everything is done by promoters and by professionals and they're not participating in that at all. We've lost sight of that unfortunately.

They are interested in the cheque that they get and if it's not that big a percentage they can't complain too much because it's new found money. They do nothing. All they have to do is go and get a license and that concerns us very much. So that is the main thing we want to look at and then we'll have to review the whole thing of the distribution of funds.

For instance, let's take casinos. You take casinos — I want a slight correction, there's not 12 there's 13 that was allowed last year and were licensed for this year, 13. Well, actually 13 days but there's about 30, 33 charities that are submitting that. That's fine, but then you have 96 applications. So you might have 30 that are very very happy but what about the other 66? You'll never satisfy people. The member is absolutely right, that once you've been in there you figure it's yours, rightly or wrongly so, you figure it's yours; that you have a monopoly on that and don't let anybody else, but it's ours. That's very difficult and there is no doubt about it. Many of these charitable organizations are working that in their budget now. So that is a concern.

I might say that we are studying that. What we did try to disrupt as little as possible but not encourage anything new. Let's start with the commercial bingos; commercial bingos had a certain date; we're extending that from month to month — I think there were two months — to try not to disrupt these people at this time. Now depending on what comes out of this recommendation of the commission or the findings of the commission, we will have to establish policies on that. That is one of the things.

We're going to study the break-open games. I think that maybe this is the time to give you the break-open games. I think that on a 50-cent ticket the price is about 37.5 cents. He expends five cents, licence fee one cent, printing and supply two cents and profit to the group is 4.5 cents. So, anyway I was answering this direct question. We want to look at the whole situation of that and we've got to find a better way, a fairer way of getting this distribution of the funds. This is not going to be done in a day.

The first thing to do is we've got to immediately safeguard to protect the public from inferior products, to make sure that everything is above board.

Then we've got to try to do everything possible to maximize the returns to these charities themselves. It's going to be a very difficult job to try to have a fair distribution of these funds but because it's difficult doesn't mean that we haven't got a responsibility to try. So, that is the direction that we want to go in this.

I might say certainly I give credit to the former administration who brought the two things under the same Minister. That was suggested years ago when we were in power and I must accept some of the blame that this wasn't done. I wasn't happy the way things were going on. They kept on with these non-bearers tickets. There was a granting of license so I refused to accept both and I even did something which is maybe not too loyal for a Cabinet Minister, but I also said that I'm going to state it publicly in the House that I wanted to disassociate myself with the way things were going on because I was worried of what is happening now and I did that in the House.

Now, in the days though if I'm going to fault the former administration, in the days we still kept our hand on that because we had very good personnel. Other people representing the province with the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and the inter-provincial group that were members of the licensing board and it was always members; there was always a key person, a departmental person representing the province in the Western Canada Lottery Foundation in other areas because we felt that these people are out there to sell tickets; the Western Canada Lottery Foundation. But, that doesn't mean that the people of Manitoba for instance, and their representative, the politicians want to go and do all the advertising that they're doing to keep on at having these things and spending that much money. Sometimes you want to slow these things down. You can't fault the Western Canada Lottery Foundation because that's their job to maximize the profit.

I think we have a responsibility to say sometimes, whoa, take it easy and this is what we did at the time. Unfortunately, there were some good men that were representing the government on the licensing board and so on. That was discontinued and if I say it's easier to look back now but if there's any criticism I think that the government of the day lost some of the control by having people as chairmen of different boards and leaving everything in their hands. I think that these people certainly did their best but I don't think that they carried on exactly what the people of Manitoba and the government of the day wanted.

**MR. BANMAN:** In the figures that the Minister gave me, 75 percent of the monies that are collected when the tear-opens are sold goes back into the prize fund. I think that's 37.5, 37, yes, 75.

I want to at this time — (Interjection) —

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's misleading. It's true but it's misleading. I'm sorry. It's misleading in this way and maybe that's not a comment that I should make at this time. I think of the kind of game that you have. If you win a dollar you're going to put it right back in. You might keep the \$50 but if you're going to win \$5 or so, you're putting it right in so you might look like you're getting a hell of a lot of prize but you're putting it right in and you're spending an awful lot of money.

I'm very concerned about that game.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, that's the particularly disturbing feature about any instant-win game. I think that anybody that's studied the system, what happens is that if a person wins \$5 — and we've all seen this happen — before you know it you're sitting at a table where you can't see the other person because there's just a big pile of break-opens in front of you because that's really what they do. Then of course, the promoters in wanting to sell tickets, use that as a selling tool because they'll give you tickets for the money. But I think it would be accurate to say that there is 75 percent of the dollar that is spent goes back in some prize fund.

I would like to suggest to the Minister here today that in his review that he has a good look at increasing the licensing fee before break-opens. If we're going to have a break-opens take a fairly large portion of the market and some of the other products are going to suffer, I think that he should have a good look at increasing the licence fee. And I'm going to take an arbitrary figure and I'm going to say, if you had a licence fee of 20 percent, you could with sales of \$40 million — I think that's what we're talking about roughly this year — you could pick up another \$8 million which could be used for things such as a field house, which could be used for sport, for future sport development, for maybe an enhanced recreation facilities program and I know I'm sort of sticking my neck out on this one because, if the Minister takes me up on it, there are a lot of sports groups as well as a lot of recreation people that would say, man look at all the extra money we've got and what a good Minister of Health and I know that, even though I'd like people to say that, that we have a good Minister of Fitness, another part of mr he tells me that might not serve in the best interests of seeing a different government in here next time. But I have to say to him that I believe that this is one way in which he would not really hurt the game at all, but would manage to raise a substantial amount of money for the development of sport and recreation facilities throughout the province.

Now, I caution him, however — and having been the first year of the previous administration's part of - the Minister also in charge of Cultural Affairs - that if he doesn't guard some of the funds that come from lotteries very jealously for sport, I can assure him - and I know he is aware of this - that the cultural components which are important, but have maybe a bigger appetite than the sports groups do will use up any additional funds that are available that happen to be not encumbered or not earmarked for something. That was something that I found out. I think that he found out too that when the government took over that the lottery funds, the portion that is earmarked this coming year for cultural development, I think is totally programmed already where he, on the other hand, did have some discretionary dollars, i.e. the program that he will be announcing with regards to recreation facilities, granted, a lesser amount, but there are still funds that he has at his disposal to do some things with that he would like.

So I say to him that what it's worth after the review is done, I think — and I found this in studying different lotteries throughout North America as well as the rest

of the world — I know Australia only returns 37½ percent of the monies collected to the people that play many of their games and it's one of the highest per capita spending countries as far as gaming, not only horse racing, but many of the others. I mean they spend a lot of money on gambling and when you talk to them about returning a large percentage of prize money, they say, why are you doing it? People play regardless of what the prize money is as long as there's sort of that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Now, if it means in tight economic times, that we want to do a few more things for sport, a few more things for culture, I think this is one area — and I throw it out to the Minister — where he could possibly get his hands on about \$8 million without causing anybody too much pain. So I throw it out for his consideration. He might not think that's the way to go, but I think there's quite a bit of money there that he could use for the benefit of recreation and sport in the Province of Manitoba.

I wonder if he could just tell me roughly what the projected revenues will be from licensing this coming year?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, I would like to thank the Member for Steinbach for his advice. I think that in some instances he might be reading my mind. I think he's absolutely right. We've got to be very, very careful to safeguard our revenue from the Minister responsible for Culture, and I've already set up a rear gunner to watch him because he's making noise already and I know that he has no reason for that. That is extremely fair, the division, because I did that myself a few years ago when I had both responsibilities. So I know it's extremely fair. So I think I get the message. I know exactly what he's saying. Apparently, he had the same problems in his years in office.

Now, as far as the licensing, we are looking at that, but we might even go further than that. And here I should be careful because I don't want to start setting up policies before they've been reviewed, before we have the benefit of this commission. But there is a possibility, as I said we want to maximize the revenue, it is a possibility that the distribution of these break-open tickets will be taken over by a charitable organization, such as we have where people representing a charitable organization, such as we have on the other side with the products of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation where the profit will go to the Western Manitoba distributor and the four partners that are there to divide amongst their charities. So that is a possibility, but the licensing in some instances, I think it's a good point and we certainly will look at increasing that. And all you might do, the licensing might come from the profit and also from the expenses. The profit — you know the same people that have these facilities — the licence, at least they would make a contribution to other charities that haven't been successful in getting a licence. So that is something that we're looking at very seriously. Oh, excuse me. There's about — the share from these licences - the government will be approximately \$1 million this year.

**MR. BANMAN:** One further point. I know that the \$1 million collected under this particular item from licences goes into general revenues whereas on the

other side, any profits that are turned over from the gaming commission, go into trust accounts which I'm happy to say, I believe about a year-and-a-half ago were put into interest-bearing accounts and the interest now accrues to that particular trust account, rather than the finance. —(interjection)— Well, I know that was a big battle in itself and the Minister knows about that problem that we faced.

However, I would like to take this one step further and I think I'll discuss this because at this time, we'll maybe take a little bit of liberty. One of the things that we were working on and I guess we talked about it briefly before the Member for Elmwood raised it and I'd like to talk about it under this item because I think the funds that could be attained from — if this particular item, the break-open continues to sell the way it has, is that, as I mentioned, a fairly substantial amount of money could be raised by the province by increasing the licence fees.

One of the projects that I would like to see the Minister have a close look at is the fieldhouse complex. The Member for Elmwood mentioned it shouldn't be downtown. I think one of the big reasons that we were looking at downtown is we're spending some, what \$96 million now, on our Core Area Redevelopment Program and we thought that maybe we could get the Federal Government involved as well as get the City of Winnipeg involved in this particular proposal.

One of the dreams, and I very often am too much of a realist and not enough of a dreamer. But one of the things that I was hoping to see and something that I hope that the Minister does have a look at is within a complex, with the framework of a complex like this, to have a permanent home for the Manitoba Sports Hall of Fame; to have a permanent home for the Manitoba Curling Hall of Fame; and possibly a permanent location for the Sports Admin Centre. So some 64 sports governing bodies could have one place to go to and have a permanent home there.

I'm not suggesting that the province should pick up all these costs because those of us that are from rural Manitoba realize that there has to be some equity, in other words, half of the funds that are expended in the City also have to be expended in Rural Manitoba, when it comes to lotteries because I think there a per capita ratio that we have to work around because many rural areas don't even have the facilities that the city is looking at right now. But, if he would manage, and I don't know if you've seen some of the proposals that we've put forward, I know the Canada Curling Hall of Fame would be interested in raising a bunch of their own money for a permanent home. The Manitoba Sports Hall of Fame might be interested in raising some money for this kind of a thing. I would say that I would ask the - and I had a talk the the Manitoba Sports Federation, I think they should possibly start some kind of a fund-raising activity if this thing were to go.

So, I ask the Minister to have a look at that, I know there is a lot of money involved but maybe if he earmarks a certain amount of money from these tear-open tickets, if that's the way he's going to go, I think by making the city come up with some money, the Parks and Recreation people as well as all these other groups, he could possibly develop quite a complex in

the downtown area. Those of us who had looked at the proposal were looking at the east yards. I think there is tremendous potential there, the city has got land there along with the linear park the city wants to develop, there could be jogging trails, cross-country skiing trails in that whole thing.

As I said, it's sort of a dream that I was working on and I don't know if it'll ever come true but it's a proposal which I find particularly exciting. I say again, I don't say that the Province of Manitoba should do it all, I think all these groups that I've mentioned should all be contacted to see exactly what inputs they would be willing to do to raise some of their own funds, and we might, who knows, get a fairly good running facility with all these things tied in in a fairly good setting. I would say to the Minister that I urge him to have a look at that particular concept, I think it's a good one, again dollars dictate what he'll be able to do, I appreciate that. But I suggest to him that these break-opens if they continue to do what they are doing that he maybe puts the grab on some of that money and does some of these things which I think will be to the benefit of amateur sport and the sporting people in Manitoba.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, the member states that he is too much of a realist, not enough a dreamer, and I think that I'm more of a dreamer and not enough of realist, maybe together we'd have a proper balance. I felt that it would be nice to achieve that and I dreamt at one time that maybe the Federal Government would be helpful when Richardson was the Minister, I'd approached him, didn't go very far. He was the Minister of National Defence and I was trying to get Lipsett Hall on Kenaston which I felt was an ideal place and the province at that time would pledge a million dollars to have these facilities to have a home for the sports administration centre and probably sports medicine also at that time. And there were a lot of facilities in the land itself not just the buildings.

Now, this is something I guess that it should be, a dream to try to get our own place for the sports administration and the sports federation office there and maybe some of these other facilities. As far as the Hall of fame, depends what you're talking about, if you're talking about a Manitoba Hall of Fame but when you talk about the Curling Hall of Fame they have the first chance to set up a Canadian Hall of Fame, and I don't imagine they'd want to go, they'd want their own facilities. I understand that they're dealing with the city now and they're looking at the pavilion in Assiniboine Park which would seem to be quite a good facility and I would hope that if there is anything that we can do to facilitate that we certainly would go along with that.

As far as starting to spending the money now, from any extra money, I must resist that temptation. I think that we have to look at the overall thing before we say yes, this is what we're going to do for that because there are too many things to be done at this time. But that, of course, will have to be looked at later on.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is 5:30 and we interrupt the proceedings until 8:00 this evening

## SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** The

committee will come to order, continuing with the Estimates for Northern Affairs and Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Item No. 6, Workplace Safety and Health, No. 6.(a) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain his statement that was reported in the Winnipeg Free Press on March 12th of this year with respect to Mr. Davey, who was the Executive Director. The Minister's statement was that: "It was our opinion that the position was redundant." Could he explain that statement?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** Yes. First, what I'd like to do is pass over to the members opposite a copy of the chart of the organization of the division. In that way they may see exactly that which we were speaking to. Once you get the organizational chart in front of you, you'll see that there was a Director of the division and placed on top of that director, just recently, was an Executive Director of the division, which provided for two persons who, we believe, essentially would be performing the same function. The Director position having been around for quite some time and the Executive Director position being a relatively new one, it was our determination that the Executive Director's position should be declared redundant because of that top-heavy nature of the decision making with the division as a result of having those two individuals, apparently so, reporting directly to each other. And so we talked to the person occupying the Executive Director's position at that time; we told him that we felt he was a capable individual, that we had no difficulty with his professional skills; as a matter of fact, I stated in this House and I'll state again that I think he is a man of high professional capability. However, the position was just not there under our conception of what the department should look like. It's not a position that's been around for a long time. It was a very new position that been around for just a couple of months. As you know, we are looking at the entire division; we are trying to determine ways by which we can have it work more closely with the Environmental Management Division and ways by which we can mesh many of the activities, and we felt if we were to allow this position to become entrenched in the division, we would be providing a position which was not necessary in the short run nor in the long run.

So we offered the Executive Director an opportunity to find employment elsewhere in the government. As a matter of fact, I personally encouraged him to do that; I know staff encouraged him to do that. He chose to go elsewhere into the private sector and is doing so. I regret the loss to the province in that respect, however, I am pleased to hear that he has been able to find himself a very good job, I believe, in Alberta in the private sector, and one which he is looking forward to. I wish him every degree of luck in his new endeavours.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that this position was recommended in 1980 by

the Mine Safety Inquiry. Has he considered that report and does he disagree with the rationale or the reasons that were used?

**MR. COWAN:** It is my understanding of the situation, and I will find the exact reference in the right Committee Report for the members' edification, that the recommendation was that the director of the division have a position equivalent to an Assistant Deputy Minister, not that there be a new position created. What it said was, "that the Workplace Safety and Health Branch remain within the Department of Labour and Manpower and be placed under a person who has the authority equivalent to that of an Assistant Deputy Minister who would oversee the activities of various sections." So there was no call for a new position; it was just that the person who occupied the head position or the director's position in the department, would have that level of authority behind him. We are reviewing that as well, but I certainly do not read that recommendation as necessitating an entirely new position.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Davey is quoted in the same article as indicating that he has no grudge against the government excepting that, "They have a different philosophy about the branch's organization." I don't really expect the Minister to be able to particularly account for someone else's statement, but does he have any comment to make on Mr. Davey's comment?

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, "a different philosophy" was that the previous administration, and he as an employee who came forward to perform this particular function felt that there should be an Executive Director. I do not believe that there should be an Executive Director. I believe that we had a very competent, and still do, have a very competent director who has been in that position for quite some time, and for that reason felt that the position of Executive Director was a redundant position. I did every I could do within my power to encourage the Executive Director to stay within the Civil Service. I thought he would have been of benefit to this province. I don't criticize him for not choosing to do so; I do regret that's the way it worked out. But the difference in philosophy to which he addresses his remarks, I believe, were that we did not believe that there should not be an Executive Director. You will note that he applies that statement specifically to the organization of the division.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that this decision delayed the \$110,000 research project which was initiated by our government at the University of Manitoba. Can the Minister advise whether the plans have now been prepared for the project is under way or, if not, when does he expect his department will be in a position to start that important project?

**MR. COWAN:** I think it's somewhat ironic, and I'm quoting from the headline in the newspaper article, perhaps not the one to which the member is addressing specifically, but certainly to one which I saw, that such a hullabaloo should be made over the fact that, because of this change in organization, that project

was delayed temporarily, and I don't deny that it was delayed temporarily as a result of this. However, one has to realize that project has been around for a long time. To my knowledge the previous Minister responsible for Workplace Safety and Health never even met with the individual responsible for carrying out that experiment and project. I'm not certain of that, but I have no knowledge of him having done so.

The fact is that whether or not he did, I did very shortly after assuming this responsibility, I went over and I met with the individuals involved. I saw how the machine performed; I was impressed with the technical capabilities of the machine; I have some questions about the way in which the machine can be used; my department has some questions about the way in which the machine can be used and the value of it, but under my direction I've instructed them to meet with Dr. Coodin and to sit down with the workers and the employers, who might be involved in the testing of this particular innovative and experimental process, to work out a program which is acceptable to all the parties involved; that would be the employer, the employees groups, the government and the persons undertaking the research project, and to come forward with a project; I said go ahead.

Now, when we had the change in personnel, that was delayed for a couple of weeks, so be it. If that's the worst delay that project has had in the past I would be surprised. I'd be extremely surprised because I happen to know some of the history of that machine coming into this province and I'm not criticizing the previous government. It takes time to set up those sorts of expensive and innovative and entirely new projects. It takes a fair amount of time and there are going to be delays. I would anticipate that there will be delays throughout the entire length of that research project until we've come to a satisfactory or an unsatisfactory conclusion of it as the case may be. A delay of a couple of weeks because of a change in personnel is certainly not one which we would seek, but not one which we should place so much emphasis upon.

I can tell you now that the Director of the division has met with Dr. Coodin again; that they are in the process of sitting down with the employers' and the employees' representatives, I believe, coming forward with that proposal. They are looking at some of our concerns and some of the concerns that have been expressed by others and they're trying to work out an appropriate research project. They are meeting again this Monday, I believe.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there have been a fair number of initiatives undertaken recently, lately, in the private industrial sector with respect to launching occupational health and safety programs on site, on premises. There always have been some, but there seems to have been additional interest expressed in initiative undertaken in that area in industry over the course of the past little while.

Over and above what the Minister has just said about the research project that is being pursued, can the Minister advise the Committee as to the way in which the division and its activities match with the

kinds of initiatives that are being undertaken in the private sector?

I think in particular of some major industries and companies, whose names I don't necessarily need to detail here, who have embarked recently on searches for occupational health and safety officers, for example, to undertake programs among their employees. How does the division and its activities match or mesh with those undertakings in the private industrial sector?

**MR. COWAN:** Most of our staff in the division are members of professional organizations which in fact are umbrella groups which work with the private sector and industrial groups in these areas. I can get a specific list and make that available to the member if he so desires to have that. By holding those professional memberships and interfacing with those professional groups, we are kept constantly advised of those demands and needs on the part of private sector employers in respect to some of these occupational health and safety programs which they want to bring forward.

We also make it known through membership in those groups, as well as through other means, to those parties that we are prepared to sit down with them and discuss their programs, to review their programs and to work out with them strategies by which they can better put in place occupational health and safety programs on their work site premises.

So I think we approached the subject area from a couple of distinctly different perspectives. One is by participating in the group and interfacing and interacting in professional societies. The other is by making ourselves available to them as a division upon request. The third, of course, is through our Workplace Safety and Health committees, which once designated under the law, are joint committees and have employer and employee representatives on them and employer and employee co-chairpersons on them, so that both the employee groups and the employer groups have direct access to the division in that way. Now, that's a limited approach because of the number of safety and health committees which we have in place now. If we were to expand the number of safety and health committees significantly then that would become a much more prominent way by which we would interface.

So I think generally we're making ourselves available for that sort of relationship with those groups. Specifically on an individual basis whenever one of those individuals or groups come forward to us requesting that sort of assistance, we provide them with whatever assistance we have at our disposal and if we can't find out the answers for them, we direct them to areas where we know will be able to provide to them those answers.

**MR. SHERMAN:** In those meetings or discussions between the division and individual employers and individual industries of that kind, are there specific standards or guidelines of a general but fairly all-encompassing nature that the average workplace is expected to meet? I know there would be specifics for specific industries, Mr. Chairman, obviously, that would be related to the particular environmental

hazards that would occur in specific circumstances having to do with industrial enterprises in particular, having to do with exposure of employees to certain environmental hazards.

While acknowledging that, would there be some general standards, general universals that workplaces aspiring to proper health and safety would be expected to meet or would ask assistance in meeting and on which they would have guidance from the division? Is there a list of guidelines for general observance for applicants of that kind?

**MR. COWAN:** The Workplace Safety and Health Act itself is a list of general guidelines, I might add, which place certain responsibilities and rights on both workers and employers and the government as well. The regulations which accompany it are in some ways very general; other regulations are very specific. So, what we have in place is a general statement of the rights and responsibilities of an employer and an employee in the act and in some of the regulations. We then, where we feel it is necessary, more clearly specify specifics by regulation. We also rely upon other jurisdictions to provide us with the benefit of their experience and expertise in developing specific guidelines for certain industrial substances and contaminants. We work with the Canadian Safety Association with their standards; we also work with the American Conference of Government Industrial and Occupational Hygienists in respect to their standards. We looked at what OSHA is doing, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. We look at what NIOSH is doing, and we also look beyond this continent in very general terms and exploratory terms to see if we can't benefit by their experience as well. Oftentimes, it becomes a matter of sitting down with an employer, taking into consideration their difficulties in meeting certain standards, sitting down with the Safety and Health Committee and the employees at the same time, and saying let us work out a way by which we can move towards the implementation of safety and health practices in this particular plant, which meet the needs which we have identified. We rely upon certain bodies that have provided us with specific figures to do that. On the other hand, we also rely upon our own sense of what is happening in that particular plant and how fast we can move to reach the goal. We don't look away from the goal; we don't turn away from the objective. But we say we're going to have to stage and implement our actions in such a way as to ensure that we are providing the most effective use of our guidance.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the department or at least the division, played a fairly integral role in the staging of a major two- or three-day workshop on industrial and occupational health and safety here in Winnipeg early in March. I, personally, would have liked to have attended part of that workshop, but duties relative to the Legislative Session prevented my doing so. However, I did have a chance to follow the reports on that workshop that were carried in the media. Was there anything specific to which the Minister can point that came out of that workshop that was useful or innovative from the point of view of the division itself and the department in this field; could

he advise the committee briefly on that point? I'm not asking for a detailed rundown of what happened at the three-day workshop, but some workshops deal with the known and the conventional and some produce some produce some fairly innovative directions which prove useful for the immediate future. Was there anything learned or gleaned from that workshop that's useful for the division in the future?

**MR. COWAN:** To clarify the record, I believe the member is speaking to the March 1st, 2nd and 3rd workshop which was held by the Manitoba Federation of Labour. The Workplace Safety and Health Division, as in previous years, did play some role in participating in that conference. I believe they may have played a more significant role this year, although I would have to check to see if in fact that is the case. I, too, as the member suggested he would, would have preferred to have been able to spend some more time there and unfortunately I was unable to do so and missed personally benefiting by the bulk of the activities over those three days.

I have talked to individuals who were involved in the conference; I have talked to individuals who attended the conference; I have discussed it in very general terms with my own staff but not in specific terms as of yet. It is my understanding that there were a great number of issues addressed, that there were over a dozen workshops, perhaps more, which dealt with specific issues everywhere from running your own sort of proportional mortality study as a group, to the understanding of the safety and health law which was put on by our own divisional staff. So it was a wide-ranging conference. I have no doubt that there were many innovative ideas which came out of it. I'm looking forward to being able to discuss them with staff and with others as that information becomes available. I have not had the opportunity to do more than spend a very brief amount of time at the conference this year and to follow most of it through the press. I, too, was restricted in my activities by the demands of the Legislature, so I regret that. However, I know that in spite of that it was a very good conference. I'm looking forward to being able to go over some of the transcripts and the notes of it once they become available from the sponsoring organization to better acquaint myself with what was said.

**MR. SHERMAN:** One final question, Mr. Chairman, on the staff breakdown chart that the Minister circulated. The left-hand side of the chart shows a fair number of personnel, about 16 or 18 personnel appearing under the Instruction Consultant Branch and the Industrial Consultant Branch. Could the Minister describe for the Committee the particular roles of those personnel? Are those the people who deal with the individual industrial and corporate enterprises to which I've referred and liaise with them in establishing their own programs in Occupational Health and Safety?

**MR. COWAN:** Everybody in the division performs all sorts of duties from time to time. The group to which the member is addressing his specific questions deals with the construction industry and the industrial sector in two interrelated but separate ways because

there are separate problems that are significant enough to allow us to pursue that approach. We're reviewing that, by the way, in order to determine if that is, in fact, the most efficient use of our limited resources, but as it stands now, that is the approach which we are taking.

The activities of those individuals are to go out into the field and to make inspections and to write improvement orders; to write stop-work orders; stop-work warnings where necessary; to sit down with the committees and help the committees develop their own expertise in this area, and to act as a consultant in many ways to the individuals whom they are employed to serve, that is, the construction industry, the industrial industry, that includes offices, every workplace comes under that particular section. So, yes, the brief answer to the member's question is that these individuals are out there interfacing in that particular way, although the entire division does so as well, and they do many other duties on top of that.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister I think has made some reference to it the other day, but the press release was issued by Information Services with respect to some statements by the Minister on the right to refuse to do unsafe or unhealthy work. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is in a position to identify sections of the legislation that he feels are unclear with respect to this right?

**MR. COWAN:** It's Section 43 which addresses the right to refuse, on the part of the individual. Perhaps I can just clarify with a general statement, if the member is interested in that as well. We have found, through experience that while the legislative right is there, there is a feeling among those who would have to exercise that right, that the legislation is written in such a way as to not allow them full confidence in what they're doing. And when I read through the legislation myself as it appears the member is doing right now, it does become rather confusing. Therefore, we don't believe that workers are exercising this right and this responsibility, because it is both, in an effective way, because the legislation is not written in such a way as to allow them the confidence to use it. Just previous to coming down to the question period today, I signed a letter which is going over to the Chairperson of the Advisory Council for the Workplace Safety and Health, actually to myself but for Workplace Safety and Health matters, asking the Council to review that entire matter of the right to refuse; what other jurisdictions may be doing as compared to us and how we can benefit from their experience; what sort of legislation would they see as being possible and workable from the different vantage points. You have to remember now, that Council is made up of professional individuals, is made up of employee representatives from varied fields and employer representatives from varied fields, as well as our own staff playing an integral role in that council's activities.

So, we feel that's an effective mechanism to bounce these sort of ideas off of and to ask them to come back with their comment, criticism and critique of our concerns, as well as of the ways in which we intend to deal with those concerns. I've asked them to do that,

among a number of other things, and once we have a report back from them, I will be taking it through the normal route in order to determine whether we will, in fact, bring forth legislative changes this Session. But it is certainly our commitment and our anticipation to make those changes to ensure that workers feel comfortable with this right and that employers know specifically what is demanded of them with this right as well, because they are protected by it and benefit by it at the same time as do employees. That's our general comments. The specific section of the act is Section 43.

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I was aware that it was Section 43. I take it then that it is unlikely that there would be legislation before this Session of the Legislature.

**MR. COWAN:** I've impressed upon the council my sense of urgency in this regard. However, I'm beginning to redefine urgency from time to time in light of the process by which we have to send these sort of changes, and very important changes, through. So, I would hesitate to answer one way or the other; I think that's probably the better part of valour and discretion in this instance. I would like to see them come through this Session. I don't know if that's possible but, even more than likely to see them come through, I want them to be effective and efficient and applicable, and if that means we're going to have to wait a bit of time to ensure that we've been able to go through the steps which are necessary to make that happen, then I'm prepared to wait.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to undertake to table the report of the Advisory Committee in the Legislature if we're in Session or if not, to distribute a copy of the report to members of the Legislature if we're not in Session.

**MR. COWAN:** I just want to make certain that I understand the request. Are you asking for the recommendations of the Advisory Council to me on this specific subject, or are you asking for a report of the Advisory Council on an annual basis?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that he's asked the Advisory Council to report on this and some other matters. I'm asking that, when he receives that report, if he would be prepared to table it in the Legislature, or if we're not in Session, to distribute it to members on our side.

**MR. COWAN:** I'd be honoured to have that opportunity. At the same time I would ask the member opposite if he would like to receive the Minutes of the Advisory Council on a regular basis, I could ask the Advisory Council if they have any objection to forwarding of the Minutes to him. I certainly have no objection and believe that their work is of a worthwhile nature that we should be sharing, as much as possible, the benefits which we derive from their hard work. I might add right now, that council is essentially the same as it was when we assumed office. We are satisfied that it is doing a capable job at this time. One of the first requests I made of that council was that they take a

look at themselves and ask themselves where they are going; where they have been; how they've reached the stage they've reached today; what goals and objectives they would see for themselves in the near future. They have undertaken that task, an introspective task that it is, it has taken some time, but I am awaiting their report which they will be making available to me in that regard, and hopefully we can work with the council to make certain they are as effective a voice as possible in providing advice to the Minister and to the government. We need all the advice we can get and we certainly welcome that advice; although we don't always accept it verbatim, we certainly do considerate it. So, I would be pleased to send the member the report on this specific subject when it is available to me and I will forward to the council, my personal request that they undertake a review of whether or not they feel comfortable in sending their Minutes directly to the member as well, and if they agree with that, I'm certain that the member will be put on their mailing list. I would appreciate his comments from time to time as well.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for those comments and I'd be pleased to receive that information when it's available to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can comment on the status of the proposed regulations with respect to hearing conservation measures that I think was underway last summer and comments were asked for by a number of individuals and associations. I wonder if he could indicate whether any progress has been made in that matter.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Draft 1 of those regulations has been circulated among the groups which will be most affected by the regulations; that is, employer and employees groups and individuals who are in high noise areas or selected high noise areas. We couldn't get it out to everybody, of course, but we did try to pick a sample which we felt was representative of the areas for which we were directing that regulation. That draft was commented upon by those groups.

There was a second draft prepared; the second draft is now in the hands of the Advisory Council. They have been requested to make known their recommendations and criticisms and suggestions in respect to the regulation. It will then go out again for comment, I believe. I think I can give that undertaking at this time and probably come back for another draft. We have found that these regulations take two, three, four, five drafts to perfect before we feel comfortable in bringing them forward, comfortable from the perspective of course that they will work and that they are an effective use of our resources. So that is the status of that particular regulation at this time. We could certainly make a copy of draft three coming from the Advisory Council — available to the member opposite if he would care to take a look at it as well and provide his comments and suggestions.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions on Workplace Safety and Health but I advise the Minister that under this section he agreed that we discuss the Workers Compensation Board that I believe he is responsible for. If there are no further

questions on Workplace Safety and Health — Mr. Chairman, I understand that when I asked the Minister some questions the other day based on the Ombudsman's report in his comments on the Workers Compensation Board, in fact, which he entitled a Tribute to the Workers Compensation Board, and in which he offers his own opinion that he believed the public inquiry would have been the best means of ascertaining the truth of the allegations that were made about procedures under the Workers Compensation Board. The Minister, I think, has indicated that he has received a report and is studying that report and in due course I think he said he would be providing to members of the House a summary of the report by the private investigator. I wonder what the status of that is now. When does he expect to be able to provide this summary to members of the Legislature?

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps a bit of history is important at this juncture. I had anticipated having that summary ready within a week or so of today's date and had suggested that would be the case. It may still well be the case, although I have found that the time constraints imposed by Estimates have moved me away from that goal somewhat. As soon as I have the opportunity to sit down in an intensive way and go over the report, I will be bringing forward a report for the review of the Legislature and the general public as well. That report will differ only in respect to the confidentiality of names which were included in the earlier reports. In other words, it will be rewritten in such a way so not to change the intent of the observations of the person undertaking the review in the first instance, but will be rewritten in such a way as to ensure that individuals who came forward and gave testimony in good faith that it was going to be kept confidential will, in fact, not be able to be identified by a reading of that report. I think that's fair to those individuals.

I'm looking forward to the opportunity of being able to discuss it at that time. The safeguard which I have put in place to ensure that the report does, in fact, accurately reflect the original report except in the matter of confidentiality is that I will be asking the author of the original report to review the public report as to its accuracy and to verify that in fact it does provide an honest appraisal of his observations and summaries. He has made no recommendations; he was not asked to make recommendations. Those recommendations will flow from the Ministry over a period of time.

**MR. MERCIER:** Just to confirm that then, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the only changes that will be made in the report will be designed to protect the confidentiality, to delete names I take it of people who have provided information or given evidence to the investigator, and that all other information with the exception of the names or I suppose information that would lead to the identity of people supplying information will be included in the material that is made public.

**MR. COWAN:** There are a few clarifications that I could make in that regard. One, the report itself is several hundred pages long and there are several



pages of summaries and observations which will be made public. To rewrite the entire report, to delete names would be a chore which I think would postpone the opportunity to discuss this report and to work upon this report far too long. The summaries themselves are such that, I think, they accurately reflect what was in the report, my having read both the report and the summaries, I can assure you of that. We will be addressing the rewriting of the observation section or the summary section of the report which provides an overview of the report. There are also several hundred pages of testimony which, of course, would not be put forward in a public way either. That was individual testimony given on the part of individuals operating under the basis of confidentiality which was promised to them.

The other change which may in fact be made is if there are individuals within the Workers Compensation management who are singled out by name as having certain attributes attributed to them. I think we should not place their name in that sort of public spotlight and so would want to protect the confidentiality of their work as well as the confidentiality of the individuals giving testimony. However, we will address the issues that were involved, the complaints that were involved, and also in a meaningful way because that's the way in which the report was written, we will address the allegations that were put forward at the time that this review was undertaken. So we will provide that information. Where there may be minor changes would be if there are names of individuals singled out in the summary as having certain styles which may reflect badly upon them and may reflect positively upon them. I think we would want to not open up that door by the issuance of this report and the other is individuals who have given their testimony in good faith, that it would be confidential, will not be named as well.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, we just received the Report of the Workers Compensation Board for 1981 the other day; I'm sure the Minister has reviewed it himself. I've read through it and when you read the number of claims rejected and then go on to review the appeals and the number of successful appeals or modifications and decisions on appeal and the medical panels, would the Minister not at least conclude from the numbers that are presented in the report that the allegation that procedures are unfair and employees were taught to look for ways to reject claims rather than improve them, does not appear at least to be substantiated by the number of claims accepted and the number of appeals accepted?

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I don't want to address the specific allegations until I have an opportunity to address the entire report. I will assure the member opposite that it is my understanding that the claims approval and claims rejection rate of the Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba is not significantly out of line with the claims approval and claims rejection rates of other boards. I'm asking for more specific detail so that I can assure myself of the completeness of that statement and the accuracy of that statement.

However, it is my understanding at this time that our rejections and approvals as a percentage of the

number of claims which are submitted to the board, are not generally significantly out of line with other jurisdictions. I feel that it would be inappropriate to comment upon the specifics of the allegations until we've had an opportunity in fact to provide the full report to the member opposite so we can review each allegation in the context of the total review.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, there was a report the other day of a group of widows who had applied to the Workers Compensation Board for benefits or have indicated that they were not aware that they could provide for benefits when their husbands died of heart attacks. Apparently a representative of the board has indicated that spouses of workers who die of heart attacks on the job are automatically eligible for compensation unless it can be medically proven the attack was job-related. I appreciate that this is a matter that the board has jurisdiction and the board and its employees deal with, but I wonder if the Minister has any comment on those complaints.

**MR. COWAN:** I would like very much the opportunity and will in fact seek the opportunity in the very near future to meet with that group of individuals to discuss their specific complaints and their general comments with them.

I understand the agony and the turmoil which they go through when confronted with this type of an experience. It's not easy. If we are to have a Workers Compensation Board and a Workers Compensation system — because it goes beyond individuals — that meets the needs for which it was designed to meet, then we must go out of our way to ensure that we provide to them the type of information, the type of support and the type of access to services which they may find necessary but under circumstances, might be considered an extraordinary effort on the part of our board.

I'm not faulting the board on this. I'm not faulting the individuals on this but something in the system is a bit askew. Something is wrong. What we must do is talk to these individuals who have formed this group, just as we talk to the Injured Workers Association — and I have a meeting set up with them in the very near future and just as we talked to the labour organizations and the employers organizations — to find out from their perspective how it is we can fine-tune a system which has been designed to provide them with the type of assistance which they might find necessary in times of economic and emotional turmoil.

I think we have to approach the entire Workers Compensation system from that perspective. We have to recognize that when a worker is injured, at the time of their injury they are least capable of dealing with that injury from the perspective of Workers Compensation, so they need support. They have emotional problems at that time; they have physical problems at that time and even with Workers Compensation in place, they have economic problems at that time because there are certain delays in the process; there are certain time lines that have to be followed. What I want to do over the next number of months and longer if the opportunity presents itself to me, is look at the ways by which we can fine-tune that system to ensure that they are given the greatest possible help at the

time of their greatest need. That's crucial; that's important. It means looking at staffing. It means looking at systems of support. It means looking at guidelines that need reviewing; the entire system but we know their problems because we hear individuals telling us their problems. They aren't making them up. They aren't pulling these out of the air and suggesting that there's a problem with the system where no problem exists.

They are presenting those concerns to us in an honest and a straightforward way and they are asking for our help. They are asking us to provide them with that type of support and I would suggest that we can do no less. I know that no member in this House would want to do any less because I know that regardless of our political stripe or where we sit in these Chambers, that each and every one of us deal with Workers Compensation cases. The Member for Turtle Mountain says right. Probably every member here has several Workers Compensation cases which they're dealing with at the present time.

The case is, that the system has been designed to provide a service. The system can provide that service. We must work together to fine-tune that service and we can't do it on the basis of reviews, or reports, or sitting in these Chambers and acting under the best intentions but not realizing where the system is falling apart. So we have to listen to those people who first-hand have to address that issue in their own personal lives, from a very personal perspective and we have to acknowledge their experience. We have to acknowledge their expertise. We have to let them help make the system work better.

If I recall the report correctly which was just tabled in the House — and I did not read it fully — there were 12 cases which were accepted as compensable heart disease cases in the year of that annual report. I'm not certain what page that would be on. I think it's tabled five or four for the member if he's seeking it. It's a whole list of occupational injuries and diseases and right down third from the bottom would be heart disease. There were 12 cases that were in fact accepted as compensable. I don't know if there's only 12 cases out there. I don't know if there's 24 cases out there. I don't know if there's 120 cases out there but I do know that there are individuals out there who feel that they have not had the proper support necessary for them to pursue their case in a legitimate way and we want to provide them with that support.

So I think the formation of their group is in fact a positive occurrence. I intend to sit down and meet with their group. I will be making an overture to them to meet with them in the near future. They have not made such an overture to myself at this present time, but I think sometimes we have to reach out and say, come forward and talk to us and provide us with your information and your experience. We will be doing that, as we're doing with the other groups and, hopefully, by taken that sort of look in an unbiased and an uncritical — and when I say uncritical, I mean not to assess blame — way, we can make that system work better. And I can stand here a year from now, if I have the opportunity, and probably make the same statements, that we have to make that system better, and if I were to grow a long white beard and long white hair and grow old in this particular position, and I don't

know if that would be the case, but if that were to be the case, then I can assure you, that on the last time that I addressed that issue, I could say that we can fine-tune the system better. It's an ongoing and continuing process but it's one that we have to deal with in a meaningful way. By the way, I feel like I'm growing old in this position. I'm not certain if the beard is turning white but it's certainly has been an aging process. I wonder if I have compensation available to me for this? Perhaps I should check. —(Interjection)— No, I'm told I don't. I know that, yes.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I can advise the Minister I don't think he has and I don't think he has Unemployment Insurance benefits available either for four years.

Mr. Chairman, the news report indicates that there apparently is a procedure where they, the board usually has a procedure where they notify dependent spouses of the right to apply for financial benefits. It would seem to me a relatively simple matter where a person dies, say, of a heart attack, and there wouldn't be that many instances each year, that the Board, as a matter of course, and maybe they are doing this, maybe there was or wasn't a slip-up in this case, there be a procedure where a clear notice is sent to the dependent spouse of her right, in clear and simple language bringing it to her attention. And perhaps there should even be, if there's no response, perhaps there should be a follow-up.

As the Minister indicates, obviously that is a traumatic time in that person's life and perhaps there should be, as a routine procedure, not just one letter sent, but a follow-up by the Board to make sure the dependent spouse has received the notice and is fully informed, perhaps two or three weeks later or four weeks later of her right to apply for benefits. I wonder if the Minister could undertake to, through his Department if he wishes, discuss that with the Board and ensure that there is not only a notice but a follow-up procedure, particularly in these instances?

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, we have already considered some of the options available to us. We are looking at other options which are available to us. What the member says is absolutely correct. I think we're in harmony in respect to this particular issue. We have to go out and make certain that people know the service is there and we just can't assume that a letter written to them or a quick phone call made to them or a form passing across their kitchen table or their desk fully advises them of the rights that they have under the Workers Compensation Act. So that is good advice, it is advice which has come forward to us through the Lamprey Report, through other reports, it is advice that we're looking at seriously and I hope to be able to discuss specifics with the member over the next number of months in regard to how we're dealing with that need for a more aggressive promotion of workers' rights and spouses' rights under The Workers' Compensation Act.

**MR. MERCIER:** I wonder if the Minister or his staff here could answer this question. I seem to recall in going through The Workers Compensation Act a number of years ago that there was a restriction on an

applicant having counsel before the Board or on an application. Is that provision still in the legislation?

**MR. COWAN:** I think it's an area where there is room for some conjecture as to whether or not it is allowable. It is a concern which has been brought to my attention. It is one which we fully intend to review and I can tell you that is not a priority right at the moment, but it is certainly one of the matters which we intend to review over the next period of time, to attempt to, firstly, clarify the legislation in our own minds, and secondly, make certain that others understand it fully, and if changes are deemed to be necessary, to review the way by which we can bring those changes about. I can't be more specific than to suggest to the member that I have had concerns in that regard expressed to me by lawyers who had wanted to appear before Boards. I'm not certain whether it was in the context of the Medical Review Panel or whether it was in the context of another activity of the Board, but it is something that we are aware of and something we are looking towards, although not on a priority basis right at this time. We want to work our way through some more immediate problems and then deal with that one as the opportunity presents itself.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister did confirm my impression formed years ago that there was a restriction in that way, and I remember at the time I felt, in a particular case I was involved in, I felt strongly that there should be the right of an applicant to have counsel. I leave that with him. I'm sure it has, and will, come up and probably is part of the overall review, but if a person has a right and then is restricted by the legislation, in not being able to really exercise that right through counsel, then I would ask the Minister to inquire into the rationale for that and consider it seriously.

Mr. Chairman, there may be other members who have questions on the Workers Compensation Board, but frankly, without the summary of the investigation that is being done, it is difficult to, at this time, ask any further questions on this topic.

**MR. COWAN:** I do apologize to the member for not having the summary available. If it were possible, I certainly would have had it available. Because of the timing of the report it did not work out that way and I offer my apologies, but I know we will have time to discuss it and I'm looking forward to those discussions as well. We will also have other opportunities, I'm certain to discuss it and I'm looking forward to those opportunities as well.

The rationale, in respect to the attendance of lawyers at board hearings, I think dates back to the whole philosophy of Workers Compensation that it should be separated from the legal system and that it was, in fact, put in place to make it unnecessary for workers who were injured on the job, to spend a lot of time working their way through a legal system, under the system of torts or the rights to sue and, for that reason, there has been a separation which has sort of gone on and on and on down the years without individuals having taken the time to really look and see if there might be some areas where lawyers who have some skills to participate in assisting an individual

appearing before the board. We don't deny that opportunity to other individuals appearing before other boards and so I take the member's concern seriously. I have had them expressed to me by others and I take that seriously as well, and perhaps when we review this over the next year we can address that issue. But again, I don't want to suggest to him, and I'm being totally open, that it is a priority item, but it is one which we are aware of and we would seek to deal with over a longer period of time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Minister, we've only received the Workers Compensation Board Report and only had a very short period of time to examine it. I would like to ask the Minister a few very general questions dealing more with the revenue side rather than the disbursement side of the Workers Compensation Board Report. I notice that there are basically five general categories involved in the Workers Compensation, and I was wondering if each of these categories maintains a separate pool and the rating is based on that particular pool. Could the Minister give me further information on it?

**MR. COWAN:** If I understand the member's question correctly, there is a general pool which is maintained for Workers Compensation pay outs. There are pension pools as well, and I'm not certain in my own mind because this is a relatively complex, sanctuarial area that those are suffering. I do know that when we increase the pensions in the Legislature that we do have to assess the workers participating in the fund an amount equivalent enough to ensure that we are able to pay out those pensions over the anticipated life of the surviving spouses and workers. So I do know we make special consideration for pensions. I don't know if we keep it in a separate fund, but generally the fund is the same that workers pay into. We have different classes or bodies of employers, if I understand it correctly and I don't have the report in front of me. It would be the Government of Canada; there would be the Province of Manitoba; there would be general employers and CPR and CNR, I believe, if that's the table to which the member is addressing his questions.

We do not assess those classes on a different basis. However, industries within classes can be assessed on the basis of their accident frequency and severity rate or, I believe, it could more accurately stated that they would be assessed on the basis of their pay outs — the pay outs which the Workers Compensation Board makes as a result of accidents in their general industry — but it would not be that we would go to one particular work site and assess them a specific amount of money. We assess the mining industry generally; we assess the lumber industry generally; we assess the retail industry generally; and you may break that down in different components, retail lumber, retail food, retail departmental stores. They are assessed at different levels; however, the five classes or the five bodies of employers which are addressed in the table in the beginning are not broken down into assessments on that basis, except maybe CPR and CNR may be assessed separately, I don't know. But I do know

that we do assess different industries on the basis of their accident experience.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well then, just for example, if we had a person working in Forestry for the Department of Natural Resources, a Province of Manitoba employee, would the province be assessed a rate of revenue for the Workers Compensation based on his salaries and the contribution on the basis of the industry that he is working for or is there a same general assessment for all provincial employees? Does it vary or is it . . . ?

**MR. COWAN:** I would have to check to get the detail for the member in response to that answer. I don't know as if it would be a general assessment for the Province of Manitoba; I would doubt it, quite frankly. I think it would probably be an assessment on the basis of the different types of work activity within the Province of Manitoba — governmental departments. But I can find out for certain and respond to the member in more detail once I have the specific information in front of me. The assessment, of course, is based on the salary pay out of the employer so that's the basis upon which the general assessment is determined. However, as to whether or not it would be a different assessment for a forestry worker in a Provincial Government versus a clerical worker in the Provincial Government or another worker in a Provincial Government in a different type of occupation, I could not be specific at this time.

**MR. GRAHAM:** The reason I ask these questions, it's rather difficult to really get a handle on what is occurring in the Workers Compensation Board. If using the figures that are given to us in the Annual Report, we're unable to ascertain whether or not all employees of the province are assessed at an equal rate or are those that are in a high-accident category, is there an assessment at a higher level on those as opposed to say, a stenographic clerk? That type of information I think is pretty important to us in order for us to make any kind of assessment at all of the activities of the Workers Compensation Board. I would hope the Minister would give us some further information so that we could make that kind of assessment in order to ascertain whether or not the activities and the rate structures set by the Workers Compensation Board are fair and equitable.

**MR. COWAN:** I will provide the member, as per my earlier commitment, with an answer to that specific question. If other questions should flow from that, then I'll be pleased to try to answer them at that time or to return with a more complete answer. This is a very complex area and complicated area and I make no apologies for not understanding it perfectly; I don't think many people do. But I do recognize that the member has some valuable questions and concerns, and I will go to those people who do understand this specific area and return to him with more complete information.

**MR. GRAHAM:** There was another figure in here that somewhere I noticed — I'm not too sure if I can find the page again — where there was some money apparently outstanding from the Province of Mani-

toba since 1972 which still has not been fully paid up, I believe. Is that correct?

**MR. COWAN:** Well, without knowing the page number and the specific details to which the member is addressing this question I can't really say. I can indicate that when an assessment is levied that sometimes an employer in the Province of Manitoba does this as well, will determine that it is more appropriate to pay that assessment out over a longer period of time on a yearly basis, and for that reason they may have monies owing which would be due to the Workers Compensation Board as a result of opting into a pay out over a specific period of time. That would not be unusual. That may be the case to which the member is addressing his questions, it may not be, but I am prepared to find out the specific information and get an answer back to the member at a later date.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just looking through these figures; not detailed at all. It does appear to me just looking at it, that the assessment and the accident rate do bear a relationship and Classification G, which is listed in Table 1 at the back, does seem to bear an inordinate share of the revenue for the Workers Compensation Board, and possibly also in the benefits that accrue from it. I think we need further information in order to make a valuable assessment of how the whole thing is operating. It appears to me just at cursory glance that probably categories a, c, d and e are maybe not bearing their full share of the cost of compensation. It appears that most of the compensation revenue is coming from the private sector and the public sector is maybe not bearing its full share. If the Minister has any information that would prove otherwise, I would certainly appreciate it at this time.

**MR. COWAN:** I would suggest to the Member for Virden that there are probably more employees in the private sector than there are in the public sector that fall under the jurisdiction of the Workers Compensation Board, and for that reason the absolute figure does look to be larger and is larger. However, what I will endeavour to do is to find out how that breaks down on a specific basis and provide that information to the member at my earliest convenience.

**MR. GRAHAM:** There's one other area of concern to me and probably it is more prevalent in my constituency than some others, although I think probably the Member for Flin Flon, maybe the Member for The Pas might also be involved. That is in the field of split jurisdiction between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan, and I had the unpleasant circumstance a few years ago to be involved in one such case which took months and months to solve, where you find there's a difference in rate of pay out between the two provinces, and the reluctance on the part of either province to assume the initial responsibility of settling the case and then going after the other province to collect their share of the costs. I find from personal experience that it's a very frustrating experience to go through. It does lead to frustrations and difficulties, but I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that in any cases that exist in the

future that whatever the natural residence of the person involved or the place of business, should be the determining factor for the initiation of the compensation claims and the settlement, and then turn around and make payment according to the joint schedules of both provinces and then claim their money afterwards from the province, rather than let the workman suffer through six, seven, eight months of non-payment when it is purely because of legal technicalities that the workmen is denied that.

I would ask the Minister if he would be prepared to set into operation a plan which would expedite matters of that nature.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I understand the Workers Compensation Boards across the country do in fact try to co-operate in that way. There are from time to time specific cases where that does not appear to be happening. I will contact the board again with the concerns from the Member for Virden. Perhaps we can get back to him a detailed answer as to how that co-operation is supposed to work, and then from that determine ways by which we can refine it and make it work even better. On the other hand, if he has specific cases which are —(Interjection)— he tells me they're all settled. But in the future and to others as well in the room, if he has specific cases, please bring them to the attention of the workers advocate or the attention of the department or the Workers Compensation Board at the earliest possible moment. We'll see if there isn't some way by which the law can be more equitably applied

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6(a)—pass; 6(b)—pass. That concludes the items under Workplace Safety and Health, Item No. 6.

Therefore, we'll continue under Item No. 7, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, Item No. 120, No. 7(a) and we will conclude Resolution 119.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,853,800 for Northern Affairs, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March, 1983—pass.

Continuing with Item 7(a), Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** We might be able to pass (a), Mr. Chairman, and indeed (b) because my questions are on Line (c) and (d).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7(a)—pass; 7(b)—pass; 7(c), Other - Northern Affairs

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I will admit that I'm not familiar with past practice in discussing this Resolution of Acquisition/Construction in the Department of Northern Affairs, but other departments, Natural Resources and Highways, do have itemized construction lists. Does the Minister have that available for us today?

**MR. COWAN:** I'll have the Page distribute them to members opposite.

**MR. ORCHARD:** My questions will no doubt stem from a perusal of this, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** While the Member for Pembina is perusing the paper, are there any other questions for the Minister? If we could continue under other items, I'm sure the Minister would allow the Member for Pembina to return to that topic at a later time. Are there any other questions other Item 7.(d)? The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps if we can, I feel badly having just passed this out and the member having to rush through it like that. We can give him an opportunity to read it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If there are other questions under other items, would you be prepared to proceed?

**MR. COWAN:** I would be prepared to answer them, but I would just ask the member how long he believes it will take him or anticipates it'll take him to go through that perhaps?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, this is an item of substantial detail even though the monies are not that great in total, although I do notice by region, there's some, I assume \$2,459,000.00.

**MR. COWAN:** I should clarify this for the member at this time. There is another \$2 million in this section which is water and sewer, which we indicated was coming over from the Water Services Board earlier and we have not yet directed that specifically to communities, it's my understanding, and therefore can address it in that way. However, we will be undertaking that level of service in respect to water and sewer in the different communities over the next year, but I think that's a general figure in most instances at any rate.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, I guess, Mr. Chairman, my question would be: how does one correlate the totals under the Summary of Shareable Capital Projects which are close to \$2.5 million with the Estimate line indicating some \$431,000 of authority that we are going to approve, specifically sewer and water if that were the cause of the discrepancy as the Minister has indicated by the project on the first page. They are indicated to be only some \$65,000 which would be substantially below the \$2 million that we are approximately looking for the project description on.

**MR. COWAN:** Basically, it was my understanding of the situation that last year's vote adjusted, was \$4,962,500.00. That's a 100-percent figure, and again we deal with the 80-percent figures and 20-percent figures because of the accounting mechanism used when we deal with Northland's money and that's under 7.(a), which is the previous one, but we can discuss that under this item. I'm not trying to restrict the debate; I'm just trying to point out where the money shows. The '82-'83 request this year is \$4,459,200, which is a \$503,300 decrease. That decrease is due to a reduction in planned program delivery of water and sewer of \$950,000.00. The rea-

son we have reduced that \$950,000 was that last year there was \$2,950,000 voted, but we were only able to spend \$1,300,000 of it. That was when it was in the Water Services Board, so this year we are anticipating being able to spend \$2 million of it. So while we have an actual reduction of \$950,000, if we were to be able to spend the 2 million which we anticipate we will do, then it's an increase of \$700,000.00. I just wanted to explain that discrepancy there.

Then there's an increase in local community infrastructure projects of \$446,700.00. So those figures which I gave you are 100 percent of anticipated cost. Print figures re the '81-82 are shown at 80 percent. The remaining 20 percent is in Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement enabling vote, while print figures for '82 and '83 are shown at zero. 80 percent of that amount is included in Vote 19(8), Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement, with the remaining 20 percent being shown in Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement enabling vote. I hope that explains it. I'm not certain that it does explain it, but perhaps as we work our way through specific questions, we can have a better explanation flow.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, we did have a lot of figures flashed by us there, and I'm not being critical of the Minister because I think I sense for the first time that he maybe as confused on this issue as I am. We do not have in lines (a) and (b) of Resolution 120 any dollars under the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Development Agreement. We certainly had funds last year. Now, that would seem to me to be different from what the Minister has just indicated that certain \$2 million of sewer and water provision or capital provision is contained somewhere within an enabling vote Canada-Manitoba Northlands Development Agreement, because clearly there isn't such a dollar value in line (a) or (b). Once again, I don't see the \$2 million that the Minister refers to detailed in his capital projects under water and sewer, as I say there's only some \$65,000, 35 of which is to waterhens, some to cormorant, some to Anama Bay, some to Pine Dock and that would seem to be the total — Mr. Chairman, maybe I've confused the Minister myself. I find that there is a summary of non-sharable capital projects which totals the \$431,000.00. Now, can I just back up a couple of minutes? Under which line item in the Estimates can we discuss the first half of Capital Projects which total \$2,459,200.00? We could discuss those right here?

**MR. COWAN:** You can discuss them right here and perhaps I can offer my apology to the member for the way in which this comes forward in the Estimates Book. It is confusing; it confuses me. I can assure you that it won't be coming forward in this way next year, however, we just did not have time given the status of the Northlands Agreement and given the way in which the Estimates greeted us when we took office to change it significantly. But next year we will hopefully have that laid out in a more understandable way. This year I can only suggest that we try to go through it piece by piece and we will undoubtedly get confused. I get confused by this from time to time as well, but I can assure you that with the capable staff here who have been through this before that they can provide to

us accurate descriptions.

My understanding of the \$2 million which we are talking about in respect to water and sewers, that it shows up under Item 8 but we can talk about it anywhere. Basically, that's what we've doing is talking about these items in a very general way, much to the chagrin of the Chairperson who from time to time does understand the necessity for the far reaching discussion but finds it frustrating nonetheless. But I don't mean to frustrate him; I just mean to deal with some of the frustrations with which we must deal as a result of trying to go through a rather complex economic formula and not having the figures laid out in the best possible format in front of us. So, the \$2 million is included in Item (a) under 7, but the money figure is in Item 8, is that correct? 80 percent of it; 20 percent of it is in Finance. Now that was the mechanism which was set up previously and so, when I give you figures now, I'm giving you 100 percent figures, but we must recall that 80 percent of it is in my particular department and 20 percent is in Finance. So far, so good? Okay. The \$2 million then comes under Item (a) but the money shows up in Item 8.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, now if I might ask a few questions on the second capital attachment, the one that totals the \$431,000.00. I note that of the total of \$86,000 by project type, namely roads, that \$70,000 of that is under two general headings called Rural Roads with no specific community attached to that. Could the Minister indicate the nature of that rural road construction? Secondly, could the Minister indicate whether the Department of Highways will be undertaking the construction and the contracting of that \$70,000 item and indeed the \$86,000 item?

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, those roads primarily are inter-community roads which fall into the jurisdiction of Northern Affairs. The work is contracted out to the Department of Highways and Transportation.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Did I hear the Minister correctly in saying intercommunity within the community or between communities?

**MR. COWAN:** That particular item is generally between, but they are roads that have always been under the jurisdiction of the Northern Affairs Department. We have not added to my knowledge any roads in that area; so those are roads in between communities. The contracts usually go out to the Department of Highways and Transport for the maintenance and the development.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the other major item — as a matter of fact, the most major single component of the \$431,000 is involved in Surveys and Land Acquisition of \$127,500.00. It is involved in a number of communities. Could the Minister indicate the final objective of doing that survey in Land Acquisition? Is it for airport? Is it for roads? What's the end result going to be of this survey in Land Acquisition?

**MR. COWAN:** It's primarily for subdivision surveys in Northern Affairs communities, some road work, right-of-way work, I believe, and some waste disposal sites

which we have to survey out to get proper title.

**MR. ORCHARD:** The final sheet indicates some \$100,000 of the total being spent in the Thompson area. I note at the same time that if one follows through at least some of the communities, to me, they might well have been Thompson area communities, Cross Lake, Norway House, etc., what is the purpose of the \$100,000 appropriation or estimate of expenditure on Survey and Land Acquisition in the Thompson area?

**MR. COWAN:** It is my understanding that there are about 10 other communities which are not included in this specific list that we may have general needs for surveying within and that's where that particular item would go. I can break it up in more specific detail if the member wishes.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, not wanting to delay the process today, could the Minister give me the assurance that he could provide that breakout on the \$100,000 item at a later date?

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, I can give the member that assurance.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Now, in terms of the item of Recreation Facilities, there are not major expenditures in any of the communities with the exception of possibly three. Could the Minister indicate in, for instance, Waterhen and Pelican Rapids, what the recreation facility expenditures are going to be spent on?

**MR. COWAN:** While we're looking for that specific information, I can indicate in general terms that, yes, we'll have the specific detail in one moment.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Possibly, Mr. Chairman, to speed up the process, if the Minister could provide, for instance, in the Recreation Facilities which are fairly community specific and in the Building Halls and Garages appropriation for about five communities, if the Minister could provide us at a later date what those dollars are being spent on, that would suffice the committee?

**MR. COWAN:** We could make that commitment certainly, and I might add I appreciate the opportunity to be able to have the time to pull that information together in a detailed way. I do want to thank the Member for Pembina for that opportunity.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(c)—pass?  
The Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Yes 7.(c) can pass, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(c)—pass; 7.(d) Other — Environmental Management — the Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate the nature of the capital construction under Environmental Management?

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, we have it directed towards the purchase of a liquid chromatograph for the

environmental laboratory.

**MR. ORCHARD:** The Minister doth peak my curiosity, could he - I don't want to have him give me an hour explanation of all the advantages of it - could he just give me basic usefulness of a liquid chromatograph, please?

**MR. COWAN:** A what? I really wish I could. I wish I knew that much about a liquid chromatograph to give him an hour, but I have a hard enough time saying it much less explaining it. It's my understanding that it is an analysis tool that measures different components in substances which are forwarded to the laboratory for analysis either by government or by the private sector. To be more specific than that, I could only guess that a chromatograph would probably by means of a spectrum determine what specific substances would be contained in an analysis sample. But that's a guess and I may stand corrected. I will get more complete information on the liquid chromatograph to the Member for Pembina in the very near future, I think it would be one of the easier ones to do. However, when discussing this with the department, they came forward with a number of requests for capital expenditures. This was one of them, and they felt that by providing this particular piece of machinery they would be able to round out their ability to provide better and quicker analysis of substances which had been forwarded to them. And I'm basing the decision to bring this forward to the Committee for their approval on the basis of their request for this machine, and their assurance that it is money well spent in an area in which I have not enough expertise to challenge them or not to challenge them. However, I am assured that they will spend the money wisely. Since they don't have all that much to spend, I am certain that they are going to spend it quite wisely.

**MR. ORCHARD:** In the furtherance of not only my knowledge but the Minister's knowledge on the liquid chromatograph, could the Minister at his convenience provide myself and others with the utility of such a machine? I can appreciate having to rely on the expert advice of departmental staff, but I know in past experience sometimes they tend to really request the ultimate in equipment and such expenditures that do require some significant explanation. If the Minister could undertake to provide me with that at a later date I would be quite satisfied.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes I'll provide him it in more detail. We have treated it somewhat lightly but I think that it is, to my understanding, a machine which will complement those pieces of equipment which we have in place and which, in fact, does do analysis sampling and will provide the environmental laboratory with a greater response capability to demands placed upon it by the government and other parties.

I would also like to take this opportunity to invite the Member for Pembina and other members who are present to attend the laboratory at some time in the near future. It is a unique laboratory and one is probably well worth the visit, and if he would like for us to arrange that for him I would be pleased to do so. And then perhaps, if I have time, we can both take a look at

the liquid chromatograph once we get it, and marvel in the way in which modern science has increased our ability to determine what substances may lie dormant or active in other substances.

I would also like to put on the record right now, and it seems timely to do so, my appreciation of the laboratory in respect to the latest event which has demanded a great deal of our time, and that's the recent fire at the University in the high voltage transformer room there. They really put the equipment which we have available to us to the extreme test to respond very quickly to some very urgent needs in respect to testing for polychlorinated biphenols, which may have been involved in that explosion, in one way or another. So I do want to thank them for having worked the many hours and put the laboratory to such a test in order to accomplish a fast and effective response to an urgent situation.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, if it would be more appropriate to undertake the discussion on the 2,459,000 on Item 8, I'd be prepared to pass (d) and the Appropriation 120.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(d)—pass; it includes the Items under No.7. Aquisition/Construction of Physical Assets.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$471,000 for Northern Affairs Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

We'll continue with Item No.8, Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement, resolution No.121. The Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Now, I note, we did get into the discussion of this the other night when I was last in this committee. And the Note No. 2 which appears on the bottom of the page indicates, I would assume, the 80-percent, 20-percent breakdown in line-by-line showing of the appropriation here where the 17.831 million represent the 80 percent that's present. And the other 20 percent, roughly 4.5 million is in the Enabling Vote under the Department of Finance appropriation. But I still find, Mr. Chairman, that there is some confusion here in the capital items list. We have here approximately \$2.5 million of sharable capital projects. It would seem to me that, if my memory serves me correctly, that last year for instance, with the 19 million that was shown in the fiscal year which has just ended, that the list of capital projects proposed to be undertaken was the complete list. It did total not only the 19.25 million that appeared but also the 20-percent Enabling Vote withholding that was in the Department of Finance. Whereas today the capital projects only represent 2.5 million and the clear indication is that there is an excess of \$22 million worth of projects in which we will be voting on, and in effect approving, should be pass resolution 121. If the Minister could provide some clarification as to how we're going to authorize some \$22 million worth of expenditures when receiving only a list of about \$2.5 million, some 10 percent of that actually being attributed to specific projects.

**MR. COWAN:** I think perhaps a bit of clarification is necessary. While this money is the total money, it is spread out through the different departments which will be spending it in their own departments on specific programs, so that's why you see the discrepancy. If you wish I can provide you with the detail as to what was spent in which department over the past year, the '81-82 adjusted figures. It's fairly long. Perhaps it's not necessary, but that's the reason for that. Some of it is spread out into the other departments and will be addressed in their Estimates as well.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Maybe I should let you ask the questions then because this is a little confusing. Can I assume from the Minister's answer then, that although it's not specified in Item No. 8 which other departments will undertake the expenditure of that, in total, \$22 million, could the Minister just indicate which departments we can inquire as to the spending, and thereby possibly get an additional capital projects list from those departments?

**MR. COWAN:** The departments are Agriculture, Education, Energy and Mines, Finance, Fitness, Recreation and Sport, Health, Highways and Transportation, Labour and Manpower, Municipal Affairs, Natural Resources and Northern Affairs.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Could the Minister indicate at what stage the Norway House Ridge is? Is it now completed and in service?

**MR. COWAN:** I can indicate that's it not officially opened yet, I will have to find out if it's being unofficially used.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Also, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate — it may well be part of the answer here or further in the Highways and Transportation expenditures; no, it's not in here. Could the Minister indicate whether there is going to be any road construction undertaken in the communities of Norway House in the internal road system and, indeed, whether the Cross Lake Road will be completed under this \$22 million.

**MR. COWAN:** There is money allocated for both of those under this budgetary figure. Whether or not it will complete the Cross Lake road or not I'm not certain, although I'm informed that may be the case. I can find out the specific construction schedule and report back to the member on that.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My recollection on Cross Lake in particular was that the — and my memory may not be correct on this — but it seemed to me that we had a land acquisition problem at Cross Lake which was delaying the completion of the road contract and if the Minister, whilst he's checking would provide me later with the information on Cross Lake, could he also undertake to provide me with the answers as to whether the acquisition of right of way has been completed at Cross Lake?

**MR. COWAN:** I believe we have an agreement in principle and I hesitate to say anything until the signa-



tories have placed their signatures on the dotted line, but it's my understanding that an agreement has been agreed to in principle in respect to that land acquisition.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister undertook with the \$431,000 listing, to provide details on basically two items, and I wonder if he might provide the same detail on these \$2.5 million worth of expenditures, or on possibly three items, for instance, the Fire Program, the Buildings, Halls and Garages, the detail as to what each community is receiving with their various appropriations and also if the Minister could provide what pieces of equipment are to be acquired in each community. I'm also interested in knowing under the subdivision, Survey and Land Acquisition itemizations, how many residential lots would be potentially available from the expenditures of the subdivision dollars particularly, and how many residential lots might be available as a result of Survey and Land Acquisition that he's undertaking.

**MR. COWAN:** I'm assuming that the member would want that in written form or in more detailed form at a later date. I can't give him a specific number of residential lots, but I can certainly give him a close estimate.

**MR. ORCHARD:** One question on the roads again, do we assume these to be roads within the community limits in each case where it's specifically identified, for instance, to Camperville, to Duck Bay, etc.? Because I note in this series of itemized projects there is no general heading of rural roads as we saw in the other ones. Are these all within the communities?

**MR. COWAN:** It is my understanding that they are for the most part if not all, within the communities themselves.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, they involve actual construction not something as routine as, say, dust control within the communities. These are actual construction that's going to be undertaken.

**MR. COWAN:** They include both construction and upgrading, but it is my information that they do not include the maintenance type of work which the member was addressing specifically.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If there are no further questions that concludes Item No. 8, Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$17,831,400 for Northern Affairs, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, the Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—.

We can continue on to Item No. 9, Communities Economic Development Fund.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** I just have a couple of questions for the Minister, Mr. Chairman. Who makes the decisions with respect to loans made by the Communities

Economic Development Fund?

**MR. COWAN:** I believe that under \$75,000, it's the board that makes the decision and above \$75,000, it requires a Cabinet decision. I think those are the accurate figures; I can check to make certain. There has been no change in that process.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** I take it then from that answer, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has not been involved in any direct way with loans then that fall under the amount of money which mark the line between the decisions the board should make and the decisions that Cabinet should make. If it's \$75,000, and he assures that he has not been involved in any direct way in any loans under \$75,000.00.

**MR. COWAN:** I've been apprised by constituents and apprised by others that they are requesting loans, but as far as imposing my will upon the board in that respect, no, I have not undertaken that, nor will I undertake that. That is a decision that they must make. We've asked them to take a look at the whole process of how the fund works over a period of time and that's a general review by to deal specifically with loans under that threshold limit, I can't recall any, no.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate to us who the present members of the board are? Has he got that information available to him, or more importantly, have any recent changes been made?

**MR. COWAN:** No, I can't indicate who the present members are at this time. I can tell you that we have not changed any members. I can also tell you that my understanding is that there may be one or two vacancies on the board where appointments ran out and we have not filled them as of yet. So we have in fact not changed any members whatsoever.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There is no resolution to include that item, No. 9. Shall we just say No. 9—pass? We return to Item No. 1, Executive I.(a) the Minister's Salary — the Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I haven't been here for a lot of the Estimate discussion by the Minister in carrying his departmental Estimates to this final stage on the Minister's Salary, so that I find myself possibly not being as familiar with some of the areas that one could find fault with the Minister although I assure him that's not my primary role here. I would like to just make a few general observations, if I might, and if I can just have a second to complete a little note here. Sorry for that interruption.

The Minister has got before him and in his responsibility a fairly major negotiation under the Northlands Agreement. The outcome of that negotiation and the direction that he pursues in not only achieving a shared-cost program with the Federal Government but indeed in delineating where those dollars

will be spent, I think he well understands quite significant importance to the communities in Northern Manitoba under the spending authority of his department and under the spending authority of any Northlands Agreement. It would be my observation from the time I had in working on Northlands projects that were undertaken by the Department of Highways and in the discussions that I had in terms of developing the parameters of the new Northlands Agreement, I think the Minister will find that one of the major thrusts of the program could well be the development of infrastructure of roads and transportation facilities, of communications facilities, of even Hydro facilities because, Mr. Chairman, it's my belief and maybe I share it as a naive one, but it's my belief that with access to markets of some of the resources that are in those communities that a good road system will allow them to create the employment that they so desire in those communities to use the natural resources in the area to provide the long-term and real employment that members of those communities have desire of.

I would hope that the Minister in undertaking the negotiations with the Federal Government and particularly if negotiations are centred around one particular Minister in the Federal Government whom I won't name at this time, if the Minister would attempt to resist some of the programs — and I don't know how to put this gently — but there can be developed a program framework which finds a way to employ a lot of advisers, a lot of experts to provide consulting services and those people are generally outside of the communities. Now, there are great employment opportunities for other Canadians and other Manitobans, but I think in the final analysis sometimes you can study the situation to death, spend all your money studying it and not end up with anything tangible that the community can use after all of the smoke is cleared to get on with the job of providing resource development and permanent jobs within the community.

I think that there has been a tendency in the past of at least one particular Federal Minister to involve himself quite highly in those "study the problem" programs which employ a lot of noncommunity personnel and end up with a broad array of recommendations which quite frankly, I think, leave the community somewhat baffled as to the utility of them and as to how the money was spent to arrive at them.

The other thing that I want to comment on before I finish is the Minister's other role of environment protection. The Minister — and I don't have to remind him of this whilst he was in Opposition — often made substantial contributions in this House on the environment. I might say that the Minister from time to time was highly critical of methods by which our Ministers responsible for the Environment handled certain situations and certain environmental accidents. He found no end of time in criticizing, for instance, some of the methods that were recommended by the department for the disposal of the vinyl chloride in the MacGregor spill, and that particular issue left this House in a turmoil for some days at the debate of the then Member for Churchill as an Opposition critic. He found a great deal of fault with some of the handling procedures that were undertaken by our government in those environmental accidents.

It was quite interesting during the course of the Estimate perusal to see a sort of rebirth of the man that basically, when faced with an environmental spill of a similar type at Austin, that was so vehemently criticized by the member when it occurred in MacGregor, that the Minister basically followed departmental recommendations as to how to proceed with disposal, how to handle the emergency, how to set up the communications; all of which we had done whilst we were government and seemingly received a great deal of criticism for proceeding in that way from the present Minister. But yet, now, when sort of the shoe was on the other foot and the responsibility is his, he finds that advice coming from the Department of Environment, the same staff that provided advice to us, to be quite good advice now, to be advice worth following and advice indeed worth defending in the House.

I want to just point out to the member that in his terms as critic in the Opposition, I don't fault him for it because this is a political arena where people attempt to make the worst possible case out of any situation and thereby hope to make gains politically which will translate into votes, and I don't think there was anyone more dedicated to that than the present Minister when he was in Opposition, and I don't think there was anybody in this House that spent more time on environmental issues than the present Minister.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, indicate that now when we are in Opposition you will probably find us much less vocal in our criticism of the handling of environmental accidents than possibly the Minister was when he was in Opposition, and we do it because, Mr. Chairman, we, I guess, don't see the value in developing the kind of alarm in the communities that seemed to be the debate style of the Minister when he was in Opposition and indeed a number of his colleagues.

I can remember one night in the vinyl chloride debate that the Member for Wellington and his wisdom was chastising the then Minister of the Environment for not preventing airplanes from overflying the area because those airplanes might ignite the gaseous mixture of vinyl chlorides and air and cause a massive explosion which would essentially wipe MacGregor off the map, when in fact detailed scrutiny of the characteristics of vinyl chloride gas indicated that they were heavier than air and would only be prevalent over a layer of air some couple of feet deep; after that they were practically nonexistent in the environment. But yet, the Member for Wellington — he got a headline in the newspaper — caused a lot of alarm about that and basically it was misinformation that the Member for Wellington was proceeding on but he did a marvelous job of the alarmist tactic in an environmental spill. I don't think it contributed to the wellbeing of the citizens of MacGregor, or indeed the eventual resolution of that environmental spill.

That's why I say that you will find this side of the House to be not any less concerned than the New Democrats were when they were in Opposition about environmental spills and how they are handled, but you will find us to be much less alarmist in terms of our bringing your procedures, your processes, to task in the glare of the camera during Question Period and in the public forum of the media and the newspapers.

I think it's fair to note, Mr. Speaker, that probably no

less a derailment occurred in Austin this fall and it received not nearly the sensational coverage, and I think in part that was due to the fact that on this side of the House we did not react with any great alarm and we did not immediately holler for the resignation of the Minister for his inadequacies and for his inappropriate actions, etc., because he was following departmental advice, the same as what we were following in Austin. That wasn't good enough for them when they were Opposition but seemingly it was quite adequate when the Minister now has the direct responsibility.

So, that, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one small thing for the residents of Dauphin, who as I understand it had the CN train loaded with the soil from the environmental spill at Austin in the community stationed on a side track over a weekend period in which there were high winds. Those high winds were dispersing that soil theoretically laden with the chemicals from the spill and that caused some concern to the residents of the community and I don't believe that the Minister was able to allay those concerns or speed up the process of removal. In fact, maybe it was the Minister's insistence that that load be covered, that it had to sit there until covers were available, that I haven't been able to determine.

But I just want to tell the Minister in closing that he will find co-operation from myself in his undertakings in the Environment and in Northern Affairs, but I think it will be a much less political area under our opposition criticism of him than it was when he was the Minister and I'm pleased now that the advice that he found so faulty with the department when he was in Opposition and the handling of environmental spills is now deemed to be rather good advice in handling those same spills now.

**MR. COWAN:** Very briefly, actually by way of a question, I don't believe that I handled the spill at Austin perfectly and discussing it with the other members during that portion of the Estimates, I suggested that we did make some mistakes which we talked about in an open way and hopefully by doing so, we'll have learned how to handle the next one better, but that remains to be seen.

I am interested in more detail on the Dauphin incident which the Member for Pembina outlines and I will be contacting him, I think, or the Member for Dauphin on that in the near future. Because I think we learn by those sorts of events and if in fact they were being held over at Dauphin, and I assure you it was not because we were demanding covers for them at that time that they were being held over, although we were making some fairly strong recommendations for covers and suggestions for covers at the time, that was not part of the reason for them being held over. I would be interested in more detail on it. I would like to address it from the perspective of trying to ensure that it doesn't happen again and if dust from the contaminated soil was in fact blowing, I want to be able to sit down with the other parties involved, CNR, and find out why that was because we were assured that was not the case and this new evidence would appear to present us with a different perspective and I certainly want to check that out.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister will appreciate that my other obligations to the other committee kept me from participating in these Estimates currently before us. I appreciate the opportunity that I have, nonetheless, to add just a few words and concerns that I have with respect to the Department of Northern Affairs. They come from the perspective of having been involved, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, backed up as Minister of the then expanded and reorganized Department of Highways and Transportation and the Minister will recall that a substantial amount of the functions that were lodged in the Department of Northern Affairs by the then NDP administration were transferred to departments such as Highways and Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to caution the Honourable Minister. I appreciate that any Minister likes to see his Estimates ballooned up; it appears at least on the surface to his constituents and in this case to Northern Manitoba as doing a great job. Mr. Chairman, let me honestly remind the honourable member that when the reorganization took place, it was done so simply because we believed some of the line departments were better equipped to deliver certain programs, whether it was the building of roads. We thought the Highways Department had the personnel to see that they were done properly. In the delivery of water services, we believed that the long established expertise that was housed in the Water Services group that was then in Agriculture was better equipped to make sure that when public dollars were spent for those purposes, indeed, the projects worked.

I remind the Honourable Minister that when we took office in 1977, I believe it was something like 19 out of 23 community water projects were not operating and they had just been built the year before at a very substantial expense. It was for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that these functions were at least in a supervisory capacity moved to what I believe were the logical line department's function. I see the Minister's role in Northern Affairs certainly as having a very substantial influence in seeing to that northerners are involved in these projects whether it's through employment or through the decision-making process that other departments are doing. But I think there was, at least it was our impression, and we have made the organizational changes. An impression that unless it was actually carried out by Northern Affairs staff, the actual monies located in all instances in Northern Affairs Estimates, that somehow meant it indicated a heightened concern or better capacity to respond to northern needs.

Members opposite, in Opposition, took some delight in suggesting that we had emasculated the Department of Northern Affairs, that indicated less concern for northerners on the part of the then administration. Nothing further could be true, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is we were concerned that when public dollars were being spent, the best possible people in the right positions for which they were hired and had the expertise delivered those programs. The Department of Northern Affairs was literally in the process of developing a Department of Highways within Northern Affairs, and there were a number of instances that

were demonstrably clear to all where very serious inefficiencies were developing in the overall provision of government services to northerners.

So, Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't suggest in these comments that the Minister should in any way not play to what, in my judgment, would be the most important function of his office, to ensure that the line departments, whether they're Education, whether they're Health, whether they're Highways, whether they're Water Services, wherever these functions are, how they are so important to northerners that he co-ordinate their approaches. He certainly has that opportunity to have a very input into the decisions that are made in these departments or indeed the programs that he initiates and his Northern Affairs staff initiate, a better service of a kind that is being delivered in the rest of the province by the appropriate department that they receive, you know, that kind of input from Northern Affairs staff to see that the programs are carried out rather than duplicate in his department the kind of a situation that we saw developing during the Seventies.

Mr. Chairman, we will watch the Estimates of this department certainly from that perspective and the goal in mind being that the service is delivered is what counts. It shouldn't really be a matter of competition between which department provides the services. I take it that the Minister will get his satisfaction out of seeing a job well done, out of seeing his government, the government that he's part of, in seeing that these services are delivered rather than pyramiding up his Estimates as they in fact were pyramided in the mid-Seventies to the point where one really had to question the effectiveness, the efficiency, in the way public dollars were being spent in these areas.

**MR. COWAN:** I appreciate the Member for Lakeside's comments and we did discuss that somewhat during the line-by-line review, and I think he has expressed the sentiments of others on his side as well. At that time, I informed the members opposite that we were not anticipating moving Highway Construction over. That was not something that we were looking at in any sort of a serious way at that time. However, we were moving some Water and Sewer activities over because we felt that we could provide a better consolidation of the service by doing so. We would be reviewing that action as well over the next year and we're prepared to move them back if in fact we find that was a mistake. But given the information which is available to us now, we made a value judgment and I will expect the comment from the Member for Lakeside as well as others as that process unfolds itself and we have an opportunity to review whether or not that was the right judgment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** I see the hour is approaching 5:30, I wonder if there is interest in my continuing my remarks now or to begin my remarks now and continue it — (Interjection) — I'll be brief. I would like to be brief and it's not my intention to hold up the proceedings at length, but I do have a couple of things that I held back from remarking on earlier, simply because some of my comments are rather broad-ranging and

it's a kind of a cover-the-waterfront situation.

Basically I rise to speak on the problem of acid rain. It's something that obviously is of great concern to the people in my constituency, the people of Flin Flon and area, given that we have one of the four major polluters for major sources of sulphur dioxide in Canada. The scope of problem, I think, can be told by the fact that the 825 foot stack in Flin Flon emits more than a million pounds of sulphur dioxide each day.

While the residents in that community have a remarkable capacity to ignore that fact, there are certain individuals, an increasing number of individuals, who have recognized that it's a problem that we cannot continue to ignore. I think that as the time goes by and as more evidence is amassed with regard to the dangers of acid rain and the pollution that sulphur dioxide creates, more and more people are becoming concerned and at some point government and industry, governments at all levels in industry, are going to have to come to grips with the problem.

I recognize that bringing up this problem at this time is going to be seen as perhaps inappropriate given that the mining industry is having its own difficulty economically right now, and given the fact that governments are being squeezed by lack of revenues. I don't think that despite that fact that we can continue to ignore the problem.

There was a 1981 study of acid rain called Down Wind, it's the acid rain story that was printed by Environment Canada. If I can quote from that report it says that "The argument against implementing these readily available solutions," that is solutions to the problem of acid rain, "is that it will cost too much." My question is that while in terms of today's dollars it may cost a lot to solve the problem of acid rain or to start seeking solutions to the problem of acid rain, what is going to be the cost in human terms and in dollar terms 10 or 15 or 20 years? It doesn't seem to be reasonable to assume that that cost is going to decrease as we proceed through the years. And the cost, I think, to most people goes beyond what we imagine as acid rain. The cost is there in dollar terms.

It says that "The price tag is considerable in these days of high energy costs and belt-tightening budgets. Both industry and government are cautious when it comes to spending money, especially on preventative medicine, but the cost of not taking action far surpasses the price of emission controls. Industry such as forestry, tourism, and fishing are threatened. Building and automobile surfaces are deteriorating everyday. Health costs could be astronomical in the long run. At every turn there are jobs which could be lost and resources which may never be replenished. When the less tangible effects are added the aesthetic losses, for example, the argument against not taking immediate action seem economically unsound and foolish."

As I've said, I recognize, and I think most people recognize the industries that are causing a lot of this problem, particularly with sulphur dioxide, are suffering these days, and we have a situation in Flin Flon where there's going to be a shutdown for a period of five weeks. At the same time, I think it would be inappropriate for me to stand up and start pounding on the desk and saying now is the time to do something. If that was the case to expect HBM&S to be able to

absorb the costs or to demand that or to expect the Provincial Government to absorb that cost totally. In fact, the 1979 sub-committee task force on the problem of acid rain recognized that HBM&S is in a marginal position and indicated that given the problem of acid rain was a national and indeed international problem, that the Federal Government has some responsibility.

If the committee would bear with me I'd just like to read the recommendation that the sub-committee made. It says, "The Hudsons Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited smelter at Flin Flon, Manitoba, and the one at Noranda are economically marginal operations. The sub-committee recognizes that. If these smelters are required to meet an 80 percent containment of sulphur in smelter feed without some form of economic assistance, these smelters may be forced to terminate their operations. This eventually would have severe consequences for the communities of Flin Flon and Noranda."

Now the sub-committees' final recommendation is that given the country-wide nature of the problem that the costs must be shared by all Canadians. To me that means that the Federal Government certainly has some responsibility, and maybe that's part of the solution. I don't think that anyone can argue that the problem isn't global in nature or that we can ignore the problem. The fact is that we can't ignore it.

For the people in Flin Flon the problem is threefold. The first problem of course is that the sulphur dioxide . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 5:30, I'm now leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock.

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning (Friday).

**MR. SPEAKER:** The members will reconvene in committee at 8:00 p.m.