

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 1 April, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — FITNESS, RECREATION AND SPORT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas):** This Committee will come to order. We are on Fitness, Recreation and Sport. 1.(a)(1) to 2.(a)(2) were all read and passed.

2.(b)(1) — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** I believe maybe Grant Assistance is the area where the grants are provided to the district recreation committees that are formed and the Member for Dauphin is going to — maybe I'm going to preempt him with a question, but there has been a lot of pressure from different groups over the years, to increase that grant. One of the problems that we had, of course, was the fact that there were many new districts being formed and even though there were no more funds provided on an annual basis to the ones that had already formed, that program has actually expanded quite rapidly over the last number of years and, of course, has I think been one of the programs whereby a lot of the municipalities as well as the school divisions in the rural areas that couldn't get along very well before have sort of buried the hatchet as to say and worked together not only in a recreation program, but also in developing some of the facilities. I think it strengthened some of the areas in which maybe some small, petty, small-town differences or municipal differences have been bridged by the introduction of a recreation district.

I'm wondering if the Minister has had a chance at all to look at the levels of funding that the recreation districts receive and I guess the biggest pressure comes from the recreation workers who are tied into a certain salary which the recreation commission of that particular area, I would say, is tied in fairly closely with what the kind of assistance the government's support is and without getting into a situation which I talked about before and the Minister alluded to that you get involved in the operational expenditures of a distinct division. It might be time to have a look at the basic grant level and see if there's any adjustments that can be made appreciating that this item, I think, will probably grow in the next couple of years because there'll be a few more commissions that come on stream from time to time.

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

**HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Yes, the member is absolutely right. The grant having been increased, now, I think if we have a choice with the economic situation that we have now is increased at the expense of new ones that might come in and I think that the important thing is to try to treat everybody fairly and we have an increase of \$49,000 and that will help with five of the grants. There is no doubt that, as soon as we can, we would like to look at the

grants to see if there could be an increase, but there's no way that this will be done this year with the situation the way it is.

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

**MR. JOHN PLOHMAN (Dauphin):** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to follow up on that just briefly. I believe the grant is largely to pay for a recreation director in these commissions. All of the grants are for that purpose. I wonder how long the grant, for example, in the Dauphin-Ochre recreation district has been at \$8,000.00.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Since 1977, the first year it was incorporated in.

**MR. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, now obviously in the five years then, of course, the \$8,000 doesn't go near as far as it did five years ago to pay for the salaries. As we all know, they're increasing quite dramatically, and having been a member of the Dauphin-Ochre recreation district last year, I recall that we did send a letter to the then Minister asking him to look at this and see whether there could be some consideration. I would just draw that to the Minister's attention to emphasize again what the former Minister has just said about those grants.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I'd like to remind the member that he's on our side, now that he's on the government side. The same answer would go to the same question, I guess, that this is something that will have to be looked at. I don't think that program was never meant to pay everything; it was something to help different communities. They can get together with other communities and other municipalities to set up a recreational director which is something new, something a few years back they didn't have it all. There was no help from the — I'm not debating that. I'm sure that both members are absolutely right that \$8,000 today won't go as far as a few years ago, but we have to look at the other priorities that we have. If we can go back a little further than that, if we go back about eight years ago, there was nothing at all. I think this department had about \$20,000 or \$30,000 to spend in all. So there's been an awful lot of improvement done. That's not the only help they get; we have specialists that work for the department that are available to help them, to consult with them and assist them, but as I say I have no defence. I'm not going to try to justify, to say that \$8,000 would go as far this year as it went a few years ago. But as I say, we choose to try and get more of the people that have not received anything at all, and once we've got most of the people in, I guess we'll have to start looking to see if we can increase the grant.

**MR. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, just to bring to the Minister's attention on whose side I am, I was just trying to point out in a gentle manner that we didn't receive any increases last year when we made the request, nor the year before.

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you. I wonder if the Minister could advise us briefly — I asked him a question in the Legislature the other day with regard to the demand billing for recreation facilities. The program I think is lottery funded, but it deals with recreation facilities and at that time, he mentioned that he was having a look at it. I know there are a number of people that are wondering what's going to happen. Has he finished his review on it? Will he continue the program or where are we headed with that one?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I wonder if we could wait for that. This is just strictly the grants on Recreational Director and what should be under Recreational Resources Development (3), if you don't mind.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** I just wanted to ask the Minister whether here, or again under (d) — wanted to discuss grants to community clubs for various purposes including keeping the buildings open.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That will be, if there's anything, under Recreational Resource Development. This is strictly the Recreational Director Program.

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

**MR. RURIC (Ric) NORDMAN (Assiniboia):** Mr. Chairman, I'm just on that \$304,000, is that an equal amount to each one of the recreational directors?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** There's a formula on that depending on the population.

**MR. NORDMAN:** I see. So there's . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would like to caution the members once again it won't be recorded in Hansard if we just keep exchanging conversation here.  
The Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. NORDMAN:** So, you're looking at approximately 40 districts?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, not that many. Approximately 30.

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

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering the Recreational Director at Rossberg has been in contact with me in the last two days; they're all set to go with a lot of programs there. Under Sports Recreation '82, is that the same item as the — they want permission to go ahead with putting the floor in the rink.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Those are capital facility grants and those are lottery funds. We'll come to that a bit later. This is strictly to help with the Recreational

Director in the community.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(i) Salaries—pass?  
The Member for Niakwa.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa):** I just have a question of the Minister. I would just like to ask some questions on some financial assistance to teams that are representing the province. Under what item would that be?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Why don't we wait for Sport Development for that.

**MR. KOVNATS:** I'm prepared to wait as long as I know. It's under (f)? Fair enough. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1) Salaries—pass; 2.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(b)(3) Grant Assistance—pass; 2.(c)(i) Salaries.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Just a minute. I think that I should give you a word of explanation here. This is something that hasn't been worked out with the Federal Government as yet for Northern Affairs, but we have the assurance from Cabinet that we will keep on with this program because that would place a lot of people out of work and Cabinet has agreed that we will guarantee to fund the program if nobody else does.

**MR. BANMAN:** Could the Minister give us any information as to the projected amount that would be expended in that particular area?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, 364,000.

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

**MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield):** Mr. Chairman, is the full amount going to be recoverable from Northern Affairs again this year?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** We certainly hope so.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, if it is not, does that mean that there will have to be additional monies voted under this item? I'm not clear that if the money's not currently provided in Northern Affairs and there is no agreement — (Interjection) — the Member for La Verendrye suggests it's in the Enabling Vote. I would like that clarified.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, it is with the Department of Finance in the Enabling Vote. All the money has been voted for and then if they can recover from the Northern Affairs so much the better.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(c)—pass; there's no amounts within it so just pass. 2.(d) Recreation Resources Development.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Excuse me, there is no amount but I want to make sure the amount is \$364,000, the total amount.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(d)(1) Salaries.

The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, I pose the same question that I asked earlier, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister with regards to the demand billing. Has he got any information with regards to that program?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I guess my answer would be the same — I can't elaborate too much more — the same that I gave in the House. This is a program that was provided to help different facilities to counteract the high rates, and that was a program also to assist people to try and get them to save on energy and that hasn't been the case at all. In that case it's been a failure because they figured it was the way it was set up, so we're reviewing the program. We will have a program; the program will be somewhat different. We're going ahead with this program, I think for this year, the way it is now, but the different facilities will be informed that we're changing that, and we are trying to develop a program that would help them, assist them and give them some incentive to cut down on this energy thing instead of just saying that we'll pick up the extra cost.

**MR. BANMAN:** I appreciate that and I think one of the problems that we had is when the demand billing system was introduced by Manitoba Hydro, it caught a lot of people off guard and did create some fairly large anomalies. I noticed in the last number of years that what was happening now is that because the demand billing rate is lower, some of the facilities in effect were benefiting from the demand billing rate, even though at some time they thought it had hurt them. But what happened really is that we had the hydro rates increase at a rate of 150 percent in a matter of three-and-a-half years, and people were really caught and thought that the demand billing was to blame for it. I think that now with the rate freeze on, the people have been able to sort of plan better and have been able to cut back on power consumption by doing things such as using the heat that the compressors generate to heat maybe part of their clubhouse. We've seen some pretty innovative things.

I would encourage the Minister to use people such as Bill McGregor and his department who do an excellent job of going out and talking to people; helping them with their facilities and I think that is probably the way to go. Many of the rural, recreation facilities are being built by recreation commissions, who very often are not experienced in either renovating or building new facilities, and can very often use the help of somebody who is knowledgeable in that field. I think that type of assistance provided by the department is valuable in reducing operating costs, reducing energy costs and many of the other related costs that can go, because if you build a facility that's more functional than it would be under normal circumstances, that's something that will in the long run save the taxpayers in that particular municipality some money. So, I'd encourage him to follow up aggressively on that part of the program.

I guess the other question is, the Minister mentioned briefly in reply to questions in the Legislature the other day that he will be announcing a facilities program, I understand for about a million dollars. I

guess one of the concerns that I would have is — urge the Minister to announce it as soon as possible because a lot of the municipalities have or are in the final stages of striking their budgets and are wondering what is going to be available. So, I would urge him to go ahead and indicate to the people exactly what is happening. Has he got a time frame? Will he be announcing very shortly the program and what is going to happen?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I would like to thank the member for his advice. We are very fortunate indeed to have somebody like Mr. McGregor, and in fact, he's the one that is the key man in this program, working for this group to do exactly what has been suggested. I might say that last year there was close to \$97,000 voted for that and this year I'm asking for 149. So, it's not a question that we're cutting the program but we're going to look at the program.

As far as the capital program under lottery, the only difference has been that we've cut down from 2 million in one year to 2 million, it'll be announced a two-year program but it'll be 2 million only for this until we catch up and try to make more money under the lottery revenue. We're working on this now and I don't think it'll be very much longer when we'll accept applications.

**MR. BANMAN:** Is the Minister contemplating that the criteria will be very much the same as the last program?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I think a lot would depend on the applications that we have. If you have too many applications you might have to cut down a bit but we're not contemplating having to do that at this time.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** That pretty well, Mr. Chairman, answers the question I was raising. The Rosburn recreation director and the municipalities are keenly interested in getting started on their proposals: floor in the rink; upgrade the baseball diamond; showers at Wellman Lake, and then putting a tractor shed out at the Angusville rink because they're putting in artificial ice there, and they've been phoning me and wondering when the Minister could give them the green light so they could start their projects. So, I guess when the Minister said it'll likely be this month sometime, they should get the green light to either go or stop.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's safe to say that we'll have everything in place this month.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister about a problem which may be a municipal problem, but I think he should be concerned about it as well. That's the fact — and I'm going to use Winnipeg and Elmwood as an example — a local community club in my area is Kelvin on Henderson Highway, and they have I'm sure, grants that come, certainly from the city and possibly from the province for recreation purposes, particularly a director, and I suppose they may have other operating grants, but their particular problem is in keeping the facility open. They have, like most other community clubs or many other commun-

ity clubs, a volunteer problem. They don't have a shortage of teams; they struggle with coaches and so on, but they seem to be able to manage that side of it and then they have a full-time — not necessarily full-time — but they have a person who works there.

The problem is this, they have the physical facility. They have the club; they have their rinks, their change-rooms, their lockers and so on, but they don't have people to keep the club open. So you get into the ridiculous situation of the clubs being closed during the week from Monday to Friday after 4:00. I'm thinking now especially of the wintertime for skating and hockey, young children can't access that club until 6:00 at night. I know a long time ago in Winnipeg it seemed like all the clubs were open after 4:00 in particular. Now, I don't know what the pattern is but I know in my own area, at least one or two of the clubs out of four or five are closed from 4:00 to 6:00 or from 3:30 to 6:00 which is ridiculous. They are often also closed on Sundays, so it's fine if you have an organized team sport, but there's the problem — does the province have any input in this and can the Minister suggest a solution?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a problem, but we have enough of our own that we're not going to accept the problems that are the responsibilities of the municipalities and the City of Winnipeg. It seems that my honourable friend is describing a lack of interest in that community, and I'm surprised if that's the same community that we heard before dinner that was so active in sports and so on. It seems to me they could get some volunteers to show enough interest in the youngsters, and I think that if you're going to have a successful community club, you need a lot of volunteers. Usually it is the parents who I've seen who work very hard in raising funds and in spending many hours. I don't know; I can accept that there's a problem, but I can't see what this department of the province could do anything to change that at all if the interest is not there.

Our main thrust in this department is to help people help themselves, not to impose certain things and try to do everything for people. I remember when I was a youngster, we used to have to clean the ice and everything and I think we probably got more out of it than having everything done for yourselves. So if there's no interest in the community, we're not about to step in even if we had the finances and we certainly haven't got them.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, as the saying goes, when I was a youngster we used to roll and scrape and water the tennis courts, but you don't see anybody doing that nowadays. You also see community clubs which are always threatened with closure because of a lack of volunteer participation. That hasn't been true in my end of town, but it's certainly been true in other parts of the city and maybe other parts of the province.

But my question is this, are there grants that the province gives for Recreation Directors and also for people to assist so that the clubs can be kept open? Because, you know, it makes little sense to have the physical structure there, the teams there and so on and yet, maybe for somebody to put in a couple of

hours a day, they can't seem to get somebody there for two, three hours a day, five, six days a week. I mean we're not talking about a great deal of money; I'm talking about a situation where for a portion of the day they apparently are unable to get somebody who will on a consistent basis keep the club open. I'm just saying, does the province provide funding for this purpose or is this strictly in the hands of the municipality in the local area?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, the province have no programs, no grants, for operating costs whatsoever in this field, and I would have to say that it would be a very low priority with us at this time.

**MR. DOERN:** Does the province provide grants to individual community clubs, or is this again, this is done to the municipality and then parcelled out for the capital or operating?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** The capital has in the past assisted in some, depending on their request of the City of Winnipeg. They could qualify, could apply, depending on what the guidelines will be for a capital project, but that's something completely different. That's certainly not capital project; it wouldn't be stretched to allow any operating costs at all. It would have to be for actual construction, or renovation, or improvement of facilities.

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

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I wasn't sure if I understood the Minister's answer to the question from the Member for La Verendrye regarding the lotteries grant monies this year. There was something about a two-year program, but with the first year, this year, having in it approximately the same amount of money as was in the program last year, is that correct?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** The program has changed; there's been millions of dollars spent in that program. It has probably been one of the most successful programs that we've had and it has enabled many municipalities, many projects, to see the light in different areas of the province. Now, in the last few years, the department had earmarked \$2 million a year for this program. This year, because of lack of funds in that particular fund that we had, it's pretty well depleted. We can only put in a million dollars instead of \$2 million; in other words, we're announcing a \$2 million program but for two years, so it'll be cut in half actually.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Does this mean, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that it is likely the maximum amount available will drop again? It had been 25,000, then it dropped to 20. Does this mean it will likely drop again?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I don't remember when it was 25.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Three years ago.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Oh, last year?

**MR. ANSTETT:** The last two years . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** It started at 20, 25. Well, these are some of the things that we're trying to determine for this year depending on the application and so on and that'll be announced as soon as we're ready to go. That's a possibility. I want to say that we had agreed that we'll be very flexible, but this is lottery funds. Lottery funds are not something that we're voting, it's something if the money is there, fine; if not, we cut down. You have to have certain programs that will be able to — if the money is there, you're going to have a larger program; if not, you're going to have to cut down on the program. We have no other way of doing that; we have no choice in that at all. It is not a question of voting more money in the Estimate. It's not shown in the page that you have in front of you.

**MR. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, my concern only was some idea as to what the maximum amount might be for the larger municipalities, the ones that are entitled to the full amount on the per capita formula. The last two years it's been 20; prior to that it was 25.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't hazard a guess at this time because this is what we're working on. It depends a lot on what we feel is needed and we will, as soon as possible, set up the guidelines for the programs.

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

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't too sure if I understood the Minister correctly when he was talking about the demand billing and the program that has been in effect and he indicated there was going to be some change in it. Could the Minister tell me once more what it was he was planning?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** It's been a grant, like the former Minister said, that it was something that had to be done fast and these grants always have to be reviewed. It hasn't done what was expected of it. It's helped the facilities but the way it was done, it practically encouraged them to spend more money and therefore the doors of arenas were left open — a lot of things like that. So, we certainly can't go along with that. It's not finalized yet; we're thinking of spending \$149,000.00. We want to make through this, Mr. McGregor, mostly there'll be an assessment to see what is needed to have an expert opinion. There'll be a workshop; it'll be an education for these people, how to conserve and save energy, and then there will be a grant to help them to do certain things, either fix the windows or the doors and so on to conserve energy. It'll be a program that will give them some assistance, but again, help them to help themselves and give them an incentive to shoot at to try to conserve energy instead of the more they spend, the more money they'll make and somebody else is picking up the shot.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I find it somewhat hard to believe that the communities would leave the doors open and things of that nature where energy was

wasted, because 95 percent of the total cost they bear themselves. The grant is a very small portion of the total Hydro cost. I think that if the Minister has had a study done of that, I would appreciate seeing it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I would suggest that you speak to your colleague to your right. I think that when this work, when this Mr. McGregor — I didn't go and look at all these facilities, I can assure you of that. I'm going by recommendation of the government that I think that the former Minister is aware of some of the problems. I don't see why our people would make these kind of statements if they weren't true at all. I choose to believe that there is something to that and I think it is a good program. I think it is high time that we reassess this program and give a little more incentive and educate the people to try to help themselves in conserving energy.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, to carry on a little further, I believe there has been some rather extensive questioning in the Chamber with respect to the proposed policy of the government with respect to hydro rates. I can assure the Minister that all of these recreational commissions are very concerned about hydro rates because it is the major portion of their budget. If there is a review of hydro rates coming up, I would ask the Honourable Minister to keep that in the back of his mind that these recreational commissions do have a problem and if there is any significant increase in hydro rates there, it could be a considerable problem. So, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that perhaps he might do some lobbying in Cabinet and if there is an unfreezing of hydro rates, maybe he could prevail on his colleagues to keep a freeze on recreational facilities.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to be drawn into an argument on Hydro at this time; this is not my responsibility. I think that the honourable member should realize what we are trying to do, and I think he should encourage us in trying to tell the people of Manitoba that it's important to conserve energy, to give them grants to help facilitate these things of taking care of the windows or doors or some facilities. Mr. McGregor was mentioned; I think that we all agree, those that know him, those that have heard about him that we are very fortunate to have a man such as he in the department. We're going to use him as much as we can. I don't apologize for this program; it was a program that was, I believe, started under the former government. I buy it 100 percent; I think it's much more important with the limited funds that we have that we educate the people to take care of these facilities instead of having a program that will encourage poor management and we're not about to continue in doing that.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister is not misconstruing what I'm attempting to say to him. I am asking him, urging him to act on behalf of the various recreational commissions if there is a review of hydro rates. I hope that he understands the position they're in and the effect that a hydro rate could have in the future and all I'm doing is asking the Minister if he would consider it with his Cabinet col-

leagues if they do attempt to review the Hydro rates?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I understood perfectly the member is trying to draw me into a debate that I don't intend to go in at this time. The member knows that I'm a member of the Treasury Board and knows that I'll have a part — that I'll be consulted like all the others before we make that decision. Of course, the concern that I have in representing my department and another concern that I have, I think he can rest assured that I will voice my opinion.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, I thank the Honourable Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park):** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the energy conservation part and I think that's a good idea.

I'm just wondering if they will be considering when they're doing the grants if they'll be apportioned possibly to the type of the building, and I'm thinking particularly of a building that we have in my area that was built in a time when energy was no object and it's a particularly hard type of building to heat. I imagine that it would take a lot of extra funds to try and get that particular building into any kind of shape that would really be an energy saver and I just wonder when they're looking at this if they might be considering the building?

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I think that is a very good point. I can't announce any program at this time but I can assure the member that I personally will be quite concerned with this and if need be, once these people have done everything that they could, we could have a program later on, something like our Capital Program or enlarge that Capital Program to enable people to make some changes to their building if it's worth it; if the buildings are in good shape to do exactly that. I think in this day and age we have to be conscious about saving energy and it becomes very, very important, so it's a point that we will take into consideration and consider very seriously.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Recreation Resources Development (d)(1) Salaries—pass; (d)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (d)(3) Grant Assistance—pass; 2.(e) Fitness Development, 2(e)(1) Salaries — the Member for La Verendrye.

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

I believe last year the Federal Government announced that they would be doing a Fitness Testing Program right across Canada and I'm wondering if the Minister has had any results from that to tell us how Manitobans stack up against the rest of Canada. In other words, is the average Manitoban just as fit as the average Swede?

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that we're certainly at the national average, that's in Can-

ada. Now, where we fit compared to the Swedes, I guess may we'll have to ask the Duke of Edinburgh, who told us a few years ago that we were way behind. I think in all seriousness that there has been a big improvement in the last few years. I personally never thought that I'd see as many people so conscious about fitness. We're taking this program very seriously. We're working with senior citizen people and also this is an area that we want to take resources from the Department of Health; it's easy in this case, I don't have to argue with any other Minister and I can tell you that we want our Home Ec Department and our dieticians to work in this department to set up programs because we feel like fitness and diets, proper eating habits go together. We're enlisting the help, the assistance of the Department of Education to work also in this area to try and do away with junk food in these areas as much as possible to educate the public.

**MR. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister could tell us, will a report be made by the Federal Government with regards to the national sort of testing program, will that be made public or will it be provided on a confidential basis to the respective Ministers of the provinces, or what is anticipated to happen with the data that they have collected from right across Canada?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I must be very honest with the member, this is news to me. I didn't even know there was such a thing. Off the top of my head, if there's a report I don't see why we wouldn't make it public. I'm anxious to see it, I didn't know that this was the case and I'm sure that we will make it public.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, maybe the Minister could check into it and if there is anything that his department is receiving and could pass along to the Members of the Legislature, I'd appreciate having a report or hearing what the results of the survey were, because I know that the department did co-operate with them in a number of areas and I think that some of the Ministers right across Canada were anxious to expand it somewhat. I don't know if that exactly happened in Manitoba but I would be anxious to see what the results were.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I would like to thank the member for that; to bring it to my attention and we're taking note of that. I understand that the educated guess is it could be by the end of this fiscal year sometime; apparently it's not quite ready. As soon as we have it, we will certainly give the information to the public and to the members.

**MR. BANMAN:** The other thing, of course, is the thing that the Minister touched on in his role as Minister of Health, fitness development becomes a very important part of — in the car business we call it preventive maintenance . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** In the funeral business we call it staying alive.

**MR. BANMAN:** I have to say to you that it is, I believe, an important part of our overall health program in trying to reduce some of the costs within the system

and that I would encourage the Minister to work together with the Federal Government on programs such as Participaction and others to try to heighten the public's awareness of what a little bit of exercise, what a little bit of watching your proper foods can do to go ahead and make you a healthier individual. So, I would encourage the Minister to continue to pursue that course, knowing full well that it'll probably benefit him on the other side and maybe he'll have to ask for less money for Health next year.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I'd be very pleased to accept the suggestion of the honourable member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(e) Fitness Development, (1) Salaries—pass; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(f) Sport Development (1) — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** A number of questions here, Mr. Chairman. First of all, there was a meeting of Ministers, I think, just during the election which I didn't attend; I think the Deputy attended it, and at a meeting just, I believe, six months prior to that there was going to be a real attempt made to sort of set down a delineation of authority if you want to call it. In other words, what the Provincial Government would more or less be responsible for in the area of games as well as elite athlete development, and what the Provincial Government would be responsible for, in other words, the national-provincial split.

I don't really think that there have been many large problems with regard to that, except that when one deals with something like the Canada Games, it becomes a fairly costly thing and I know the Federal Government is constantly reviewing their role in it. I'm wondering if the Minister has had a chance to discuss any of this with his federal counterpart, in other words, the assistance to athletes, the Elite Athlete Program that the Federal Government carries on versus the program such as we have here, the ManPlan Program, and if there's been any meeting of the minds or any rules or regulations established as to who's going to do what, and who's going to be looking after the different athletes that are, in this day and age, trying to excel in the particular sport they are engaged in.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm quite concerned at this point because again I think the Federal Government is trying to push more and more of their responsibility to the provinces. Unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to speak to the federal Minister and I suggest that we should have a meeting fairly soon, but I can give the members of this Committee an example.

The Western Canada Games that we've had for a number of years now, the '83 Games were supposed to be held in Calgary and of course the Province of Alberta are quite anxious to have a kind of a dry run or a dress rehearsal for their bigger games and they're anxious to have these games. So far, apparently, the Federal Government is saying that they will no longer pay for transportation of the athletes. Now, I've informed the Province of Alberta that it wouldn't be fair not to advise them at this time and if this is the

case, there's no way that Manitoba will be able to go. We haven't got the funds in this situation, the economy being the way it is, and with the limited funds that we have it certainly wouldn't be a priority that we would send. Although we think it is very important, we think it is a responsibility of the Federal Government. They just announced that they had games in the north and they paid for transportation. I think this is an example of the west having a bad deal again. We haven't got the competition that they have in the East and so on, and the western Ministers together are uniting to try to have Mr. Regan change his mind on that.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, I'd urge the Minister to hang tough on that one because as he mentioned one of the biggest problems we have with the large province that we have, and the sparse population relative to a lot of other areas such as in eastern Canada, one of the problems that the athletes do have is to try and find competition at their particular level, and one of the areas where you can do that is at this form of games. The Western Canada Games which I had the privilege of attending several years ago, was one which I think did definitely lend to the development of sport in the province. So, I'd encourage him to hang tough on this one and, hopefully, the Federal Government will see fit to come up with some of the funds for travel assistance.

Another question with regards to Sport Development, and I guess we could have asked it under regional section, but is the Winter Games which we've just had. I guess some people will have other opinions, but from what I can gather having been involved in the setting up of the games as well as now observing how they were carried out, they seem to have been a fairly good success. One of the benefits of the games was that it didn't require massive amounts of money and, from what I could see, a lot of local people got involved. I know just on the local playdowns in the eastern region we had a lot of activity, a lot of volunteers involved, and they seem to have come off fairly well.

I'm wondering if the Minister, who has been travelling to Flin Flon and out to Boissevain and I think a few other places, could just give us his brief overview of what he thinks the future of these games hold and this type of a format. I know that some of the people in Winnipeg weren't happy because these were rural games, but I stress again that one of the problems that we have is that the rural people very often feel, not only the sports organizations, the different sports governing bodies that are out there, they feel that maybe they're being neglected somewhat and don't receive the service that the people in the City of Winnipeg do. I know some of the facilities we have out in the rural areas aren't what we have in the city, but I think this is one way of going ahead and producing a good competitive spirit out there and I believe the rural people were appreciative.

I'd be interested in hearing what the Minister's assessment of it is and whether or not he thinks this is the type of thing that we should be trying for, maybe a summers games in a year or so.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the member

knows of my interest for these games. I think when they were first started, we had dreams of bringing in the Manitoba Games. We started in the toughest region in the north and it was a very good success, then we had the Manitoba Games.

I'm very pleased with the games that are just finished. I think that in all respects it's been a real success. I have no criticism at all, but I must admit that, although I have an open mind on that, I'm going to look very seriously at the possibility of bringing back the Manitoba Games. I think there's advantages there also. When I say Manitoba Games, that is all Manitoba.

I would like to enlarge them, for instance, to have instead of just an Olympics for the seniors to have the seniors participate in these games, one or two sports, to mix with the younger crowd, to have some of their volunteers, some of their organizers, some of the athletes. As I said last year, I feel that the community is very important. I would like to see the handicapped participate with that. No, maybe that dream is something that might never happen, but we're certainly going to work in that area.

I think that we can bring the City of Winnipeg in there providing there are certain rules. Let me remind the members that Winnipeg did not win the last Manitoba Games. The people figured, oh well, there won't be a competition, Winnipeg will win everything. I think that could be taken care of in the kinds of sports and the rules that we have. I don't think that anybody participating, for instance, in level A hockey will ever be permitted to play in that. I was in Selkirk just a couple of weeks ago where they had the oldtimers playing hockey. I don't think that they can ice a better team of oldtimers and people over 35 in Winnipeg than they could in some of these areas. I think it's good to be competitive.

I think there is something lacking when you bring these athletes just to go in a region and they are participating — as I said I'm not complaining — but I think there's some benefit under a truly Manitoba Games, also. It was great in Selkirk where they have the hockey, and then we travelled to Gimli where they had track and field. But the fever, the spirit of the thing when you bring all these athletes together, I think it's worth that. I think where you develop these kinds of leaders also and officials and volunteers. I think that's important also and then, of course, it goes without saying that the legacy that you leave for the facilities such as we did in Neepawa a few years ago are remembered. I met many people in these games that became leaders in these Manitoba Games that are now the leaders and in charge of these regional districts and they speak very fondly of the Manitoba Games that we had in Neepawa. They had facilities on a smaller scale, of course, than the Manitoba Games in Brandon had. It goes without saying that larger centers would never be chosen. I'm talking about Winnipeg and Brandon and areas like that for the Manitoba Games; it will always be a rural center.

I have an open mind on that, but if I have any bias, the bias would be to favour a truly Manitoba Games to try and incorporate as many people in our society as possible and bring them all together for a good time, good competition and sportsmanship.

**MR. BANMAN:** I know what the Minister's talking

about. The problem, of course, we have in Manitoba is that we only have two large centers and it becomes very, very difficult for any rural area to host the size of a total games concept, and I guess one of the benefits of doing it the way it was done now was that it gave a lot of smaller communities the chance to bid on a particular game. I appreciate that you don't have the village setup and you don't have all the athletes mingling from all the different sports and it doesn't leave the atmosphere, but I guess given the logistics problems that we have within this province, it's one way of maybe letting everybody have a crack at it who would normally not have that opportunity. I just ask him to keep that in mind when he's looking at the whole thing.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** As I stated, I think these games have been quite a huge success. I'm not knocking them, but if there's any way of improvement I say we'll go with an open mind. It is not more difficult for a smaller center to hold the Manitoba Games than Brandon to have the Brier, for instance. It gets the best out of people when you have to hustle to get rooms. I think it's terrific some of the things Brandon did in the Canada Games, the Brier, the Figure Skating Championship; they proved that they could do it and it's a very, very small place to hold such a thing as the Brier, and I think that many of the centers of Manitoba could hold a Manitoba Games, such as Neepawa did, Dauphin. I don't think it's that difficult. You have to exert yourself a bit; you have to count on a lot of volunteers and it becomes a big thing for that town that they're not ready to forget too soon.

As far as getting more people to get a chance, don't forget that we would have all regional games leading to the Manitoba Games, so many centers would be involved. But as I say again, we're starting with an open mind. We're getting reports from this game and we look at it very, very seriously, but I thought I'd be honest with the members and say that if I have any bias right now it's towards the Manitoba Games as I say, with the handicapped, senior citizens people. We don't have to look at any other model; if we can start our own model here, we're happy.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Just a few remarks and I don't imagine we'll be going too much longer on this department. First of all, I'd like to say that I'm very disappointed of the lack of members attending the interrogation of the Minister, particularly the members of the government side. I think that it would be incumbent that this department is of some importance, moreso than what it appears just from a look around. At one time, there was more staff than elected representatives listening to the Estimates.

After having said that, —(Interjection)— I realize, but I think that we are too. It's incumbent that we be here. First of all, I come from a very unique area and represent a very unique area, which is part of St. Boniface and St. Vital. There are five particular members from that area, people that represent St. Boniface, Riel, St. Vital, Niakwa and Radisson. We all have the same problem. Our area develops some of the finest athletes ever to come out of the Province of Manitoba and it does present us with a problem inasmuch as they do represent the Province of Manitoba



on occasions. They travel to other provinces and to other countries to represent the province. Over the last few years, and I'm not going to condemn this government because the one previous and the one previous to that never did fund it to the extent that I would have hoped that they would be funded. At least give them some assistance when they're going on their trips representing the province; in small things; in large things; in money; in paraphernalia; selling the province; representing the province, and telling the people what type of great province we have.

I was wondering whether the Honourable Minister can advise if there's any program to help fund not just my area, I was speaking with a little bit of tongue in cheek there, but all the areas in the Province of Manitoba. Is there any extra funds, any grants, that are given to these athletes so that it would assist them and it wouldn't present them with a hardship when they in fact are representing our province in national and international competition?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, there is nothing I would like better than to be able to tell the honourable member yes, that we're working on a program to do just that, but I would be misleading him something awful. There is only so much money. We start dealing with the sports bodies themselves.

First of all, we have a very costly Sports Administration Centre that helps all these clubs indirectly, but through their sports. There's also different programs that will give certain money to the sports themselves, the sports association, and they determine how to do it.

Let me say this to my honourable friend, that there's about 64 recognized groups; I think there's 64 sports. The hockey alone has 53 provincial championships. That's hockey alone, plus all the other little groups who come to see you and me that want assistance and you'd love to be able to do it, and you just can't do it because it would be impossible. You can't do those kinds of things. The same people that are saying that the taxes are too high, that we have to be careful and especially being an NDP government, we'd take an awful chance of we did that because we'd be throwing money away, so this is not something that you're about to get. I'm sorry, but there's many clubs that are very successful.

I have a couple of grandsons that are playing hockey and I've gone around and seen the way they work. Your old buddy, Harold Loster and the old Vince Leah team, they bring the Colts away. They have a tea at Eaton's; they've had that for years; they have raffles; they have everything. I'm sure you've poured tea there many times and, unfortunately, there's not much we can do on that. You can just imagine 53 championships and you're not talking only about champions; you're talking about any club that has an invitation to go to Grand Forks or Brandon or maybe to Europe, and they're going to be the ambassador, and we know that's all true, but just imagine how much you would have to spend to help these people. It's completely impossible. —(Interjection)— Yes, 53 and there's many more than that, but my grandson is in Brandon right now and if he wins, he has to go to Kelowna, B.C. and he was told and his coach was told, no way are you going to get

any help. I'm sorry.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank God your grandson doesn't take after his grandfather in sports ability.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** He's a fantastic player, quite the contrary, he's a very good player.

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

**MR. KOVNATS:** We seem to have an awful problem. You're going to be criticized for wasting and squandering money anyway, so one more really wouldn't matter.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** If you join the party after the way you've been seen to spend money on school and so on, I might consider it.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Well, you know, now you've brought up another point. —(Interjection)— I wasn't the one who brought it up, but I was going to take the opportunity of asking the Honourable Minister of Education a couple of questions. But it's not her department and I'll carry on just with Fitness and Sports and Recreation tomorrow.

But the problem I have — you mention that there are so many hockey teams in the province that, you know, would it be fair to give to one and not to the other? I think the thing that comes to mind is that over the last couple of weeks I've been quite involved with something very very important, very important, and this most important thing that I've been involved with has been the parents of a girls' ringette team. It's a championship team and they're going to Halifax to represent the province. It's the Bonivital, and I think it's the Belles or the Petites, I'm not sure. But unless the members of this group have never seen a ringette game, your missing one of the greatest exhibition of sports that there's ever been my opportunity to witness myself, and it's just beautiful.

It provides these young ladies with an opportunity to participate in sports; whereas these young ladies have never had the opportunity to participate in sports in previous years. We've always shunted the females to the back of the bus and —(Interjection)— pardon, you don't want to sit at the back of the bus. Well, we've shunted the female athletes to the back of the bus, it's just an expression. I'm not going to use, like getting into bed with somebody, because it's kind of a vulgar expression and I realize that. The last time that an expression similar to that was used it caused an awful furore but I'm not going to get into that.

I think the problem is that the young ladies have never had the opportunity in sports as the young men have had in hockey. Here is a chance for us to support these young ladies in a sport that is going to catch on and be something great in the province in the next short time. It's just going by leaps and bounds. —(Interjection)— Well, I think that we've discriminated against these young ladies for too many years, and I think it's time that we show that they are on an equal basis and maybe even a little bit more for them for the next little while to show them that we understand their position, and that they are going to be representing the province and particularly this team that comes

from our area, Mr. Minister, and some of them come from your area too. I think that we should be looking at them, because I think that if we support them particularly with some financial support and I'm reaching into my pocket and giving a little bit of my own, but I think that the province should be able to. —(Interjection)— Well, it's just a little bit, that's all I can afford.

But I think that the province should consider giving these young ladies some financial support, some little paraphernalia, some buttons to take with them when they represent the province. They're leaving very soon, and as a matter of fact, there's a social this coming week-end to try and raise money for them because some of the parents just can't afford to send their kid. They're forced to send their kid because, you know, it would be such a traumatic experience to withdraw them from sending their child, even though they can't afford it. But somehow they're coming up with the money and I think that the province should be able to come up on sort of short notice, because nobody really told them that they would be representing the province. Sure they can say, no, we're not going to represent the province. You know, we didn't know it was going to cost this kind of money, we're not going to go. But they've accepted the responsibility and they are going to send their kids and they need some help. Mr. Minister, let's give them some help. I implore you, Mr. Minister, would you kindly have a look and see if there's any funds available to assist them?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I've had a look a long time ago; there's nothing there. After we give the Sports a direct grant of at least \$755,000 for different things, there's not much left. I think that there is not a department under the previous administration, and the one before that, that has improved so much over the last 8, 9, 10 years as this department. I remember the only thing when Al Miller, the Deputy Minister, when he started, was brought in because Deifenbaker at the time had committed \$5 million for all Canada. It was a part under Welfare, of all things. It was a directorate in recreation, so you'd be able to be in line to have the hand out and get some of that money. Not that long ago, there were a few thousand dollars, and now it's millions of dollars and there's no way that we can do everything.

I would think that a member of the right-wing Conservative Party would understand that, because that money doesn't grow on trees. I think somebody told me that not too long ago. There's only so much that we can do, and we would love to do it as much as my honourable friend, but we deal with first of all the administration centre, direct grant. We can give you a list of some of the grants that we have. We give all the championship certain pins. There has been a lot of progress under the former administration. We were just starting to have a policy on this question of pins and medals, recognition when they come in. They have a medal if they win a world class athlete, and then the Canadian championship, or Manitoba champion. We're progressing in that area. We've done an awful lot but there is no way. I know that you and I would like to maybe just do it for St. Boniface and exclude the others, but I can't do that. If we do it for one, I say to my honourable friend, we have to do it for

hundreds and thousands of teams because every week-end there's a bunch of teams that are going out.

The former Attorney-General accompanied his son on a tournament last week and they're going all the time, so it is impossible. There are other priorities, we will help and we will start dealing with the sports group. Then there are certain areas that they have a choice; all the teams don't need the same thing. Some of them want to hold provincial championships, and dominion championships, some others need equipment, other needs facilities, help in the facilities. If you add all that is done for Sports and Recreation, there's been an awful lot of progress through this department; through maybe Northern Affairs; through the Department of Education because there's a lot of sports in there too; the University Grants Commission. There are millions and millions of dollars. I think that we'd like to do more, my honourable friend knows that, we come from the same background, but we have to be responsible.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Well, I was just going to tell you what happened. Actually I thought that when I had heard the presentation from the Honourable Member for Dauphin whereas he had spoken to the Honourable Minister and the Minister looked like he was agreeing and was going to provide some extra funds for the Dauphin area. That's why I thought well, you know, if he can get extra funds for Dauphin I would just, for whatever purposes, I would love to see my little girls get some extra funds. They are my little girls; I've had the opportunity of associating with them in the last short time and they're a wonderful bunch.

I think that I'm not going to try and push any more. We don't really have the time to try and get these funds from you at this time, Mr. Minister. They were talking about building a covered arena, not with artificial ice, would that come under this — you know, we're just about finished — may I just speak on that for a minute also?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, you're talking about the Capital grant on . . . We've covered that, but go ahead.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Well, I would wait until the Minister's Salary, if you prefer, but fair enough, I'm not going to ask you any questions on it. I'm just going to bring up that in my area, they are trying to develop this ringette and make it into a sport that's going to be something for the future. You know, we're not trying to build professionals, but we are trying to provide a facility for them. Some of the people in the area had suggested that we do have a covered stadium with some seats and without artificial ice, but if you've got it covered, you can start earlier and finish later and I don't think the capital cost is going to be that great. I don't want to get down into the details, but they thought that they could do it by making arrangements to get one of the nights at the Convention Centre with the lottery, you know, the gaming nights and they had made application and they were refused. Is there any chance that this group can make application, get a permit to raise enough money and it's not for travel and games; but to provide for a new covered arena?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You're talking about the city, the city has received an awful lot of money from this province for the arena. There was half-a-million dollars last year, half-a-million dollars this year, another half-a-million and \$700,000 I guess to come; there's been an awful lot of money. You leave some choice to the city. Now the ringette's share, the same concern as my honourable friend; that was something rather new for me the ringettes, I was over to see a tournament — a good tournament — and both my wife and I went over that Sunday for the closing exercise, we were very much impressed. I can say that there's been some discrimination, I agree with my honourable friend that for a while there's been some discrimination and I make the commitment that the Province of Manitoba — it's very little — but the Province of Manitoba will do everything possible to have their ringettes included as a sports at the next Canada Winter Games. This is one thing that we will push; we think that they should have a chance. They're terrific athletes. I was very, very surprised.

Now, on these other facilities, as I say there was a grant of millions of dollars to the City of Winnipeg for the Arena that they have now and there is also grants that have helped to build other facilities and if we open the grant — unfortunately the member wasn't here when we discussed the grant — but there is a Capital Grant that was started ten years ago or so and is going on and it has been a very successful program. So as the money comes in — it is money from the lottery — so if there is a lot of money there, there will be more for the program; if not, there will be less.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister mentioned that there was — about this Sports Excellence Award, which is the gold, the silver and the bronze — I've had the honour and the privilege of representing the province in presenting these awards to championships for the Province of Manitoba. I would just like to go on record right now that it's one of the greatest thrills, really, to present these young champions with these Sports Excellence Awards and I would hope that with this change in government that I might still be considered to make these presentations, particularly in my area. I'm not looking to make them in other areas. I think that there is some sort of unwritten rule that government members only make these presentations, but I would be more than just a little pleased to make these presentations on behalf of the New Democratic Government. I wouldn't slight them, I would just do it my own little way as I've always done it not as a political point.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** It would be very tempting to use you, but I'm afraid you will give us a bad name the way you push that money around.

**MR. KOVNATS:** I've not done it in the past, but I guess I'm getting to be a little bit of political animal and I guess when I want something, I guess I'm going to have to be a bit of a political animal. Is there any advice now that the Honourable Minister can advise this group, whether in fact that the government will be continuing with the Sports Excellence Award and maybe even expanding on it?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, I think it's something that was really started going in your administration; we're pleased with it and if we can improve it, we will.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you. I think that I'm prepared to give the Honourable Minister credit for it, but certainly the former Minister of Fitness and Sport had a lot to do with it too. —(Interjection)— I'm just agreeing with you. I tell you I've got to just say thank you to your staff for the complete co-operation that I've had with most of them in the past — when I say most of them, some of them I don't know, but the ones that I do know have been most co-operative in supporting amateur sports in the province.

Now, I'll just get down to one more point. In 1952 or thereabouts, I had the privilege of playing on a championship football team and I represented the City of St. Boniface, the Norwood-St. Boniface Legionnaires and we won a Dominion Championship and we were represented with rings for the City of St. Boniface. I was just so pleased and elated to have represented my City, the one I was born and brought up in and you know my whole background is of St. Boniface, and they presented us with City of St. Boniface rings. Well they were rings and it was Mayor Ed Hansford, I guess was the mayor at the time, and he made the presentation and it was rings with the crest of the City of St. Boniface. I think that the Honourable Minister had a great deal to do with the organizing of that particular championship game in the City of Winnipeg. It was the Peterborough Orphans were brought here and the Honourable Minister at that time, I think was a councillor in St. Boniface and did an awful lot of work, and I've only got one question to ask the Honourable Minister: I've lost the crest on the ring, where do I get it replaced?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I might even have one at home, I'll look. If not, we'll ask Juba to give you one of Winnipeg's.

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

**MR. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to get back to the subject of the Winter Games again, and through the Chairman to you, I want to say that the Westman region is the area that I probably know best in the province and to watch the activities of the Winter Games in the past month, it was very gratifying to see the small communities taking part. I think that there was much more participation this year than in previous years. I don't suppose the book has been closed yet on the analysis of the Winter Games and I would be interested in knowing whether the decentralization did in fact have greater participation throughout rural Manitoba and whether or not it was more costly or less costly. Would the Minister have some information on that?

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** This is some information that we're compiling now. I don't think that you can make a necessarily fair comparison, every chance that you've had, you get better at it. I think that there has been only two Manitoba games and more of these regional

games and it is a much more difficult job. I think that's part of the learning, part of something good that comes out of these games.

As I said, I'm not knocking the games at all, but we're looking at the situation of not taking anything away from these people at all. I think they'll have the same thing and maybe have something added a bit. The cost, I can't make a comparison at this time; it depends — you know you could change that all you want, if you go to Neepawa and you help them build a track and then help them build a swimming pool and so on, it's going to cost more money. There's no doubt, it depends how rich the program is. So, you can't make that kind of comparison.

I think there is much to say for both systems and I said very candidly that I want to look at it with an open mind and if I have any bias now it would be for a fully Manitoba games with the senior citizens, the handicapped people and everybody involved.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the Minister that in rural Manitoba not all the communities are the same size. Some communities would have great difficulty in handling any more than 50 participants; another community might be able to handle 100; another one might be able to handle 200. So, with the flexibility of decentralization it allowed the small communities to put in a bid for a sport in which they were able to roughly judge how many participants would be involved so that they could adequately handle them. I thought it was a terrific idea and the communities seemed to think so too because there seemed to be much greater interest created throughout, especially, the smaller areas of the province so that the whole province seemed to be involved in the program. I want to commend the Minister for everything that was done in the past Winter Games, because I thought it was an excellent program that the communities seem to appreciate and enjoy.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** The member is talking about regional. There has been regional and then district games. I'll give the member an example, Boissevain isn't any bigger than Virden, is it? They had eight of the nine sports there and they did very well. I was there for the opening; there were a lot of people there. The ladies, the volunteer ladies auxiliary, served a terrific meal. Everybody was very, very pleased. So, I think that could be done. You're not taking anything away; a smaller place would have the region, and then the district, and then the big city. You can't say that it's a truly Manitoba Games if more than half the population doesn't participate. I owe it to that half of the population to look at, to see the possibility of them participating.

But it will not be at the level of the people that get all these advantages. It would be at a different level. If you have senior citizens, it would be at that level; if you have hockey players, old-time hockey over the age of 35, that's it; if you have nobody that participated in the Manitoba games or anything higher, will be able to participate. So I think that we could resolve that and I don't think we take anything away. It's more of a gamble, but the people of Manitoba always come through and I think that they would, and I think you'd

be surprised in what these small centres could do.

**MRS. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, back to ringette for a minute; who decides who can enter the Canada Winter Games? You were mentioning you were going to give support.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** There's an association with the Federal Government and there's people representing the provinces in these areas and the ringettes were very close to being accepted. I think it was at the last minute it was turned down, and we we're doing a bit of lobbying, and we certainly, in Manitoba, will be committed to support very strongly the ringettes for the next games.

**MRS. HAMMOND:** I thank you for that because I know that in St. James-Assiniboia we have strong ringette groups in every community club and we have young women participating in a league also, and I know that they are most anxious to participate in the Winter Games.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** In all fairness though, I should point out that ringette is not as popular all across Canada as it is here. For instance, one or two of the provinces, there are very few now, I think that we're probably one of the provinces that is doing better and that has to be a factor because the Canada Games is just that, Canada Games, not just the provinces. But I think that they seem to be picking up very, very fast and we will push it because we are very proud of our ringettes here in Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 2.(f)(1) Salaries.  
The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** I'm just going to raise one more point here and I know it's sort of a thorny one, and I don't know if the Minister will want to discuss it at any great length, but one of the things that has really received a lot of attention again this year and I guess it does every hockey season is violence in hockey. We've managed among the younger peewees and bantams, we've managed to implement rules which have made that game a lot safer for those youngsters. We've made them wear helmets; we've made them wear face guards; we've done away in many of the leagues with body checking, physical contact. As a result there are a lot less problems there. We had an incident again, I guess, with the Jets, and one of their players the other night got cut up pretty badly. The Minister has been playing football and we all know the rules in football, if you fight, you're out. It's as simple as that, and it's a very, very physical sport also.

But, I guess the question one has to ask now is, at what point in time is it incumbent upon people to start asking the NHL, the Board of Governors, to start having a look at this? I don't think the answer is to take measures and start charging these players when these things happen, and yet I know the frustrations that are involved when you see this type of thing happening right in front of you when there doesn't seem to be any rhyme or reason for doing it. I'm just wondering if the time hasn't arrived where some gentle prodding from the sports Ministers across Canada

in talking with the NHL officials, with the Board of Governors, whether or not it isn't time that somebody has a talk to these people. It's not the toughies or the goons that are attracting people, I don't think any more, as they used to.

The Gretskys of this world, the Hawerchuks, these are the people that most fans are going out to see now. It's the art of the game and going from what my young son watches and that, that's the type of thing they're looking for. Maybe it's a problem that's been with us so many years that we just talk about it every year when a few of these incidents happen, but we're going through some of that problem here in Manitoba right now, and you sure hate to see us stepping in with a heavy hand when it should be the Board of Governors who really starts clamping down on people who, just for wanton violence, are involved in brawls on the ice. I guess I speak as a fan as well as a parent; you'd sure like to see the calibre of hockey as I mentioned, Hawerchuk and Gretsky and these people are bringing to the games, rather than the goon squad hooligans that we see sometimes. I wonder if the Minister has given any thought to this, or what his thoughts are on it?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** It's unfortunate that after the afternoon and evening where we seem to agree on most everything that I have to disagree with the member because I think he's overreacting. I think he's exaggerating and I think if he thinks for a minute of all of the hundreds and hundreds of games that the kids are playing, and they're doing a damn good job, that you hear a few and all of a sudden it becomes a big thing. It's far from perfect; it never will be with that kind of sport. But there has been big improvement. I think the cages are doing an awful lot of good. I would hope that, this is where we would look at, I don't know if we should interfere in that, but I would like to see the kids every year keep the cage and eventually they would end up feeling naked without that cage, and eventually they would carry on in the NHL and that would stop the fights, because who in his right mind is going to punch a cage.

So, I think this is one of the things. I remember when Toe Blake wanted to get rid of Jacques Plante because it was sissy to wear a face guard and who in his right mind now would go in the net? He has to be a little punchy, I think, to go in the net, but anyway, who in his right mind would play goal without a face mask? So, I think that has come a long way. But I think that the problem — (Interjection) — the member says, well, it's up to the league. The league doesn't give a damn about the sports Minister, I can tell you that. There are a lot of American teams; they don't care about the CAHA, the CAHA has a very much of a voice at this time. I disagree, I think that when the goon stuff started to go down, was after all the threats and everything that was done, was when the Attorney-General of Ontario a few years back, decided that he would lay a charge and since then it went down. It wasn't the Attorney-General that went out to seek that, it was the police that recommended it and I think he was right. It's unfortunate that you'd have to say that about one of your own players, the Jets, but I think that you have to show the example sometime and I agree with what the Attorney-General did. I think he made it quite

clear he wasn't going to try to lay a charge, but you don't leave a bench and you don't have a coach that's going to send you — I'm not suggesting the Winnipeg coach did that, but it happened later on for one of the Colorado or L.A. where the coach sent somebody to pick a fight. I think it's too bad. I think that the NHL should clean up their act.

Not only are you kicked out for the game in football, but football that's not the important thing; it's television. The kids that want to make a career out of professional hockey, they watch these people and they think that's smart and they try to imitate them. Now, in football if there was a fight, the camera would be on the crowd and they'd talk about the weather or something else, but here they fight and you look at the fight and you get all anxious.

The problem, I think we must recognize and the government can't do much about that, I think the Hockey Association has done a good job. There's hundreds of games every night now. There's so many levels and age of kids playing and you hear about a few of them and what do you hear mostly, the fans. I think the real problems are with the parents and the government can't dictate to them. If need be, we'd have to work with the Hockey Association and clear the arena if need be. Some of these kids are on pins and needles with their fathers and mothers yelling at them; the language is awful. The insults, if you cheer for a team you can't have your neighbour cheer for another team, you insult them and I think that's where the problem is, when people lose their cool completely and start hitting a 14-year-old referee, that's another thing. There's so many games that you have to dip down in the 14 and 15-year-old to work with the kids 10 years old and that's good to bring in. Those kids are pretty good if they were only left alone by the parents.

**MR. NORDMAN:** Any of them watch the question period, they would swear they were in a hockey game.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, the way some of the members of the Opposition act, it's very bad. It reminds me of that.

**MR. NORDMAN:** He says, which is the Opposition?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 2.(f)(i) Salaries — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** I think that the Minister had indicated some of the problems and I appreciate some of the comments he made. As I mentioned in my earlier remarks, we have done a lot I think in minor hockey to try and straighten that out. As I mentioned, I think that area doesn't pose as large a problem as it used to, because there are definitely less injuries.

The thing that really, of course, heightens this and brings this to everybody's attention are the few bad things that happen and we've had one in Manitoba here. It's unfortunate — and this is what I'm trying to say — it's unfortunate that the League itself cannot police those problems. I just say that knowing full well that the Minister doesn't have jurisdiction in that particular area, but it's a matter of concern and I raise it here today for what it's worth and hopefully we'll be

able to see some of the League people smarten up in the next few years and recognize that there's talent out there if you let it go, it'll perform very well and maybe draw larger crowds than the straight hooliganism that we see very often.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 2.(f)(i) Salaries — the Member for Niakwa.

**MR. KOVNATS:** I don't imagine that we will be lasting too much longer, but just to carry on just a little bit on what the former Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sports mentioned concerning each sport policing themselves. I think this is the greatest thing and I think that you regulate each sport, not by having that many rules but by having enough rules to regulate the sport. I guess my attitude when I was refereeing was to see that both teams played by the same rules and if you're going to allow one person to sneak in behind and smash a player in the face, then you have to allow the other, but you're not going to do it so you stop it right from the start. If you want scratching and kicking and biting, put it into the rules, but if it's not there then you've got to regulate it to the point where they're not going to allow any of that stuff.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That is only allowed in oil wrestling.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Yes, and the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sports when they have meetings across Canada.

I've just got one thing that came to mind. I had refereed a football game in Toronto many years ago and the two quarterbacks were a fellow by the name of Jonas and a fellow by the name of Wilkinson. They were the two quarterbacks for the Toronto Argonauts at that time. —(Interjection)— Yes, I was and I remember during the game and then yesterday on the bus, one of the little boys on the bus was asking me about when I was doing football and I mentioned Jonas and he looked at me and he says, who's Jonas. How quick they forget.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 2.(f)(1) Salaries—pass; 2.(f)(2)—pass; 2.(f)(3) Grant Assistance—pass.

Resolution No. 67, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,889,900 for Fitness, Recreation and Sport for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983.

We go back to Minister's Salary — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in the final analysis that when I was Minister I did appreciate, as the Minister does, the many volunteers that participate in the field of amateur sport. Without the volunteers in this field, it would be virtually impossible to do one-hundredth of what we do and there are many people that give of themselves and their time, as I mentioned earlier, very unselfishly.

I also want to thank the staff. The Minister commented on the staff and the dedication of the staff. He mentioned that they were loyal to me; I must say that they were loyal to me. The names that he mentioned it was interesting to note, I think all of them have been

with the department long before I got there. Some of them worked for the Minister when he was there.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** They didn't all wear three-piece suits in those days.

**MR. BANMAN:** I think I inherited all of them from the previous administration when I took over. I think they served them well at that time, they served me well and I know the calibre of people that are involved there, and I know they will serve this Minister well. Their concern is the development of sport, recreation and fitness in the province and I know they will carry on their duty faithfully to this Minister and be a credit to the people of Manitoba in the field they are working in.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I was going to say, thank you to the members, but I'll cut it short. I know what happened to Al Mackling just this afternoon, so I'm not going to tell you how wonderful you've been.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have to pass the Minister's Salary—pass.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 66, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$663,700 for Fitness, Recreation and Sports for general administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** This brings Fitness, Recreation and Sports to a close and I'm wondering if the committee wants to rise for the evening or do we want start another Estimate.

Committee rise

## SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Committee come to order. The discussion is continuing under 1.(a) Executive Salaries — the Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I welcome this chance to conclude my remarks. I have a number of other things that I'd like to put on the record despite some people's objections.

I believe I was just getting into the more particular problem that we're having — Am I getting heckled? — the particular problems of the Flin Flon area and I believe I had begun by saying there were concerns on three different fronts.

The first one, of course, is the quality of the air in and around the Flin Flon area because of the sulphur dioxide problem and the emissions coming from the stack. To the uninitiated and those not familiar with Flin Flon, I think it's fairly easy to assume that because of the height of the stack and the popular conception that because of the height of the stack, the air quality has been dramatically improved and the assumption as well that because of the height of the stack that there are no problems with living in a community that has a major source of sulphur dioxide as its base. That simply isn't true.

The building of the stack in 1975 did alleviate some of the problem. However, on numerous days over the last seven years that I've lived in Flin Flon, the problem of breathing in sulphur dioxide fumes, I have found, occurs quite regularly. Whenever there's a temperature inversion, the air surrounding the stack brings the smoke down, the sulphur dioxide fumes down, and creates a problem in whatever direction the wind happens to be taking the fumes. I can assure you that it's no laughing matter particularly for those people who first come to Flin Flon before your lungs adjust to the fact that every once in a while you're going to take deep breath of sulphur dioxide. It's a frightening experience for novices to Flin Flon air and to young children and so forth, and it's a problem that we encounter all the time.

I'm told that pre-1975, before the days of the stack, that it was quite common for people to be walking downtown and actually have to move indoors into a store to get a breath of fresh air, literally because the air was so befouled that you couldn't make it from store to store without that manoeuvre. However, it has improved, but that's not to say that it doesn't get so bad on certain days that you have to remove yourself to get a breath of fresh air. And it is a problem. I guess it's a problem that will continue to be a problem until there is an ultimate solution to the problem of a million tons a day of sulfur dioxide coming out the stack and I recognize that's the cost. There's no simple solution to that problem and any solution is going to be a costly one.

However, the history of sulfur dioxide pollution in Flin Flon goes back some 50 years, I gather as long as the smelter has been there, and it continues to this day. Again, there is a history of Clean Environment Commission orders and ordinances that have tried to limit the amount of sulfur dioxide that goes into the atmosphere, and tried to limit what they call fugitive emissions from other parts of the plant, but by and large the plant continues to operate with the exception of the stack. It continues to operate, emitting as much pollutant as it ever did. There have been some attempts by the company of late to correct some of the problems that cause some of the ground level pollution to occur, and I suppose those are having some impact on the quality of air, but they are not of major import as of yet. The quality of air in the downtown area on certain days is still, to my way of thinking, hazardous to a person's health.

I guess another problem in the same vein is that while the Environmental Management Division does monitor the air quality in Flin Flon, it does so on the basis of two different levels; one is called the maximum allowable level of sulfur dioxide in the air, and the other one is called the maximum desirable level. Although the monitoring stations tell us that those levels, particularly the maximum allowable level, is not exceeded very often, it is exceeded on occasion, and the maximum desirable level is exceeded more frequently. My concern is, and I suppose the concern of many of the people that live in the community is, what exactly does the maximum allowable level or the maximum desirable level mean? Is it attached to any significant scientific evidence that would tell us that this level or that level is dangerous to human health?

My belief is — and I have never seen any evidence to

the contrary — that in fact those levels are arbitrarily set. There is no specific proof that would tell us that this or that level is actually acceptable, so I think the title, Maximum Acceptable Level, is misleading. I don't know that there is an acceptable level. However, that's been established and we go by that.

The other problem that occurs in Flin Flon is one of jurisdiction. We have two standards actually in Flin Flon. We have a maximum allowable and a maximum desirable level that are set by Manitoba standards and our next door neighbour, Saskatchewan, has another set of maximum allowable and maximum desirable levels and the irony is that those two levels are different. In fact, the Saskatchewan level is exactly half of what the Manitoba levels are. That leaves me to conclude that the setting of those levels is entirely arbitrary and in fact, there is not any acceptable level of air pollution, of sulphur dioxide pollution, and that's a concern.

Of course we want our air monitored and of course we want it not to exceed the maximum desirable level, but the question goes beyond that. Is the maximum desirable level really a meaningful figure? I'm not convinced that it is. So on the one hand, we have an air problem. We are breathing air that is in some sense polluted, perhaps not all the time but certainly occasionally by the sulphur dioxide emissions of the smelter operations in Flin Flon.

The second problem, of course, is with the quality of water and that occurs because of the emissions of sulphur dioxide and other heavy metal particles from the operations in Flin Flon and there's a 1977 study that was designed to examine the atmospheric fallout in the vicinity of the smelter in Flin Flon — as I said it's a 1977 study — and it outlines the amount of accumulated pollution if you will, that was deposited on lake surfaces near Flin Flon in the year 1977 in a period of 85 days.

Now, just for the record, I would like to read in some of the accumulations that occurred in that 85-day period. In Cliff Lake, which is a lake where we get our drinking water, there were 70 kilograms of iron, 2.6 kilograms of magnesium, 39 kilograms of lead, 5 kilograms of arsenic, 3.3 kilograms of cadmium, 103 kilograms of copper, 1663 kilograms of zinc, 326 kilograms of SO<sub>4</sub> — (Interjection) — Well actually it ends up tasting quite good with rye; that's the irony of it. The point is that this is the accumulations of base metals and other chemicals in an 85-day period. That leaves one to worry about the long-range quality of water in Flin Flon. I don't want to be an alarmist. I have checked with the Water Standards Division of the Environmental Branch and they assure me that the water quality in Flin Flon is top notch, and that's probably why it goes with rye so well. But you still have to worry in the long run about accumulations of that level in our water system. And there are a list of another dozen and more lakes in the area with accumulations that are equally astounding.

Although our water quality is acceptable, I am told, and our Ph levels are high, and we're told not to worry, I don't see how those kind of accumulations can not cause one to worry about the long-range potential for danger and the long-range potential for damage to our presently top quality water system. So of course that's a concern.

There is another concern that no one, to my knowledge, has examined very closely and I have spoken again to Dr. Boehn, in the Environmental Management Division, about this and there's another phenomenon that is called acid shock. What happens is that over the winter a certain amount of sulphur dioxide accumulates in the snowfall and when runoff occurs, of course you have a concentration of heavy metals and sulphur dioxide, and heavy metal particulates in the runoff and what kind of effect does that have? And to my knowledge, as I said, that there has been no systematic sampling done at spring runoff to see if there is that kind of heavy concentration of heavy metals and sulphur dioxide and whether the PH balance in the water changes dramatically in spring runoff. So that's something that I'm also concerned about and I know one of my constituents has phoned me and asked me about that very question, about whether there is a buildup. There are no answers for that at present.

I guess the other problem is ground pollution and the buildup of heavy metal particulates on the ground — I don't know why these studies were all done in 1977 — pardon me, this is a May, 1980 study that was conducted by the Environmental Management Division in which it talked about some of the effects on the local habitat and the local wildlife and the summary suggested that at least in one species that was tested that there are accumulations of several metals in the tissues of small animals in the vicinity. So there is a buildup in the area of heavy metals and through all kinds of processes drinking water and eating food I presume those are ingested and become part of the life cycle of those animals. If it's shortening the life cycle of those animals then we have to assume that it's perhaps shortening our life cycle as well.

The whole issue of how to go about solving this problem is one that I think governments of all levels and industry is going to have to face. There are no simple solutions, unfortunately. There are no solutions that do not cost dollars unfortunately but nevertheless those are problems that we're going to have to face and we're going to have to face squarely.

I don't think it is prudent of us to continue to assume that those problems are going to go away by and of themselves, I don't think that's factually correct and I think it's unduly optimistic to assume that because we're going to have to deal with them. I don't think we can continue to put them off. The people in my area I suppose have been party to putting them off for the last 50 years. The concern is that if we put them off for another 50 years that it would be to our detriment and I think everybody now believes that's the case.

I think as well it has to be said that — and I said this in the beginning — that given the present economic situations that mining companies find themselves, given the present situations that governments find themselves vis-a-vis their financial resources, that it's not realistic to say let's go and solve this problem overnight. Clearly that isn't going to happen. It's going to be a long-term process.

What we have to do now is we have to decide that we have the desire to move forward on these issues; we have to commit ourselves to assisting in whatever way we can and I'm hoping that this department, the Environmental Branch, will do that. I'm hoping that

the companies involved, and in this case HBMS and Inco will also be willing to co-operate in the sense that they develop, not long-term plans — if we're talking about long-term plans we may be talking about 10 years — in which they seriously strive to come to grips with this problem.

In doing that, of course they are going to have to develop some kind of procedure for some economic planning to allow them to do that and I think that some gentle persuasion on the part of both levels of government is needed here, because I think the inclination to do that will be furthered if the government decides — and the people in the community I'm sure will be behind the government — if they decide to use some gentle persuasion and to use some discussion and dialogue to make sure that process begins.

In concluding, — I notice the measure of relief in the Minister's face — I want to say that there are some good things happening and I brought this topic up simply to refresh the member's understanding of the problem and refresh the Minister's awareness of the problem. I want to say that there are a number of good things happening which would create a certain amount of enthusiasm in any environmentalist — and I hope all of us are environmentalists — and No. 1, is the Minister has indicated that there is going to be some increase in the spending of the Environmental Branch and a significant increase, and I think that's a good sign. I think that shows concern and I'm sure it will be expressed as concern as we continue to study and monitor and work toward solving some of these problems.

No. 2, the Minister has also indicated that there is going to be some further monitoring of the ambient air quality in Northern Manitoba. I think that should bring some measure of satisfaction, some measure of relief to the people in Flin Flon, to know that the government is actively monitoring the situation and improving the facilities for monitoring sulphur dioxide emissions and the scope of the problem that they are creating.

No. 3, I think that sort of an issue that's tangential to the whole problem, but one which is important to the solving of the jurisdictional problem which has plagued the Flin Flon area for the last 25 years approximately and that is the fact that the Flin Flon mining area is governed in part at least, by The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Act which is a Federal Act and it has in some ways inhibited the control of environmental problems and indeed created a lot of other ancillary problems and I believe we're close to solving that problem. I believe the Minister has indicated that jurisdictional problem is being worked on between the government in Saskatchewan and our government and that's a hopeful sign.

No. 4, as I've mentioned previously, the present Minister has often and loudly stated his concern on environmental issues and I think that bodes well for the people of the province and the people in this area.

I think those are the points of good news and I would thank the Minister for those indications and will turn the floor over to someone else at this point.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** I am tempted to give one of my speeches, however, I will content myself this evening with thanking the Member for Flin Flon



for his timely comments. It is a matter that we have discussed not only in this Chamber, but he and I have discussed it on numerous other occasions.

I value his input especially now that he has a great deal of time to make himself familiar with the details and the specifics of the situation there from both a personal and a technical perspective. For that reason I appreciate him having taken the time to put on the record some important statements and to provide a gentle prod by way of his remarks and which he does as well when the occasion arises during other discussions to make certain that I don't forget some of the things which I had said.

I know there is support when it comes time to take some necessary steps to ensure that we are proceeding in the right direction in respect to dealing with a very serious concern, one which we have addressed at great length in the Chambers over the past number of days, but one which is always timely and one which we should always pay attention to.

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

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon has put us all in danger of concluding the examination of the Estimates of the Minister of Northern Affairs on a very high note, on a very high road and I hesitate to permit the exercise to be concluded on that level. There are two or three things that I think we would like to put on the record clearly before we express judgment on the Minister's Salary for a final time relative to fiscal 1982-83.

First of all, I'd like to ask the Minister though if he has given any consideration to questions I raised with him earlier during consideration of the Environmental Control functions of his department and the Environmental Management Branch.

At that time I said — and I think in a fairly restrained way — that in my experience on the Treasury Benches there had been great difficulty with the Environmental Management Division in terms of identifying objectives in the environmental and public health fields and then subsequent to that, in terms of moving in any cohesive and co-operative way to achievement of those objectives.

I encountered personally some extreme difficulties in terms of liaison between health and environment. I believe that has been a standard condition for governments in Manitoba ever since environment was taken out of the Department of Health and I would venture to predict that unless the Minister makes some fairly innovative and necessary changes, it will continue to be the situation, Mr. Chairman.

Three or four examples that come to mind are the difficulties that we had in getting together with respect to environmental responsibilities in the inner city of Winnipeg as against the former suburbs of Winnipeg; the difficulties that we had in addressing the environmental and pollution problems relative to the Red River, particularly that portion of the Red that flows through the City of Winnipeg; the extreme difficulties that we had in getting ready and valid information with respect to chemical pesticides and particularly with respect to the pesticide Baygon at the time of the health emergency in encephalitis last summer and I

could cite other examples, Mr. Chairman.

None of these difficulties flowed from obstinacy of personnel or from shortcomings of personnel. I want to make that fact clear. But they did stem and I would venture to suggest will continue to stem from the invisible but impenetrable iron curtain which seems to exist between the Environmental Management Branch and the public health side of the Health Department and I think it is very very serious.

There was a time, of course, when Environmental Management was part of the Health Department. Then in the early years of the Schreyer administration because the Minister of Energy and Mines of the day — Mr. Greene, the former Member for Inkster — was particularly interested in environment, environment moved over to that department under that Minister. Subsequent to that, we had a situation when the Lyon government was in office where, because of an over-structure of the Health Department heavily burdened with Community Services and Corrections for a good part of that time, it was not practical to attempt to bring environment back into the Health Department.

But notwithstanding the burden borne by the Health Department at the time there was considerable discussion and consideration devoted by those of us in the Department of Health to that very objective, to that very goal. We intended, once we successfully reconstituted Health and Community Services and particularly the Regional Field Delivery System in a way that has now been accomplished, to start working very intensively on reintegration of environment and health.

Now we have even a different situation. Not only is Environment no longer in Health, it no longer is even in either the Energy and Mines Department or the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department where it rested for a while. Now because the Minister of Northern Affairs is particularly interested in the Environment or certainly demonstrated to be so interested at the time that he was in Opposition, and I would say demonstrated it very capably, we've got Environment over in Northern Affairs. I presume that if the First Minister should decide some day to carry out a Cabinet shuffle and make the Minister of Northern Affairs the Minister of Education then Environment would move over into the Department of Education; if the current Minister of Northern Affairs became the Attorney-General, Environment would move over into the Department of the Attorney-General. This, Mr. Chairman, is highly illogical, impractical and nonsensical, to say the least.

For the past several years now Environment has travelled around the spectrum of government departments like a circuit judge on tour. Where it should be in Health so that the Public Health officials of the Health Department and the Environmental Management official can come to grips together, cohesively and co-operatively, with things that need to be done in the public health-environmental sector and those two disciplines are barely inseparable in 1982, Mr. Chairman. There is very little difference between the objectives and the challenges and the needs of Public Health and the objectives and the challenges and the needs of the Environment.

So, I raised that question with the Minister earlier in examination of his Estimates. I didn't like to go into it in too much detail at that time because he had his

officials sitting in front of him and I didn't want my remarks to be construed as any criticism of his Environmental Management officials, but now in the free arena of debate between the Minister and ourselves, unencumbered by any such considerations, I raise it again and say that, up to this point in time, if the Minister's interested in my own personal evaluation of this situation, I would say that during the time that we were in government the relationships, in terms of tangible achievement and in terms of timely service to the public of Manitoba, the relationships between Environment and Public Health verged on the disastrous, they were a virtual disaster and as far as I can see they're still a disaster today. I haven't seen any evidence that the Minister is working on that difficulty and on that challenge.

I know that no Minister likes to see any part of his or her responsibilities hived off to another department. There's a natural tendency to protect one's departmental and territorial responsibilities, that's human nature. But I want to say to my friend the Minister of Northern Affairs that one of the reasons why Health and Community Services was split was because of the initiative that I personally took, loyally and strongly supported by many of my senior officials, but because of the initiative that I personally took with the First Minister of the Day in requesting that the two segments be divided into separate departments because no Minister, with responsibility over those two huge arms of public service, could properly serve his respective departmental constituencies. He or she could not serve those two vast areas in any kind of meaningful way, the only way that service could be performed was to divide the two. I pressed for that division, and I want to say to the Minister of Northern Affairs that it's not as painful as it may appear on the surface. He may not like to consider giving up any part of his departmental empire but it would be in the best interest of his services to Northern Affairs, and the best interest of his services to Workplace Safety and Health and other aspects of his area of responsibility if he did so. It would certainly be in the best interest of Health and the Environment if they were combined in a way that enabled them to work together on the mutual targets that they both face.

So, I want to ask the Minister again, at this point, whether he is giving consideration to that and, if not, what he is putting in place in the way of structure in his department and what his colleague, the Minister of Health, is putting in place in the way of structure in his department to ensure that those two divisions of the public service work together instead of against each other?

**MR. COWAN:** I thank the honourable member for his comments, all of which I can inform him are well received and will play a role in our decision-making as we attempt to determine how to best approach the location of the Environmental Management Division within government. I do not want to rule out any one location over another location at this time. I do want to suggest, as was suggested earlier and stated earlier in the review of these Estimates, that we are looking at the Environmental Management Division and the way it corresponds to the Occupational Environment and seeing if there can't be some melding there and mesh-

ing there which would allow us to have a department of that nature. I think that would be a positive move forward although there may be others that would think it would not be such a positive move forward, but I think it is certainly something that we should consider and something that we are considering. It makes a certain amount of sense when you think about how closely those two environments are affected by activities one each in the other.

So, I think that is something that we are looking at. We've made it very clear that we are looking at that and tend to review that, but that in no way precludes us from looking at other options as well. The option which the member has brought forward is one which I am prepared to review although I can inform him, at this point, I would need to be convinced of the logic of that move far more than I have to date, however, I don't rule it out; I don't rule any move out at this point.

Next year's Estimates, I think, we will be able to more fully examine exactly where it is this government believes the Environmental Management Division should reside. I'm not opposed to a Department of the Environment, quite frankly. I think that this issue has become important enough to all of us to warrant a department onto its own. I'm not opposed to a Department of the Environment which included in it Safety and Health; I think that those two issues are closely related and again the public awareness of those issues and the technical awareness of the need to expand our activities in those two areas would tend to support that sort of a meshing. However, I want to look very carefully at that before proceeding and that's why we are talking about Environmental Management Division and Workplace Safety and Health under the Department of Northern Affairs this year.

Next year I may not be discussing it, that remains to be seen, at least from this vantage point. Next year it may be on its own. That remains to be seen. Next year may see the Department of Workplace Safety and Health back in Labour. That remains to be seen as well, but upon assuming government we did want to highlight our concern and also to attempt to bring into better focus activities in these two very important areas and I think we have accomplished that. So, we are reviewing it over a period of time. We are looking at it very carefully. I especially appreciate the comments from the member who has some extensive personal involvement and experience in respect to the activities of the Environmental Management Division and how it relates to other departments. I think it's necessary for me to know that. And I know that when he says that he does not mean to reflect badly on staff and I can assure him that they do not take it as such.

I've asked them to look at the comments which you put on the record the other night and to provide me with some information in respect to their feelings about those comments. I will do the same this evening and I do so because I think it's important that we address those concerns and those issues, and we will.

The member also asked what we were going to be doing in respect to the Baygon spraying last year and shortly thereafter in the House, I announced that the Clean Environment Commission will be reviewing the upcoming spraying program. That of course will be done in the context of previous spraying programs, not only the one in 1981, but the one that was done in

1977 and '75 as well. Also, they'll review that from the prospective of what new substances are available to us to deal with that very serious problem, to try to avoid the type of health emergencies which confronted the Minister when he was a Minister and could possibly confront the Minister who presently occupies this portfolio or any other Minister at any given time. The objective, of course, is not to have to deal with that urgent health emergency, but, knowing that that may well happen, I think we have taken the proper course of action by saying, let the Clean Environment Commission, which is the appropriate body to look at this, review the whole spraying programs now, when we aren't faced with an urgency, when we've got time to sit back and to examine exactly what effects are going to accompany that spraying program in a less emotional and a less tense environment. So, we have done that.

I thank the member opposite for his encouragements in that regard, because he was encouraging and he can take some satisfaction in the fact that the announcement followed so closely his own comments, although I can assure him that the procedures for getting that put in place preceded his comments by some time. But the fact is that he brought home the urgency of the situation and we knew that we had to act and had put in place already the mechanisms which were necessary to ensure that we could accomplish that goal and objective once stated. So, that's been done.

The area pollution of the Red River and the downstream communities in one that is mind-boggling, to say the least, and one which has profound impacts and must be dealt with. I hope after my Estimates to be able to sit down with the Mayor of Selkirk, the Mayor of Winnipeg, the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs and others to discuss where we go in respect to that problem because we have to go somewhere and we have to make certain that we're working together as much as possible as we move along. So, I have given my commitment to the Mayor of Selkirk that once I've been able to catch up on the backlog which is created as a Minister moves through his or her Estimates that I will sit down with him and the Mayor of Winnipeg and have that initial meeting which, I think, will provide us with the foundation for working together towards the solution. I don't know what the solution is right at the moment. I don't know that they know what it is right at the moment but we certainly want to sit down and talk about the problem because we know what some of the problems are and talk about the different mechanisms and resources which are available to the communities that are involved and to the provincial government and if we have to involve other levels of government, then let us do that but at least begin to work towards a solution.

So, next year, we may not be able to say that we've solved the problem but we may be able to say we have moved this far and we have put in place these things, these mechanisms, these procedures, these philosophies and practices which accomplish some goals and objectives which we agree are worthy of our effort.

I think those are the questions which the member addressed to me. I hope the answers are not too vague in all instances. I think that the answer respecting the

Clean Environment Commission is something we can grasp and hold onto and say, that's going to provide us with a better system in place so that if we are caught in the same sort of situation which he found himself caught in and having to take quick action, we at least have a bit better information behind us in order to make informed decisions. It's no reflection on what he did because he did what he had to do at the time he had to do it. But we have learned from that and we should continually learn. No doubt we will be confronted with instances where we have to act very quickly and we'll make the same sort of value judgments, wrongly or rightly, but we'll make them in good faith. That's important, but it's also important where one can begin to determine previous to having made that decision some of the data which you need available to you, then you know that you can make a better informed decision.

The others are things that we're going to talk about over a long period of time, but I hope each time we talk about them that we have moved a little bit closer to the solution. Next year, I think, we will more appropriately talk about where the Environmental Management Division is and how it got there and why it's there. In the meanwhile, I am examining the comments which you have made; I have directed my staff to examine the comments that you have made and brought it to their attention and hopefully they will try to resolve any differences which can be resolved at the present time as a result of you having brought forward those concerns.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I would thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman, and assure him that we shall certainly be watching with interest the objectives that he pursues and the progress that he hopes to make over the course of next year in resolving some of those difficulties and in achieving a more efficient combination of services and initiatives as between the Environmental Management Division and other divisions in departments of government, in particular, the Public Health Division of the Department of Health.

I would also say that I welcome his announcement about the Clean Environment Commission review of the mosquito pesticide spraying technique and I indicated as much when he made the announcement in the House. It's something that must be done and must be done now. Encephalitis is a somewhat cyclical epidemic and it operates in an erratic cycle and there is a tendency, if we don't encounter it for three or four years, to become somewhat complacent about it. It's likely that we won't experience another serious threat for the next few years but no one can be sure of that. It might occur again this summer, it might occur again in the summer of 1983, therefore we should be moving now — and the Minister has assured me that he is — to search out ways to deal with it that may be better than the methods that were used at the time. There may prove to be no other efficient methods but that's presumably what the study will be about and again I endorse that initiative.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just before permitting the Minister to work his way back to his office and his evening duties as Minister secure in the fact that his salary is in place for this year, I want to place on the record once again the unhappiness expressed earlier

by a spokesman for my Party, and in particular my leader, over the questions that he has raised with respect to the subject of Indian land claims in the province. The kinds of concerns and anxieties that now are aroused generally by his appointment, or his intention to appoint an Indian Land Claims Commission, and to review all those methods and procedures with respect to the solution of Indian land claims that had been in place for the past number of several years, in which I think in the view of most, had been successfully working towards a conclusion of the problem.

He has cast a major question mark over that procedure and we have not derived from him an examination of the question, any satisfactory answer as to why the procedures in place are now being reviewed and seriously questioned, whether he intends and his officials intend, to change the so-called bench marks, the guidelines and the format very substantially.

In saying that I want to stress that the position of this party is that the pursuit of equitable solution to Indian land claims must be undertaken, not only with the interest of the Indians and Native people of Manitoba in mind — and that certainly is of paramount interest — but also with the interest of all Manitobans in mind.

The search should be conducted in an atmosphere of desire for equity for all the people of Manitoba. We believe that the format in place and the procedures that have been followed in the past four years were designed with that objective in view and have been pursued with that objective in place. We cannot help but question very seriously, Mr. Chairman, the position that the Minister has taken and the impressions that flow by the apparent vagueness that he applies to the subject overall.

We're not satisfied that he and his officials are not determined to change the format and the procedure very substantially and very substantively. As my leader asked in Committee, consideration of this question some days ago, why should such a substantive change be necessary and if no substantive change is necessary, why are we going through this whole exercise that he has laid out at the present time?

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we want to reiterate our concern about the dismissal of Mr. Dave Tomasson from his very important position in the department. He was Director of Agreements Management and Coordination, and as the Minister well knows and all members of this committee know, he was a man of considerable experience and considerable respect in terms of dealing with Native people, and with just such questions as those that come under the aegis of the Indian land claims challenge generally.

The Minister has suggested that the position Mr. Tomasson occupied became redundant because in order to give the section and the division of the department a higher profile in respect to the agreements that had to be worked out — not only in the Canada Northlands area but in the Indian land claims area, etc. — he wanted an Assistant Deputy Minister.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the question still remains as to which came first, the chicken or the egg? The redundancy or the appointment of the Assistant Deputy Minister? And if indeed the Minister's position is valid with respect to the need for appointing an ADM and

the consequent redundancy of the director's position, why would Mr. Tomasson not have been considered for that ADM's position?

We've received no satisfactory answers from the Minister as to the decision made to appoint a Deputy Minister to designate the person, no matter how qualified he or she may be, to come in and take that position and therefore to use that as a justification and a rationalization for declaring the directorship redundant and for firing Mr. Tomasson.

Mr. Tomasson had the qualifications to do the job that the Minister requires done regardless of title, and if the Minister felt that the title had to be a high profile title ADM, why wasn't Mr. Tomasson considered competent and capable to fill that position? He'd certainly demonstrated that competence and that capability, and the Minister's decision leaves us with the conclusion that it was undertaken for purely partisan political reasons. That is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, and certainly does nothing for the moral of the department or any department in the public service in this province.

Thirdly, Sir, we have to raise the question about the impact on the morale overall of the Ministers, and the First Ministers decision to appoint the former Member for The Pas, Mr. Ron McBryde to the Deputy Ministry of this department.

One is entitled to one's views about Mr. McBryde's competence and I don't intend to argue or debate that point. Mr. McBryde may be an extremely competent individual. Certainly I don't intend to stand here tonight and criticize his competence or his ability during the time that he himself was a Minister in the Schreyer administration. But the fact is, Sir, he came fresh from politics, having served in this House until the dissolution of the House last October and has moved into the top job in a department, which is a job to which all ambitious men and women working in the public service aspire. I think that, Sir, is a very sad commentary on the merit system in the public service and I would feel, were I a civil servant in the Department of Northern Affairs, that my integrity and loyalty and ability didn't count for very much if I had put in 10, 15, or 20 years serving my province in that department with some ambitions of reaching the top as most of us have and then found that in the end as I was approaching that goal, I was supplanted by a professional politician, fresh out of the political traces, fresh out of the partisan firing line who was moved in over on top of me and made Deputy Minister. I think that must have a very serious impact on the morale of the department notwithstanding Mr. McBryde's person, personality or competence. I think the least the Minister and the First Minister could have done was have allowed a period of grace to transpire in which there could have been a removal from the heat of partisanship where Mr. McBryde is concerned or where any of us are concerned when we serve in the political arena, and that for the sake of the morale of the department generally that a career civil servant who had the qualifications and had the track record of performance should have been named Deputy Minister, if indeed the department was in need of a new Deputy Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I must put those three criticisms on the record as we move to the conclusion of the consideration of this Minister's Estimates and wish him in

the year ahead a satisfactory and successful experience for the sake of northern Manitobans and say to him that we hope he will devote considerable attention during that year to reinforcing a departmental morale which his actions, up to this point, may have damaged considerably.

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

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleague from Fort Garry has covered some of the points that I had intended to cover, the methods of hiring and firing that seem to have been practised in this department so far have certainly merited some comment and I don't think I can add anything to what my colleague has said without being repetitive except to say that we are somewhat dissatisfied to say the least with the performance in that area so far and we'll be watching very carefully in the hopes that we won't see that type of practice furthered in this department again.

There is one other issue that I would like to touch on or expand upon to some extent what my colleague has said and that hinges around the question of the Land Claims Commission. There seems to have been a pattern developing with this government, Mr. Chairman, to the point where we detect that there is a considerable amount of activity undertaken for the sake of activity. There have been promises made and courses embarked upon, but when we start questioning what really is being accomplished, what might be substantial in these new efforts we find that in fact to a considerable extent they are somewhat less than they might have appeared to be initially. The Garrison approach, for instance, being an example of where the objective that we all want to reach is an admirable one and it would appear that the government was undertaking worthwhile new initiatives, but when we get into it we begin to wonder whether they really know what they're doing because it's evident that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources, for instance, don't have the same understanding of the problem.

So, when I come to the question of the Land Claims Commission, I begin to wonder whether there isn't some of the same disease evident here and I've just reviewed the debate that took place back a couple of weeks ago on this item where the Minister was pressed for some terms of reference or some comment on the guidelines that existed before as to what was wrong with them and the Minister didn't seem willing to provide any information.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to press him on those same points then because I don't suppose he's any more willing today to provide them than he was then, but I do have a few fairly straightforward questions that I would like to ask very briefly of the Minister. The first of those would be, what is a land claim?

**MR. COWAN:** If the member is asking for the difference between a land claim and a land entitlement, the Land Claims Commission will be possibly dealing with both of those. As I said earlier, we are now in the process of determining the terms of reference for the Land Claims Commission. The Member for Ruperts-

land, as my Legislative Assistant, is actively involved in that and I see that my remarks before had been construed to be a hesitancy on my part to answer the specific questions, but I tried to explain at that time that it was a matter which was being developed and I did not certainly want to prejudice either the terms of reference of that committee or the final outcome of that committee's deliberations because I felt it was a very important committee and a very important process by making statements at this time without having allowed it the opportunity to pursue its goals and objectives. Those goals and objectives are the clarification of these claims which are outstanding, the entitlements which are outstanding and attempting to, in a very open way, allow people to come forward and put their comments clearly on the record and I still stand by that. I think that should be allowed to unfold in that way and it will unfold in a very public way as we pursue that particular objective. I think it's a good objective and I think we're doing it in the right way.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, this is called a Land Claims Commission. Now the Minister tells me that possibly it's going to deal with both claims and commission. Why would the Minister call it a Land Claims Commission if it might only deal with entitlements?

**MR. COWAN:** I don't think I said that. I think that it may deal with both.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, this is what concerns me that perhaps they have moved more quickly than they should have and they don't understand the significance of that. If the Minister had named it a Land Entitlement Committee then we would know that it was going to deal with entitlements. When he named it a Land Claims Commission, then that opens a much, much broader avenue than calling it a Land Entitlement Commission. Now, the Minister says it may or may not deal with claims.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that he has already built up expectations among groups of people that they are going to be dealt with. I believe there's even been a public announcement that it is going to deal with Metis claims and that is quite different from the land entitlement question, so I don't think the Minister can stand here now and look back and say, we may not deal with land claims, that we're only going to deal with entitlements. I think that the Minister is committed right now to dealing with claims which is a much much broader issue, Mr. Chairman, than entitlement and perhaps he would care to comment briefly on who has land claims?

**MR. COWAN:** I don't have all the detailed figures in front of me at this time and I don't think that I'm expected to have those detailed figures in front of me, but if the member is asking me, are the Metis people putting forward land claims? Certainly, they are putting forward land claims and we have made the record very clear that it will be dealing with those land claims. We've also made the record very clear, or attempted to at least clarify it, that we wanted to allow an opportunity for people to come forward to talk about the specific terms and references of this committee previous to making wide sweeping statements about

what we anticipated the commission to do.

**MR. RANSOM:** Would the Minister care to tell the committee why he thinks that claims have not been settled to this point? What has held up the settlement of claims?

**MR. COWAN:** I have been informed by individuals who believe they have land claims that they feel that those claims are outstanding and they have not had an opportunity to pursue those claims in a public and open way. And this Land Claims Commission will allow them that opportunity, I would anticipate.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister expect that this commission is going to accomplish?

**MR. COWAN:** I expect that the Land Claims Commission will in a very general way, and I don't want to be addressing the specifics without having the terms and references developed as I have indicated, the clarification of certain land claims and the clarification of how people see those particular land claims and entitlements and how they see the province responding to them. It would then make recommendations to the Cabinet as is the case with other commissions and Cabinet would act accordingly.

**MR. RANSOM:** Would it be fair to say then, Mr. Chairman, that what the Minister expects from this commission is simply recommendations that would in fact alter the guidelines for land entitlements that are presently in place and perhaps expand to establish guidelines for land claims as well?

**MR. COWAN:** That could certainly be part of it.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I take it that this commission can have no power to settle, certainly not settle land entitlements and I believe I heard the report on the radio a few days ago that a Mr. Jim Gallo (phonetic) who has had extensive experience in working with the Native people on land claims has said that this commission would be, and I think he said, useless or worthless, words to that effect. I would not want to say that that was a direct quote, that those were the exact words used, but that certainly was the gist of the report of what Mr. Gallo had said. I wonder if the Minister could comment on that?

**MR. COWAN:** I haven't heard the specific report that the member refers to, neither have I had an opportunity to talk to that individual to my knowledge. I would appreciate hearing his criticisms and his concerns first hand. I'm certain my Legislative Assistant, the Member for Rupertsland, would as well like to hear those first hand so that we can incorporate into the formation of terms and references those criticisms which we feel are appropriate criticisms and which we feel we can direct our energy towards.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder has the Minister had any discussions with the Federal Department of Indian Affairs prior to the announcement of this commission?

**MR. COWAN:** I have not personally had discussions prior to the commitment to such a commission. I have had discussions with Mr. Ray Chenier, a parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, since having assumed this office.

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

**MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to put on the record, I guess, before time runs out with the Minister of the Environment. Unfortunately, I've spent most of my time over in Natural Resources, and at this time, I'd like to put on record a few comments that I may have regarding the Department of Environment, Northern Affairs and Workplace Safety and Health. I think this whole area is an area that is going to be of much stronger concern in the public's mind over the next several years to come. It's not just a fad; it's not something that's just going to come and go in a couple of years time. The whole concern of both our north and better living standards for the people in the north, cleaning up their own village environments on a more global aspect within the whole province, in particular, our larger urban centres, we have an awful lot ahead of us. In alteration of our past lifestyles, and it's through these alterations in lifestyles that we're going to be able to protect our environment and our heritage, really, so that we may pass it onto future generations in a state not worse, but better, than we had received it.

I think there is some logic in the organization of this department. I think the people in the north are certainly happy to have a Minister representing them from the north. I think as well, and this is from first-hand experience in my travels through the north through the 17 different reserve communities, very remote communities many of them, in the summer of 1980 when I was employed with the Federal Department of Environment and to see the disparaging conditions that so many of these communities are in.

One thing that stands out in my mind very very clearly was in the village of Shamattawa where the Hudson's Bay Company had a tank which was originally designed as a water tank for transporting water. It had a manhole size opening in the top of it, plenty big enough for a person to climb into. They had this mounted on a farm wagon, a utility wagon. The wagon had broken. At one point in time they were using this wagon for transporting gasoline down to a bulk storage tank near their store from the airstrip which was about a quarter of a mile away from the store. After the wagon broke they gave up transporting gasoline using this same container, the same wagon and tank. The children in this community, which has a history of sniffing gas; has a history of emergency flights to Winnipeg; and has a history of children who have come to Winnipeg and never been able to return because of brain damage and yet the company that owned that tank sat with it there, did not try to seal the thing off.

There were footprints coming up the side of it and inside the tank, you could see sneaker prints throughout the inside of the tank as well. There was

no more gasoline in liquid form left in but the residue was certainly still strong there and it made a perfect atmosphere for some child foolish enough to climb inside to sniff the gasoline, not only of the residue but also taking other gasoline with them. I was very disturbed that there seemed to be no one with a great amount of concern, either in the community - in the community there were some very concerned elders, I should say, make that clear - but on behalf of the Bay there was very little attention to it - I understood some months later the tank was in the same condition - from the province our report was made available to as well, I don't know that anything had been done, at least before the end of 1980, and I find it quite depressing that when conditions like this exist, when a tank that is not designed for use for gasoline is being used for gasoline storage and there is no attempt, on behalf of the owners of the tank, to conceal or to contain access to it in a community that has such a record of misuse of gasoline by the children in the community.

I think as well, in general and from our study that we conducted in the North, there are problems, problems with sewage, tremendous problems with sewage in the communities both from the white aspects of the community, the schools and nursing stations. Many of the so-called treatment plants do not work as they are designed to; in many cases, the design is just not feasible in the northern climates. There is discharges into drinking water supplies in a couple of different locations and I think that we've got to start looking, not just for new sources of supply, but we have to start looking very closely for control of the contaminants in the communities.

I'd like to just put a couple of words on the agenda or on the record as to the need in the future - and I don't think that we should rush into it, I want to take enough time so that the job is done properly - and this is in the area of the environment of a proper and a complete environmental assessment and review process. We have a great many demands on government itself for projects for the government to undertake. I do not believe that in the past they have given proper consideration to the environmental assessment review process.

I think we have to give it a lot more attention than has been given in the past to such things as benefit-cost analysis, where in many instances, as was indicated the other day in the Natural Resources Estimates, that the government investment was not even considered, or considered at a very low level, as one of the costs in a cost-benefit analysis. I just do not accept that, I do not think that you can just take the government's investment for granted and forget about including that as part of the cost-benefit analysis to give any kind of a decent review to any project being undertaken by the province. I think in this regard, and in the environment in general, the society has evolved far quicker than have we politicians. I think it's fine time that we started to do some catching up and we've got a lot of catching up to do.

In pollution control, I believe it's been mentioned and debated in this Chamber quite a bit already during these Estimates review of the problems with our third and I believe fifth largest producers of sulphur dioxide in the country and the problems there with the long-range transported air pollutants, in particular,

acid rain. We also have to look at the uptake and the release in the soils in the land due to acid rain, largely; of heavy metals going into water supplies and being taken up by plants and stunting plant growth, and in some areas killing plant growth completely.

We can't look, as was done some years ago when we were dealing with the Great Lakes water pollution, as looking at phosphorous or looking at any one component as being the critical one and the only one, and you clean that up and the lakes are going to be clean and the environment is going to be clean. You've got to start looking to a much greater degree of the interdependency and of the interrelationships and, in many cases, one element working as a catalyst against another element.

So, things are far more complex than we have in the past given credit for and I think that if we're going to gain anything in the future towards the improvement and the enhancement of our environment we have to give full credit to the ecological system which is so complex, and start looking at impacts right across the board.

In Workplace Safety and Health we've seen union movement in the past take a lead in the past few years in moving towards cleaning up environment of the workplace, and therefore, as well clean up the general environment around the plant and of their community. One area that I have quite a bit of concern for, and I understand there has been a fair amount of research done in Ontario with it - the Minister would be well aware of it, as well as the Member for Thompson, well aware of the problems here I believe, at least having underground experience - and that is the problem of diesel fuel in underground mine shafts. The problem of diesel fumes off the transfer from electrical generating equipment and from propane propelled equipment to diesel. In Ontario I know they have been undergoing a very thorough study for a couple of years now. As soon as that study comes out I think that we can tie onto it and gain from the results of their study which I think can be transferred directly over to us here in Manitoba.

So, in concluding, Mr. Chairman, I think the public is going to be watching this general area, this department with a great deal of interest. I think, as I said before, that they are ahead of the rest of us, in general, in their awareness, in their concern and the Minister is not going to just be watched closely by his colleagues, both within his own party and on the Opposition benches, but in the public as a whole. I feel confident that our Minister will be able to meet that challenge and to carry that challenge on towards the future so that the province in four years hence will be in far safer hands environmentally than has been in the past. I'm not just speaking of the past record of the former government, I'm speaking of all former governments.

Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)—pass; 1.—pass. That concludes the consideration of the Estimates in Northern Affairs, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health and concludes the Items under 1. Executive.

Resolution 114. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$408,900 for Northern Affairs, Environ-

ment and Workplace Safety and Health Executive for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Steve Ashton (Thompson):** If I could direct the members' attention to page 8 — pardon me, page 9 — of the Department of Agriculture, the heading General Administration No. 1.(a) The Minister's Salary. An opening statement by the Minister.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake):** Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly pleased this evening and particularly on this my first occasion to have this opportunity to present the Members of the Assembly with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture for the 1982-83 fiscal year.

The Department's current expenditures for the coming year are estimated to be \$42.1 million, up some 8 percent over the 1981-82 level of \$39.1 million.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me. I believe the tradition is that the Minister's officials do not come in until after the opening statements. Is that not correct?

**MR. URUSKI:** This sum covers both operating expenses and Acquisitions/Construction of Physical Assets. In the area of staffing, I am proposing an increase of two-and-one-half staff man years over the 1981-82 level of 728.35 SMY's to 731.09.

Further funds are proposed in Schedule A of Capital and this will affect our programming through both the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Manitoba Water Services Board.

Before proceeding, I would like to say a word regarding the agricultural industry in general in Manitoba. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, increasing numbers of Manitoba farmers have been suffering severe financial setbacks during the past few years. The summer of 1980 was marked by drought conditions while in the past year, the financial climate has worsened with high interest rates, continuing high rates of inflation in prices of farm inputs and depressed market prices of many farm products. As an initial response, my colleagues and I have already introduced the Manitoba Interest Rate Relief Program. We believe that such a program is necessary to assist low and middle income farmers whose incomes have been most seriously depressed by the explosion in interest rates during the past few years.

I would like to turn more directly now to my department's Estimates and, as stated earlier, proposed current expenditures are at \$42.1 million for the 1982-83 year. The major portion of these expenditures will be used to carry on existing programs in the department. Although I've had the opportunity to review a number of program segments, I have not yet been able to carefully analyse and make policy decisions regarding all segments of the department prior to tabling of the Estimates. However, I fully intend to carry out such reviews over the coming year and realign program activities where necessary to focus more sharply on realizing departmental goals.

Such reviews will involve a consultative process

with my staff, my colleagues and the farming community in general so that programs and policies will be set to reach a broad spectrum of the rural community in the most reasonable and equitable way. As indicated in the Throne Speech, there are three areas where it is of prime importance that effective action be started urgently.

The first of these is price and income stabilization for our hog and beef cattle producers who have been clamouring for government assistance and leadership for the past year or more. I fully realize that this area is clearly a Federal responsibility and that a meaningful stabilization program on a national basis is much to be preferred over the current situation where many provinces provide temporary or more permanent income assistance programs that differ widely in coverage and effectiveness. In view of the urgency of providing a level of support that enables our cow-calf operators to survive their income crisis and to maintain their beef herds, as you witnessed this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a program that will require funds additional to those in our 1982-83 Estimates which made no allocation for beef stabilization.

As you know, the Hog Income Assurance Fund implemented by the previous administration has been under way since January, 1981 and is intended to be operational until December of this year, 1982. I intend to work with the producers in examining its continuation and of course if interest warrants, I will participate in a stabilization program beyond December of '82. We will be discussing that in time with the producers and the Hog Board of the Province of Manitoba.

A second area of prime importance involves the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I firmly believe that this institution can play a more vital role in assisting farmers and this role becomes particularly crucial in periods of high interest rates. Therefore, my department will undertake an in-depth evaluation of MACC's capacity to assist farmers through these uncertain financial times by providing more meaningful, relevant loan programs. A more detailed outline of the Corporation's direction will be forthcoming once I've had an opportunity to extensively review departmental options and recommendations in this context.

The third key issue I propose to address revolves around the issue of agricultural lands protection in the province. We are presently examining and planning ways to implement ways of restricting absentee ownership of agricultural land. As with my other two major thrusts, the intent of such action is to strengthen the family farm unit in Manitoba.

There are numerous additional activities to which I intend to direct my attention, not only in the 1982-83 year, but in the future. This includes such items as transportation policy, including the controversial Crow rate issue and other areas affecting the movement of our agricultural products. Various marketing concepts and ways to help alleviate some of the current problems associated with existing marketing systems and methods by which the valuable work undertaken through the existing AgroMan Agreement can be followed up.

In some specific areas of endeavour, my department will be emphasizing certain activities. This includes increased grants to municipalities to assist



and improve their work in veterinary medical care and weed control programs. Augmented funding to allow for increased enrolment and producer involvement in groups such as the Dairy Herd Improvement Association and the Commercial Hog Improvement Program. In addition, the department will examine ways to further the effectiveness of resources allocated for farm and community water development as well as develop policies with respect to irrigation.

We will put more emphasis on farm management programs that assist producers in running their operations in the most efficient manner. Such endeavours are of heightened importance in financially difficult times. To further enhance this program, my staff will be presenting a Farm Management '83 home study course which will, no doubt, be of interest to a great number of Manitoba farmers.

I personally am optimistic that in the longer run, brighter times are ahead and look forward to being part of the stimulus to revitalize an exciting industry. However, I am also aware that this must be a co-operative effort among all those involved in the industry. As such, I challenge all segments of agriculture to provide ways to help build a stronger and brighter future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Roblin Russell.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Mr. Chairman, we welcome the opening statement by the Honourable Minister, a review of the Estimates of this department which supports our No. 1 industry in this province. It's the backbone of the economy and everything seems to evolve around how well agriculture does in this province and it's been that way for many, many years. I'm somewhat disappointed in the opening statements of the Honourable Minister. He never mentioned the word inflation, I don't think, at least if he did I didn't pick it up. Unless this factor, this disease, or this economic problem that's plaguing this country, unless it's brought under control within the next decade I don't think there'll be any farmers left in this province to carry on with the way the things are escalating and falling in on them from all sides. I would think in this debate, that the Minister would have more to say on that subject matter. As the new president of the Grain Growers said in a statement in Rosthern, Saskatchewan the other night, I thought very interesting, he said "The real question is not one of freight rates but for farmers to decide if we can afford double digit inflation, or anything close to it over the next ten years." And he goes on to say there "with double digit inflation we won't have to worry about transportation rates, or what our share of the rate is. If commodity rates don't match inflation we will no longer be in business anyhow."

And that's the second point that I wanted to raise to the Honourable Minister, is the commodity prices that our producers in this province are receiving today for their products. And I don't see how they're going to possibly carry on with the costs that's facing them today from all sides. We can start with energy. The energy costs are staggering for any farmer today when he takes a look at what it cost in the last few

months after those federal price increases come on stream. It's a staggering price and I just wonder if maybe this committee shouldn't get after the Federal Government and ask them to relieve some of those federal taxes that's been levied on farm fuel, because after all the farmers are the ones that are producing food. And without food we wouldn't last very long in this country. There certainly is some ray of hope in the province in energy with the little gasohol plant that's already operating at Minnedosa, that is some hope, but I imagine the amount of fuel that comes out of that plant is certainly not going to solve all the problems that we face in this province. The costs of fertilizer, the costs of equipment, the costs of goods and services to keep the farmer going today are staggering compared to 10 years ago. I wonder what encouragement that they have today as they prepare to seed their crop for another year.

There certainly is some encouragement in some of the fields. The CSP Foods Plant at Harrowby is on stream and moving ahead. But I wonder in the debates of Crow Rate where the canola industry is going to end up. It's still an unknown factor and the number of documents that the Honourable Minister of Transport and Highways has tabled already to us doesn't seem to give that industry the answers that I think maybe they were hoping that we could come up with. But possibly in the debate and in the ensuing reports from Dr. Gilson we will get some rays of hope for that industry.

The other industry that has come on stream is the use of sewage effluent at Roblin for an irrigation program, which is a first in this province. While it's new I sincerely hope the Minister will devote a lot of his time towards that and that we can see more and more of those types of projects in the province, because there's a lot of interest from different communities that have been in touch with myself and others in the Roblin area. The ag rep and others feel that there is a certain manner with type of process to handle the effluent and environmental problems that come up in our larger rural communities.

The debates in this House regarding the removal of Hydro rates has certainly, the freeze on Hydro rates has concerned a lot of farmers. I've had a lot of calls in the last few days since those discussions took place in the House and I hope the Honourable Minister will address himself to that subject during the course of these Estimates so that we can give our farm community some ray of hope that at least there'll be one cost that won't escalate in the year ahead. And I'm sure he will give us that time.

The other point that I hope that we'll have some time to discuss in these Estimates is the full utilization of the Port of Churchill. I would hope that that Port will get back up to the 50 million bushels that is its capacity to handle because it's a very important part of this province and it can serve a very important and useful role to the service. The Interest Rate Relief Program, I shall leave that, we'll discuss that at some length. My colleague, the Member for Morris, the other day discussed rather briefly, and has many questions to raise on that subject. The Beef Income Assurance Plan that was announced by the Honourable Minister today, unfortunately the Chairman of our Agricultural Committee in this caucus is at Brandon Fair, as I said

today where he should be, with the agricultural people, and I'm sure when he returns there'll be a lot of questions that he will want to raise. I am somewhat concerned about the document that the Honourable Minister laid on the table and while I haven't had a chance to study it in some detail, I certainly will have a lot of questions to raise.

I note that the Minister mentioned the Hog Stabilization Program. If there is any encouraging sign on the agricultural scene as I see it, it is the hog industry maybe have a fairly good year in this province. Because from what I can gather the problems of foot and mouth disease in Denmark will certainly have some bearing on the market in this province and maybe our prices will escalate so that the hog producer will have a better year than he's had. The MACC revisions and loan programs, I'm sure that we're going to devote some time to that subject matter and also he mentioned the restrictions that he proposes to bring into the Lands Protection Act in these estimates.

So those few words I, on behalf of our group, welcome the statement that was put into the record by the Honourable Minister and I hope that we have a very fruitful and open discussion on these Estimates and hopefully we can use all our resources, all talents and all our skills to see if we can't help the agricultural industry in this province, who is having so many problems as I stand here tonight. Thank you.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Minister will allow us to discuss the proposed beef program under this item inasmuch as there is no line for the \$17.5 million program contained anywhere in the Estimates and that of course . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister. Order please.

**MR. URUSKI:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is a line if the Member for Lakeside would check the Estimates, he'll see Item No. 10 where there is an amount dealing with the Income Insurance Fund which covers all the income assurance programs that are under the government, Mr. Chairman. Item No. 10 the last item, Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister will not preclude us from asking some questions on the announcement that he made this afternoon. The weekend is coming up. It's questionable whether we'll be able to deal at any great length with his Estimates tomorrow and I know that certainly, myself, as an interlaker and others as we travel home to our constituencies, would want to have as much information as we can and I think with the general practice that you, Sir, as Chairman have allowed in preceding Estimates, to deal with the fairly general items under this heading of administration.

Mr. Chairman, my specific question . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Before we continue on with Item 1.(b) or subsequent items, I would inform the Minister that it would be appropriate at this time to

invite his departmental officials down if he so desires.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I missed the Minister's press conference this afternoon but I would like to ask just for clarification some specific questions regarding the program that he announced this afternoon.

One of them is the fact that the government is very specific about the provincial government's share being 2 percent of the gross sales value of the marketed animal but not affixing any particular cost that he alludes to will be the producers. In fact he says, that cost could vary and I wonder why at this stage that that is the case? That will be an immediate question that many producers will ask. We acknowledge the Provincial Government's dedication to this program to the rate of 2 percent. What is the producer's share going to be?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the producer's share will be developed by the Committee. There has been some interest expressed that there should be several levels of insurability under the program and the committee that I propose to set up will be discussing this matter further with producers over the next month prior to the contract being developed when we arrive with some recommendations from the producer groups. Those, whether there shall be a two-level, two-tiered system of support or a one-tiered system, that will be discussed and at that point in time the producer's share will be announced.

I might mention to the honourable member that dependent on the level of support that is decided upon, the producers premium level could range anywhere from 4 to 8 percent in terms of the gross sale value of the finished product.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with this question very cautiously because certainly we in the Opposition have I think, very understandably pressed this Minister and this government for some action in this respect. It was a very specific campaign promise during the election in November, so on the one hand we welcomed the Minister's remarks this afternoon.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Mr. Minister.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**MR. URUSKI:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I see the Member for Lakeside wishes to debate this item and I'm certainly willing to go ahead and debate and discuss this item at length.

However, I want to have the assurance that is we are debating this now and we'll go into lengthy discussions on it now that when the item appears in the Estimates next, that item will be passed. So can we have some decision as to whether we want to go at it now or do we go at it when the appropriate time comes?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. RANSOM:** On the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I can't give the Minister that assurance but this is the

appropriate place to begin discussion. Mr. Chairman, I think you'll see that under General Administration it says it "Plans and ensures effective implementation of policies, programs and activities in the Manitoba Department of Agriculture."

Well, Mr. Chairman, we're interested at this point in how well he's been planning and ensuring the effective implementation of a plan such as this and I think that that sort of discussion is entirely in order at this point.

As the Minister makes more information available to us we will have an opportunity to see, in fact, how that will actually bear upon the producers in this province. By the time we reach the end item we will have more knowledge of that and we'll be able to discuss it at that point as well and I daresay when we come to the Minister's salary at the end, that there will be further comment.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the Member for Turtle Mountain that there will be ample opportunity to discuss this issue during the Minister's Salary and we will be coming back to it and of course the appropriate place in the Estimate where there is a specific line — and if there wasn't a specific reference to it in the Estimates but we have a specific line — the Member for Turtle Mountain, the House Leader of the Conservative Party would want to acknowledge that if there is a specific reference to a program that they would want to confine their remarks either there, or if they want to go into the whole range of debate on the Minister's Salary, certainly that's open at that point of time, but at this point in time we're not there. We will be there whenever members opposite wish us to get there and at this point in time we're into the specifics of the department dealing in General Administration.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. We are here going to be talking about how well this department has been planning this type of program of beef stabilization and we're going to be inquiring as to whether they can effectively implement it or not and I think if the Minister will lean over and take a little advice from the Minister of Transportation, he will find that in the past the Minister of Transportation has used this section for a rather broad exploration of the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

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

**HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I think I would like to remind members opposite that there were many occasions where we had a similar debate, where there was a line in the Estimates and where the Opposition, it didn't matter whether it was our group or that group wanted to debate that line on the Minister's statement and the ruling usually was that if they chose to do it that way, then they could not engage in that debate on the line itself in the appropriation or the resolution and that was a choice open to them. I don't think we can entertain debate on the same item in two places other than Ministerial Salary or the item itself.

**MR. ENNS:** I think I must apologize for not making myself clear on this item. I specifically thought I said, I'm not in a position and I don't want to debate the plan, the actual Income Stabilization Program as such. What I want to debate is just how well this government and this Minister has planned to produce this program and what steps he's taking through his administration in developing this program. That's really, I think, quite appropriate to this particular section and, Sir, that's what I want to talk about.

Mr. Chairman, what I am disturbed about, the Minister's statement is that he is now planning to call together a beef advisory group to advise him how to draw up a program to stabilize the beef incomes in this province. Mr. Chairman, any cursory reading of the plan that the Minister laid before us, the structure is all there and my question to him would therefore have to be, I would assume, is this merely a proposal or will the advisory group that the Honourable Minister refers to in the press release today have the opportunity to fundamentally alter the scope and shape of the proposed plan? Because Mr. Chairman, there are of course some very serious deficiencies even in the setup as the Minister has indicated this afternoon.

I take it for instance, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no help for any feedlot operation involved in the plan and I note from the Minister's nod of approval that is the case. Now, the feedlot operations, of course, account for a very substantial high majority of the number of animals that go to processing in this plant which, by the way, is one of the goals of the stabilization program which is to help out, provide jobs in Manitoba, create greater employment opportunities and keep our processing industry healthy and alive. Mr. Chairman, I take it then I can take that back to my producers, to my feedlot operators, and say that the Beef Income Stabilization Program that is being proposed will not in any way touch one of the major sectors in the beef industry, namely the feedlot operators.

The other question is, I suppose I'm going to have to wait because I can see where the Minister intends to use or is planning, Mr. Chairman, to use the announced \$17.5 million I suppose in various ways, but the one specific way that he mentioned as a grant possibly to the cow-calf operators on a cow unit — he mentioned the figure of \$50 — but my cattle producers are going to ask me that if he in turn has to contribute between, I thought he said, 4 and 8 percent of the value of the animal when it's marketed, that may be considerably more than the original carrot used to bring the producer into the plan and he may start doing his little arithmetic all by himself and say, hey, what's in this proposal for me?

Mr. Chairman, I'm asking and I'm seeking from the Minister an opportunity that he perhaps didn't have under the rules and regulations of the House to broaden that statement that he made to us at 2:00 o'clock or for those of us who weren't at his press conference to expand on some of these very immediate questions that cattle producers will be putting to all of our members as we go back to our constituencies. No. 1, at least give us a reasonable guesstimate as to the producer involvement in the plan. I appreciate the Minister's comments. If he says it could be a variable level of insurance contained in the plans, that

could call for a variance in the premium collected, but he did mention the figures of between 4 and 8 percent.

Mr. Chairman, 4 and 8 percent, 8 percent is a pretty health premium contribution on the part of a producer who is already hard pressed to make a dollar with this animal. Mr. Chairman, if we believe the stats there are many cattle producers that don't make 8 percent net on their cattle sales and this government is introducing as a way of help an 8 percent premium contribution on the part of that same producer before seeing any tangible results other than perhaps the carrot of the \$50 to get him to enroll in the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I simply ask the Minister to avail himself of this opportunity to make those of us and I don't say this in any disparaging way, with the exception of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the truth of the matter is that most of our members do go home to our constituencies and we will be running into cattle people as will the Minister himself. I would like him to help us out on this which will undoubtedly be the No. 1 question in the minds of most of my constituents that are in the cattle business as I come home for this weekend, Mr. Chairman.

No. 1, can the Minister confirm no help available for any feedlot operations in the province? No. 2, can he be more specific about the producer contribution at this point in time?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it appears that the honourable members from the Opposition wish to discuss this and I don't mind on the understanding that, as we had indicated, this matter we will deal with now and that the debate will conclude on my Estimates in terms of further comments. Is that accurate in terms of the discussion?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I'm a little surprised at the Minister that after four months of awaiting this promised beef plan, the Minister now wants some assurance that debate of the plan is going to be limited. What we are trying to do at this point is discuss items that are appropriate under this section which clearly talks about planning and effective implementation and that's what we're talking about, how this program was planned; how they see their plans working to help the beef producers; which ones they have planned for; which ones they haven't planned for; how they plan to see the thing implemented. That's what we're going to talk about now and when we have determined some of those things, Mr. Chairman, then we will be able to talk more intelligently about what impact it will have upon the producers which I think would be appropriate to discuss when we get to the final line, Item 10.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Opposition will make up their minds where they want to debate this. The comments that were raised by the Member for Lakeside, obviously he wanted specific information. I'm perfectly willing to provide all the specific information to the questions that he's raised as long as I understand and the members understand that we're going into the detailed discussion under this Item which would normally appear as Item 10 in the Estimates. Those specific questions that he's raised, I'm perfectly willing to answer them

and we will get into the discussion on the specifics of the plan.

The member's questions did not speak about the overall ability or inability or planning or not planning, Mr. Chairman. The member raised some very specific questions with respect to the detailed aspects of the program. I'm prepared to discuss that. I know the member would want that kind of information and I'm prepared to give him that tonight, provided I have an understanding that we can finish off the broad debate under my salary and the discussions dealing with the program as would normally come under Item 10, will be bypassed.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I can offer a suggestion. On Item 10, if it is the intent of the Opposition to debate the Beef Stabilization or Income Plan now, then I suggest and hopefully get concurrence from the members Opposite that when we get to Item 10 that we reserve, that for the same kind of discussion but with respect to commodities not now discussed. In other words we have hogs in the program, we have beef in the program. If they want to talk about beef now, that's fine. But they can't talk about beef when they get to Item 10, they can talk about hogs then. They can't have it both ways.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. If I might presume to provide some guidance with my limited experience, I have found in two sets of Estimates that the questions get answered either now or later and while the Honourable Minister of Government Services is quite correct that it is the Minister's prerogative to answer questions under the appropriate Item and I think that is the rule; the tradition, short as it may be in this Committee, has been that questions are generally answered when they're asked.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I am pleased if the honourable members want to discuss the program. Let's move to Item 10 and let's deal with all the questions that they want to. Obviously I'm prepared to do that. Let's move to Item 10 and the appropriate area and let's get all the Items and the questions on the table and discuss this Item. I'm very amenable to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it's only wise to look at the past practices of this Chamber and ever since we have started dealing with two committees, one here and one in the other, it's almost impossible to prevent some repetition because members would like to talk about a specific Item in the Estimates and find that they're in the other Committee. So when they come back in here they want to ask their questions and they should have the right to ask their questions. I'm sure there will be some duplication that occurs that has occurred for the last several years and I don't think we can stop it now.

We found that it has worked very well in this Assembly and I hope it continues to work that way.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to pick up where the Honourable Minister of Transportation left off I must say, Sir, that as long as I've been in this House, which is not as long as the Minister of Transportation, the decision as to whether there is repetition or not rests with the Chairman and the Committees have generally approached the questions under different lines in the Estimates with a fair amount of flexibility. In fact, I don't know that the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Transportation ever participated in the Estimates of the Department of Health in the past four years but I know that the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs and various other members of the Committee did. I well recall discussing, for example, community clinics under four different lines in the Estimates of the Department of Health during one Session.

So, Mr. Chairman, the point cannot be made fairly and legitimately that there has not been in the past a pretty free-wheeling approach. If the Chairman finds after hours and hours, weeks and weeks and months and months of deliberation, Sir, that there is an element of repetition creeping into the exchange, then certainly that prerogative rests with the Chair, Sir, to make a decision on it.

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

**MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield):** Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of compromise proposed by the Member for Fort Garry, can I suggest that we have roughly \$320,000 worth of discussion on the Beef Plan under this Item and \$50,000 worth of discussion under the Item in No. 10 so that we don't completely duplicate the debate under the two Items?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** In minutes, how long is that?  
The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** I was hoping to get some hard information to take back to my cattlemen. I'm going to be asked that question. All of our members are going to be asked that question and I don't really understand this mickey-mousing around by the Minister at this particular time. We want to clear the established, how the planning process is going to work. The press release that the Minister left with us this afternoon at 2 o'clock indicated that he is calling together the different cattle producers associations; that he is establishing an advisory beef producers group to assist him in further development of those plans. We want to get to the bottom of how that process is going to work, Mr. Chairman, and I think there are some very basic questions that naturally arise from that. You can't intelligently discuss a plan with our cattle producers, with our constituents unless we have the answers to a few very specific questions.

No. 1, I repeat for the third time and I hope the Minister will consider answering it for the third or the

fourth time or the second time; for him to confirm that (a) there is no assistance being considered for the feed lot operator; that in effect he will likely force a vertical integration of the feed lot operations with the packers which I also understood was a position that the New Democrats opposed, a vertical integration of any kind.

Secondly, the specific question was, the thoughts that the Minister had, the planning, the guidance that he's going to provide and the implementation of this scheme with respect to the producers contribution, is it going to be 4 percent, is it going to be 8 percent? It's going to be taken how? At source. Has he made arrangements with the packing houses to take it at source at that point or does the individual producer have to put it up front when he ships animals for slaughter? These are the kinds of questions that we have to have — there aren't that many questions, but a few of these specific questions that we need some straightforward answers to that I can take back to my cattle producers.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, obviously the member when he says there's a few questions: there will be a lot more questions. Knowing the Member for Lakeside that once we begin this route there will be many more and I welcome that. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, obviously the Member for Lakeside, if he has read the press release will release that the basic features of the plan have been announced. The use of the Producer Advisory Committee will be, if one could put it, to fine-tune certain aspects of the plan. The basic parameters of the plan have been announced and they were announced by myself, so the basic plan is there. It will be fine-tuning and changes that will be discussed.

His specific question with respect to feedlots and assistance for feedlot operators; those people who now have a cow-calf operation and also have a feedlot, of course, would be assisted on the cow herd and they would naturally to feed their animals out because the assistance is paid or will be paid on the basis of the finished animal or the slaughtered beef. There will be producers who, of course, all their animals may not go on the plan and may not be in a position to finish all their animals on their farms and we will, with this producer group, look at those areas and some of those may have to custom feed their animals at feedlot operations and then market them, Mr. Chairman, so there may be some, but to answer his question specifically in terms of any direct cash assistance, there will be no direct conditional grant assistance to feedlot operators. The conditional grants as I've announced will be on the basis of the existing cow herd to protect the basic herd in the Province of Manitoba.

He questioned the matter of what the farmers will pay, Mr. Chairman. He should know and there have been producer groups who have raised the concept of variable premiums of coverage and, of course, they will require variable premiums because there may not be one level of coverage and that's why I've given a possible range. There will be a basic coverage in which the producer will put his funds into and the government will support with the 2 percent amount and then, if there's an optional level, then of course

the premium will vary, but the government input into the plan will be at the 2 percent.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would care to advise just how this plan was developed. It's been four months in the making. I'm interested in knowing how it was developed in terms of what groups were consulted, what outside consultants had a hand in developing this. Perhaps the Minister could give us some details of that.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, over the last number of months since the election, I have attempted to consult with as many producers and groups within the province. I've met with some groups two and three times and I've met with I would say several hundred producers seeking their views on various options that would be considered in this plan. From all these discussions and consultations, this plan has evolved and is now being announced.

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

**MR. CLAYTON MANNESS (Morris):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask some specific questions, if I can. Is this program similar to the Saskatchewan program?

**MR. URUSKI:** There are similarities and there are not similarities, Mr. Chairman. The member may wish to be more specific when he says similar. There's a difference in terms of the level of guarantees and the like.

**MR. MANNESS:** The reason I asked the question is I figured maybe the Minister has some understanding of the Saskatchewan program and if he could tell us that then we would have some benchmark by which to compare. Could he tell us or has it been established the maximum number of cows per farm?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that's part of the refinement area that the producer group will discuss over the next month.

**MR. MANNESS:** I refer to the release that was given to us in the House today, the Minister indicated that "participating producers will market all slaughtered cattle through a Beef Marketing Commission." Can he tell this House what changes in legislation will be necessary and in what Acts to allow this to happen?

**MR. URUSKI:** There are no changes that are required in any legislation to allow that to happen, Mr. Chairman. There is authority now under the Natural Products Marketing Act.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't give a very complete answer when asked how the plan had been developed, who he had consulted with. I'm wondering how often, for instance, did he meet with the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association and did the former Deputy Minister, Mr. Bill Janssen, was he consulted with in developing this plan?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, absolutely, I've con-

sulted with many people in the industry. I did consult with the MCPA and in fact we had several meetings. I've consulted with, I've said, approximately 700 people in Manitoba in terms of seeking their views and their opinions on this plan and obviously, some of these views have been used in terms of comments and suggestions made by producers and people in the industry and outside the industry to develop this plan.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would tell us what producer group is he talking about when he speaks of working out the details of this plan. He's made reference to a producer group a number of times. Could the Minister elaborate on that a bit more, please?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know which groups that I've met specifically. We've met with MCPA; we've met with independent producers; we've met with the National Farmers Union; we've met with the Farm Bureau and we've used in-House staff to do the analysis and develop the premium levels and other features of the plan, but if the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is offended I didn't meet with him specifically, obviously he can be offended, Mr. Chairman. I've met with as many people and producers in Manitoba over the last number of months as I could. In light of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there was a stabilization program in place which was ending March 31st of 1982, which ended yesterday, Mr. Chairman, a program that they, for political reasons, completely put the kibosh on, left producers hanging out to dry, so to speak, and now they're saying, why isn't there assistance for the beef industry, Mr. Chairman. They, for political reasons, ruined a stabilization program and ruined and turned the confidence of producers into any stabilization program the government to bring in, and now they are harping that there hasn't been a stabilization program developed.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Opposition should remember that the comments made during the election campaign, and that we said we would sit down and discuss and develop meaningful programs for the stability of the beef industry; we did not propose specifics and the time-frame. It was your people, your former Minister and your colleagues who, for political reasons, killed the stabilization program and turned the confidence away of producers in the hope, in the short hope, that market prices would rise and that they would be able to survive. But, Mr. Chairman, it turned out against them that, during the last year of their administration, the market prices went down and producers were clamoring to their own government and they were turned back by their own Minister saying, we didn't have any money, we aren't going to deal with you. That's the kind of support your government gave to the beef producers of Manitoba.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I simply draw to your attention the fact that I was asking a question about how the Beef Producer Advisory Group was going to be constituted, when the Minister launched off into a tirade about things that have happened in the past. Let the record show that we were sticking to the items under consideration and asking specific questions,

the Minister commenced the broader debate. I asked the Minister, not the groups that he'd met with, he answered that question; he didn't answer it very well but he answered it. I then asked him how the producer group is going to be constituted; how is it going to be selected; who's going to be on the Beef Producer Advisory Committee that's referred to; that's the question I asked. If he'd listen to me placing the question instead of the Member for St. James there he might be able to deal more correctly with it.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, obviously the members don't like to hear about how they've ruined the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba over the last several years. It certainly irks them all.

Mr. Chairman, I'll answer the question very specifically. The decision will be made by myself and the department in terms of the composition of the advisory group from producers all around the province.

**MR. RANSOM:** I understand then that now we're being told by the Minister that he is going to be selecting, he is going to be handpicking the people who are going to advise him on the implementation of the details of this plan. Mr. Chairman, I suggest then that the Minister probably is in a position to tell us some of the details of the plan right now because, if the Minister is simply going to handpick people to go on this committee, if he had said that he was prepared to have the Beef Producers Association appoint two members to the committee, someone else appoint two members, we might know that there was a possibility of getting a cross section of producers to give an unbiased view of how this plan should be developed. But if the Minister is going to handpick the people to be on the advisory group, then I expect you'll get the kind of plan that he's already planning for at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering, then, what the Minister plans to do for those other sectors of the beef producing industry that don't qualify here. There are a great many people in the feed lot business, for instance, who also are faced with high costs, interest costs, that have large operating loans. I wonder what the Minister plans to do for that segment, or were they not included in the promises that were made to beef producers during election?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, with respect to the questions on the Advisory Committee, I propose that the Advisory Committee will be composed of producers from all regions of the province, similar, Mr. Chairman, in the way the former Minister of Agriculture composed his committee when he dealt with the Hog Stabilization Program; he handpicked his people from around the province. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, the committee that he set up during the last week of the election campaign, or the second last week of the election campaign, to hurriedly put a committee together dealing with the beef program where he indicated to one group, did he consult with producers around the province? No, he went to one group and he said: "Look boys, I'm in trouble; you better get your act together and help me out of a jackpot." So he went to one group and he said: "Here, put all your people on this committee."

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the members oppo-

site that the committee that we will have will be as wide-ranging a representative group of producers, I would hope from all regions of the province that produce cattle.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the other sectors of the industry, obviously, the basis of our beef industry in the Province of Manitoba is as a result of the maintenance of a viable cow herd because if it were not for the cow-calf producers the beef industry in Manitoba would not exist. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that when the industry will have an adequate supply of calves, and that there will be some that we'll have to custom feed, those would be able to be moved into feed lots within the province. How much of that will spill over, of course, will depend on the ability of that industry to do the finishing on their own farms, but, Mr. Chairman, unless we protect the basic herd in the Province of Manitoba we will not have a beef industry for any length of time.

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

**MR. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to debate this particular issue because with this skeleton there's not enough meat on it, really, to debate anything at all.

I'd like to ask some more questions of fact as to the whole planning. My understanding is that the authority that would allow this new plan to come into existence, because I think later on in this submission you do in fact say the Agency Market Plan is as the Minister indicates under the Natural Products Marketing Act. As he has pointed out it is a named commodity. I'm concerned as to, and further more I assume that this commission of which he speaks will be something similar to a hog commission. I'm wondering how he envisages in the planning stage - and I think that's what we're talking about - how he envisages part of the cattle slaughter herd that comes to market going through the commission and the other part not; a system I've not yet seen certainly in the hog industry or any other. Has he thought this out that far?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, obviously I want to encourage producers to use this commission to market all their slaughtered animals but the only way that we would be able to handle the program of support payments and the support payments will be made on slaughtered animals, would be handled through the commission in terms of being able to keep adequate records and the like, so that all the cattle would be marketed; the slaughtered cattle that would be enrolled in the plant would be marketed at the commission. Certainly I wouldn't want to discourage other producers from also putting their animals and marketing them through the commission if they so desire. But will be an evolutionary process, Mr. Chairman, it will not be done over night. I recognize that a commission in terms of achieving greater price support for the producers of this province, on a provincial basis, cannot do great things. But, what it can do is at least, Mr. Chairman, it will at least effectively handle this stabilization program in the way the cattle are marketed and attempt to bring about as much competition in the marketplace for the cattle that are being marketed.

**MR. MANNESS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister when he envisages the first levies being made, voluntarily of course, by producers. I guess what I'm asking is once this marketing plan, the agency marketing plan — and I think he says in here is expected to come in effect in October — will all animals at that time be eligible for stabilization; all slaughter animals?

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it will be those animals that will be enrolled that will be eligible. It's not a levy, Mr. Chairman, it will be a premium that the producers will pay on the basis of the slaughter animals that will be eligible for support. That will be paid at the time the first animal is marketed through the commission. At that time the deduction and the support price will be made.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm listening with increasing fascination at the program as it's evolving itself from minute to minute because the Minister gets up to answer certain questions. Mr. Chairman, why we are so concerned about talking about it at this particular time is because all things have to have some reasonable soundness behind them if they're to be implemented. We have some experience with previous attempts by honourable members opposite in getting into a beef program. Before the Honourable Minister gets away with leaving on the record the suggestion that the previous income program was the Valhalla of the beef producers, let me remind him that well before the October election of '77, fully a third of the original participating producers had been allowed to get out from under that program under the many loopholes that so-called contract contained, another third at the previous Minister of Agriculture's encouragement were being encouraged to opt into the Federal program to get out of their own program that they gave birth to a few short years before. We were left with that third remaining in a year where the producers had to pay back to the government and the former Minister stood up in this House and said sue them, sue them. We were supposed to take them to court and wring that money out of those cattle producers. Mr. Chairman, the cattle producers have every reason to be extremely wary of any new schemes that emanate from that side with respect to the cattle industry.

Mr. Chairman, the concern that we have when we talk about who is the mastermind behind this program, how was this program developed, who did the Minister and his staff really talk to about the development of this program; that's why we're so concerned at this stage. Because, Mr. Chairman, we were left one unholy mess on our desks shortly upon assuming office in October of '77 with the grossest of inequities being created by that administration. A third of them that had received full benefits of the program: \$7,000, \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000; but under that program should have been paying back in the better pricing years, managed to escape that obligation by the program you had developed by opting out of the contract which many lawyers, legal people, that I have talked to couldn't stand any scrutiny, certainly couldn't stand any court case. By the way, none has ever been tried.

Another third — the same ag reps, the same exten-

sion officers that originally were sold the first income Beef Stabilization Program — were instructed by the then NDP Minister of Agriculture to go out and advise the same farmers to opt into the Federal program. If they did so, they got out from under all obligations of that plan. Mr. Chairman, that is true. I'm talking about constituents that I'm aware of. I'm talking about extension workers that I have reasonable confidence in reporting accurately the situation as it was. So, Mr. Chairman, that program was a costly program. I have no question, Mr. Chairman, that the intentions of the program weren't the best. As I do not question for a moment that the Minister's intentions for this program are for the best.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the proper planning, the proper foundation has been laid for implementation of a plan, if it's faulty to begin with, then I think we have a responsibility and we will be exercising that responsibility in at least pointing out the pitfalls as we see them of a program that appears to be, as the Member for Morris has indicated, yes, there's a skeleton of a program there, but it's pretty lean on the beef in terms of the flesh that surround that skeleton.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Member for Lakeside wants to recall from memory in a faulty way in terms of trying to put his thinking and his thoughts and his impressions as to the previous program and this program. It appears that the Member for Lakeside would like us here in this Legislature to believe that the initial program in 1975 was the ruination of the cattle industry in the Province of Manitoba. He should remember — (Interjection) — obviously he said the producers weren't pleased with him, Mr. Chairman, when over 6,000 producers, 6,300 producers enrolled in the plan.

Mr. Chairman, the member also said that a third of those producers got out and then another third got out. The only reason the producers left the program in terms of opting out from the federal program, we were lobbied by the producer groups of this province, the former Minister was lobbied to say, look we want to opt for the federal program and that option was given to them, and 1,472 producers opted out of that 6,300 producers for the federal program, Mr. Chairman.

But to say that the rest got out, up until 1980, there were 3,647 producers in the program until April 1, 1980, Mr. Chairman. It was this administration that was lobbying to get those producers out. In fact, they wrote letters encouraging them to get out and in fact during the drought year they said yes, you can have assistance under the Drought Program for hay and feed for your cattle but we will deduct it from what we believe that you owe it rather than exercising their option to purchase under the program as was part of the contract. They didn't exercise their option to purchase those cattle which were the terms of the contract, you didn't exercise it. Then you shafted the producers and said yes, you're in trouble during the drought year but since you owe us money we're not going to give you that back because we're going to credit you what we think you owe us, Mr. Chairman.

That was the nonsense that was played with respect to the previous plan. So the members now want to suggest that there is something untoward in the new plan to bring about at least an initial six years of



stability into the beef industry. Now, because they got caught last year with their pants down indicating the former Minister of Agriculture told producers of Manitoba in October, yes, you're in trouble but do like I and liquidate your herds. That's the kind of speeches and comments he was making last fall before the election, Mr. Chairman. He said he had his herd in the Balmoral area and he indicated yes, the beef industry is facing serious times and I've had to liquidate part of my herd. That's the kind of advice that was given.

Now, the members opposite are such experts in terms of assisting beef producers in the same manner as they assisted the hog producers in this province; obviously they will be wanting to get into a lengthy debate on this area and we will continue on for a number of days.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise