



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

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

39 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXIX No. 42A - 1:30 p.m., MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1990**



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

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 10, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to officially table the special audit of the North Portage Development Corporation. There are limited numbers of copies to be distributed amongst the Opposition Parties.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Victor Mager School, twenty-eight Grade 5 students, and they are under the direction of Cathy Matthews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme).

Also, from the Darwin School, we have fifty Grade 9 students, and they are under the direction of Tim Watters. This school is located in the constituency of the Minister of Urban Affairs.

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

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### RCMP Services Regional Replacement

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Acting Premier. I do not know whether Harold Neufeld will stand up but—

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

**Mr. Doer:** I am sorry. I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, a very serious question though, we have asked in Estimates recently about the state of the RCMP negotiations with the federal Government. We were told in Estimates that it was too secret and sensitive an issue for orderly discussion in this Legislature. The critic was never able to ascertain for one moment that the

Government was investigating with their other colleagues in western Canada the possible takeover of the RCMP. This falls upon a situation in our country where everyday symbols of our country are being eroded. The confidence of Canadians in their country is being eroded by the initiatives of the federal Tories and aided and abetted from time to time by their provincial counterparts. The CBC last week, medicare discussions the week before, VIA Rail—it goes on and on.

My question to the Acting Acting Premier, Mr. Speaker, is: Why are they considering the takeover of our police force, the RCMP, by the four western provinces? Why do we have to read about it out of a Conservative convention? Why is it not discussed in this Legislature? Will the Government now agree to drop the contingency plan of a western takeover of the RCMP in western Canada in terms of Manitoba's position?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about comments during the Estimates process about secret processes or whatever. I do not know which Hansard report he is reading from.

I would just ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who told him that this was a secret matter? There has been nothing secret about my meeting with Ministers responsible for policing jurisdictions, eight provinces and two territories meeting in Vancouver to discuss the matter in the light of the federal withdrawal from negotiations a month or so earlier at the officials level.

\* (1335)

It seems to me though that if we did things the way the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would suggest, we would never have a contingency plan of any kind, and we would then be criticized for not being prepared for whatever might come along.

It seems to me that the message I am getting from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and sometimes from the Liberal Party as well is that they would rather fight than win. I guess if they ever won any of their battles they would never have anything

to fight for anymore, and that would be just too much for them.

### RCMP Services Regional Replacement

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** You lost on medicare, you lost on post-secondary education, you signed the first deal of the RCMP 10 years ago, you have lost on VIA Rail, you have lost on CBC, you have lost on Unemployment Insurance. I could go on all afternoon, Mr. Speaker, about the wins and losses of this Government. They are on the record.

My question is to the Premier. Why does he not initiate a public disagreement and a public representation of Manitoba on behalf of decent RCMP funding and policing in Manitoba? Why is he not leading the western Premiers in an attempt to keep the RCMP in western Canada? Why is he dealing in the backrooms with his western Premiers to develop a western police force without any public—

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

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that is precisely what was done. Publicly the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) has raised that issue. A communique after the Justice Ministers' meeting was issued stating our displeasure with it. The fact of the matter is that the only way to be able to bargain with Ottawa from strength is to have an alternative.

We do not want to be like the former NDP administration of which he was a part, of whom the story used to be told during the '80s—how did you know when a plane arrived in Ottawa with Howard Pawley on it? Well, it kept whining after the engines were shut off.

The fact was, all we got from the former administration was whining, and that is why we lost in terms of the transfer payments from Ottawa on EPF. That is why we lost consistently in every single battle—the CF-18 and everything else—under that whining Government.

We have to have alternatives, viable alternatives, so that Ottawa will take notice. We do not want to lose the RCMP as a national symbol or as a police force, but we have to have alternatives in order to fight the attitude that Ottawa is facing us with.

**Mr. Doer:** I remind the Premier that it was his

Government and his Cabinet in 1980-81 that signed the last agreement downsizing the contributions of the federal Government. Maybe he should think twice about his cheap shots, again about the former Premier, and the bottom line results.

My question to the Premier is: Will he take a public position and call the Prime Minister about decent and fair funding for our western Canadian police forces and rule out the option of western Canada taking over the police forces from the RCMP? The Premier knows that any cost-benefit study will show that is not viable. He also knows that police standards will show that is not viable. He also knows that police standards show it is not viable and it is a further erosion of our Canadian standards, which are being eroded every day by his cousins in Ottawa.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, our first goal and objective is to retain RCMP policing, but we cannot do it and accept it at any cost. We cannot accept it if 90 percent of the costs are going to have to be borne by the province as Ottawa is suggesting. We cannot do that. We have to have an alternative, and I do not know whether any cost-benefit study will show that it is not viable to have a western Canadian police force. It is not my first choice, but we have to have an alternative if we are going to face Ottawa and say to them that this is unacceptable and that we have to have these costs more fairly distributed.

\* (1340)

### Manitoba Nurses' Union Negotiations

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns):** Manitobans are becoming increasingly concerned and worried about the health of negotiations between the Government and the Manitoba Nurses' Union and about the Government's intentions to seriously address the concerns of health care workers in this province. After two months of bargaining and with the date of contract expiry fast approaching, the Minister of Health is refusing to put any money on the table.

We want to know from the Minister of Health, why is he treating these serious negotiations like a poker game? Why is he waiting to the last second? Why is he refusing to put any—

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

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr.

Speaker, first of all, with all the gentleness I can muster, I want to indicate to my honourable friend that we are not refusing to put a monetary offer on the table.

We will be placing a monetary offer on the table through MHO, but let me indicate to my honourable friend, first and foremost, we have over the last number of months, not solely as part of the formal negotiating process, but outside of that process, undertaken a number of initiatives which we believe are valuable to the professional career of nursing in Manitoba, not exclusive of a number of issues, but let me indicate to you: nursing education; nursing's role in the workplace through analysis of All in a Day's Work; a national nursing symposium sponsored by this province, a national symposium with Ministers of Health involved across Canada; a nursing education advertising program to enhance recruitment of nurses to the profession.

The bargaining that we have undertaken will proceed, and I am ever hopeful that we will arrange to come to a conclusion without the necessity of work disruption, strike or any other measure, because we intend to be fair in our dealings with the nurses of Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her supplementary question.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is refusing to put a monetary offer on the table before the last date of scheduled negotiations.

**Mr. Speaker:** And the question is?

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** We want to know from the Minister, in the spirit of good faith bargaining, will he return immediately to the bargaining table with a monetary offer so that the optimum climate for co-operative negotiations is created and so that time prevents the necessary give and take between the two sides?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, the December 14 date was one that was agreed to between MHO and the Manitoba Nurses' Union. Government has the interesting position of not being directly at the bargaining table, because the Manitoba Health Organization is the central bargaining table, if you will, for all nursing negotiations throughout Manitoba. That is the first time that they have centrally bargained for all institutions. Up until then there were other separate bargainings ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, the contract expires December 31.

I simply indicate to you that it is Government's will and desire that we will achieve a settlement which is satisfactory to the nurses of Manitoba, to the Government of Manitoba, to the taxpayers of Manitoba. We can make that settlement without the necessity of a strike or any other disruption in patient care of Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her final supplementary question.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister of Health is not prepared to respect the timetable set down by the two sides at the bargaining table. One wonders what this Minister has to hide.

I want to ask the Minister of Health: Since this is a very serious matter with very serious feelings on the part of health care professionals, is this Minister of Health going to subject the nurses to the same sort of bullying tactics and verbal abuse to which he subjected the doctors of this province? Is he going to put the people of Manitoba—

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

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, without accepting any of the excited rhetoric of my honourable friend from St. Johns, I simply remind my honourable friend that we did achieve through the bargaining process a settlement with the MMA. That settlement I think was one viewed as reasonable by Manitobans, by physicians obviously because they accepted it.

Mr. Speaker, I might also remind my honourable friend that settlement was achieved some number of months after the expiry date of the contract. I am anxious, as is Government, that we settle with the Manitoba Nurses' Union. We believe we can because we approach the negotiations with nurses in Manitoba from an understanding viewpoint of their value to the health care system and not wanting any disruption to service to follow.

\* (1345)

### RCMP Services Regional Replacement

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

Earlier in Question Period, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) said that the Opposition would rather fight than win. Well, Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Party would like to do is not capitulate every single

time the Prime Minister of this nation goes about destroying the symbols of our nation.

One of those symbols that binds westerners more tightly than many other symbols is the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Can the First Minister tell this House today why, instead of playing hardball with his Tory cousins, he is prepared to offer them the very alternative they want, thereby playing right into their hands?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party does not understand that this is precisely what we are doing, playing hardball with them. We are showing them that we have an alternative. You cannot bargain with somebody who unilaterally has the power to impose a settlement on you that you do not want to accept unless you have an alternative.

We do not want to have the RCMP removed from the service of this province and this country. We do not want to change that. We believe the RCMP ought to be the prime means of policing in Manitoba. They ought to be the national police force.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot accept the offloading of \$90 million over the next decade, additional expenditure over and above what we have. We will not accept that and therefore we must demonstrate that we have a viable alternative.

### Federal Government Premier's Support

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, will this Premier tell this House why he consistently supports the Mulroney vision of Canada? Yes, indeed, it is a vision. It is a vision without medicare, a vision without a national transportation system, a vision without a national police force.

Why is he supporting his federal cousins every single step of the way by not offering the fight that is essential from Canadians from coast to coast, led by Premiers who care about Canada?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** The fact is that I support none of those things that the Leader of the Liberal Party has said consistently.

Mr. Speaker, it is because her hero, the person she worships day after day, Pierre Trudeau, began all these changes, began the changes with respect to funding of the RCMP, attempted to cut back on

VIA Rail unilaterally right across this country. The destruction of VIA Rail began under the Trudeau administration. The reductions in the payments for EPF and equalization began under the Trudeau administration, a half billion dollars worth to Manitoba under the Trudeau administration.

We are fighting all of those things, and we are fighting them whether they are imposed by a Trudeau administration or by a Mulroney administration. We think it is the wrong way to go, Mr. Speaker.

### RCMP Services Regional Replacement

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the most ineffective way to fight is to stand up in this House and say, no, no, no, we do not agree with any of those things. We are really not Tories. We are a different political Party with a different political vision, and then time after time after time enter into agreements which say they are in fact in favour of the dismantling of our programs.

Will the First Minister commit today to opting out of any study which will see Manitoba participate in a western Canadian police force when what we want is a national police force in this country?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, as usual, the Liberal answer is capitulate, and we will not do that.

\* (1350)

### Firearms Control Government Initiatives

**Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed toward the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, one year after the Montreal tragedy and one year after the Minister stated that something would be done to deal with the misuse of guns in our society, we have the Minister stating in the paper on the weekend that he would be doing something.

When and how will this Minister act in order to protect the lives of women and children in Manitoba in light of the recent spate of killings involving guns?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Recently we announced, Mr. Speaker, the Pedlar review into domestic violence

in Manitoba. We would have appreciated a higher level of support from the New Democratic Party.

**Mr. Chomlak:** Mr. Speaker, amongst seven or eight different other things, Ms. Pedlar has to study guns. That study will not go even close to solving the problem. We are three months away from the study.

When will the Minister take action? That is three months down the road before the report is even delivered. Will the Minister take action today that he promised a year ago, that he promised in the paper that he would act on?

**Mr. McCrae:** I was frankly disappointed at the response to the announcement of the Pedlar review by the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) and now repeated today by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

I believe the Pedlar review will give us some useful advice and do some useful research. I know that many people out there who are interested in justice issues as they affect women and domestic violence are as hopeful as I am that the Pedlar review will yield benefits for the women and families of this province. I wish that hope and that optimism would be shared by the Members of the New Democratic Party, because we need their support. We ask for their support and we await their support.

### Federal Legislation

**Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan):** While this Minister studies, guns are being passed around. There is a black market in firearms acquisition certificates, Mr. Speaker.

My final supplementary towards the same Minister is: Has he made any representations to his federal counterparts on behalf of women of Manitoba regarding proper legislation be enacted at the federal level?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, last week Manitoba's firearms officer met at a meeting with firearms officers from all the jurisdictions in Ottawa. Some of the issues about which the Honourable Member is talking were on that agenda, including the issue of a photo identification system with regard to the acquisition of these firearms acquisition certificates.

In addition, we are concerned that the Bill involving gun control is seemingly stalled in Ottawa. That is something that we are in the preparation of correspondence with the federal Minister about.

### Repap Manitoba Inc. Layoffs Equipment Replacement

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister.

Residents of The Pas and the surrounding area are becoming increasingly concerned with the situation at Repap as it is today, and it has been like that for about a week and a half now.

When I was in The Pas a week ago I was told by Repap officials that some 300 workers had been laid off. Today they advised me that 600 to 700 people are going to be laid off or are laid off already. I was not able to ascertain how long the layoff will be. Officials say maybe March, maybe longer; who knows?

My question is: Has the Premier contacted the officials in Repap to see what could be done to get the equipment replaced as quickly as possible, anything that can be done to get these 600 or 700 people back to work?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Acting Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I can give some information with respect to the replacement of the equipment that was destroyed in the fire. I find the question a little bit surprising from a representative of a Party which is dead set against Repap, its presence in The Pas.

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

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, that is the truth.

In discussions of Repap they want to see replaced as quickly as possible the precipitator in question so that they can once again maintain a level near full production. The company desperately wants to move on to satisfy the markets they have, because they know if they have to back away from their clientele over the next four or five months that they may have great difficulty securing those customers again.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Mr. Speaker—

**An Honourable Member:** Are you speaking for the Party here, Oscar?

**Mr. Lathlin:** The Party is not against Repap, as we have said before. The Party is concerned with the environment.

**An Honourable Member:** It was your deal with Repap—your corrupt deal.

\* (1355)

### UIC Claim Processing

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for The Pas, kindly put your question, please.

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Since this situation, this shutdown, coming so soon before Christmas with, like I said, 600 or 700 people being laid off, the officials do not know how long the layoff will be, maybe beyond March, will the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) or the Premier, the First Minister, contact his federal colleagues with a view to ensuring that UIC claims are processed as quickly as possible or that some assistance be given to those people who are going to be laid off?

Like I said, people do not know how long they are going to be laid off. Some say March, maybe April—

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

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, in rising, I have to state my displeasure of hearing the statement of the Member for Dauphin about a corrupt deal with Repap. I challenge him to say that—(interjection)—if he has—

### Point of Order

**An Honourable Member:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Filmon:** Is he denying he said it?

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's is very clear that answers to questions should relate directly to the matter raised. The Member for The Pas is asking some very serious questions on behalf of his constituents and does not need this kind of political rhetoric in response from the Premier in this Conservative Government.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, this is a very important question. This is very important to the residents of The Pas and district. The Government is treating it as a very important, serious matter, but when a Member of the loyal Opposition calls it a corrupt deal, he is imputing the motives not only of Repap, but the Government of this province.

I say to him shame, and he should withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Ministers are having some difficulty in

containing their remarks. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia will have ample opportunity to put your remarks on the record. On the point of order raised, I would remind the Honourable First Minister to deal with the matter raised. He should not provoke debate.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Filmon:** I am glad to see the courage of the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), Mr. Speaker.

In response to the Member for The Pas, I consider that to be a very serious matter. We consider it to be a very serious matter. We would like to be able to say that there will not be any layoffs, but the matter is a matter of examination by the Environment Department.

We would like to assured that there are not serious long-term environmental impacts to the operation without the precipitator. That was an unfortunate loss in the fire, but the matter has to be examined carefully before final decisions are made. We will not know that until we get a report from the Environment inspectors who are doing the investigation.

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. It will be followed by a motion of substantiveness, asking the Member for Dauphin to offer a full apology to the Members of this House and the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I, as the Government's representative in the divestiture process of Manfor, took a package of information that came from the former Government. We put certain criteria around that divestiture process and, in the best interests of this province, attempted to work toward an agreement with Repap that would safeguard the interests of the existing work force in The Pas and district, that would also try to save harmless the taxpayers of this province from having to contribute yet additional hundreds of millions of dollars in underwriting the losses of Repap.

We also looked into the future of the forestry industry in this country, all of it basically with the hopes and aspirations of the Native community in an attempt to ensure their economic place in our province.

That is all part of the public record. Today a



Member in this House from his seat indicated that deal and indeed every part leading up to that deal is corrupt. That imputes the motives not only of this Government, but certainly of myself as a representative of the Government that negotiated the deal.

\* (1400)

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Member to do one or two things, to stand in his place and offer a full apology to the Members of this House, specifically myself, and failing that, to stand in his place and indicate where it is that the deal is corrupt and where it is that the Government knowingly, or myself knowingly as its representative and agent in this deal, has knowingly broken the law in an attempt to provide some gain somewhere.

This is a most serious matter. I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) be required to withdraw and apologize for his comments respecting the integrity of those involved in the negotiation of the Manfor divestiture.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, one of our most basic rules in regard to matters of privilege is that they ought to come up infrequently in this House.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of comments that were made back and forth by Members, including Government Members and Opposition Members, might be the subject of a point of order. If Members have difficulty with a specific word or phrase, they can rise in their place and bring what they feel may be a breach in terms of our rules on unparliamentary language to the attention of the Speaker.

To deal with this matter through a matter of privilege is in my mind inappropriate. I would refer you to our rules, pages 75, 76—and Members of this House—where indeed there is definition of privilege which I think outlines quite clearly the fact that this matter should have been dealt with as a point of order, not as a matter of privilege.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that Members were quite pleased for a period of time to engage in comments back and forth across the floor. In fact the whole issue of the Repap deal itself was raised by Government Members in response to a very serious question by the Member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) on laid-off workers in The Pas, workers who could be out of a job for three and four months.

The matter was indeed brought, I would say, against the rules of the House, but was initially raised by the Government Members, inappropriately so.

The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) was merely responding in regard to those statements, in regard to the deal, what we in this House would consider a complete distortion of this Party's position—let us not forget that is what he stated—because the New Democratic Party stated very clearly in regard to Repap that it supports not the deal, not the incompetent deal of the Conservatives, but it supports developing the resources in The Pas in a way which makes sure that there is not the kind of environmental lack of safeguards that this Government brought in, that respects treaty land entitlement and ensures proper guarantees not only at the first phase but the second phase of employment, something this Government has not done in terms of the Repap deal, Mr. Speaker.

We are willing to debate our Party's position on Repap with this Government any time, but the Minister should not take the opportunity on a matter of privilege to attempt to put what is an unfair statement against the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) on the matter, something that he—

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that had the Member for Dauphin raised the issue of corruption during a question, as the Speaker you would have requested the Member to withdraw or to substantiate those remarks. In that sense, if we go to Beauchesne's in reflections on Members, it quite explicitly explains that in fact the Member for Dauphin has violated a rule of this House. I would suggest to the Member for Dauphin, if he can bring forth evidence to show and justify that in fact the comment that he threw across the Chamber is in fact accurate, I would encourage him to do so. Failing that, I would encourage him to stand up—all Members in this Chamber are honourable—and withdraw the remarks.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my remarks on this by referring to the dictionary definition of the word "corrupt." It refers to destroy the purity of, it talks about infect, taint and also mentions bribe, and I want to clearly say that it also mentions bribe as one form of the definition. I

clearly withdraw any reference to that definition of corrupt as it applies in this situation, but I will say that the word is certainly appropriate when talking about the kind of deal that has resulted from the negotiations by this Minister of Finance in terms of it being incompetent, not corrupt. So I will withdraw the word "corrupt" from the reference that I stated—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Dauphin has withdrawn his remarks?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Dauphin, if you so wish, sir, would you want to stand in your place, withdraw the remarks that were put on the record?

**Mr. Plohman:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have withdrawn the word "corrupt."

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Dauphin. That is unequivocally withdrawn, which settles the matter.

The Honourable Member for The Pas, with his final supplementary question.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Justice, on the same point of order.

**Mr. McCrae:** I just seek your direction on the withdrawal of the Honourable Member for Dauphin. My understanding was that it was to be an unqualified withdrawal, and we had quite a lengthy qualification attached to the Honourable Member's withdrawal. The withdrawal that we heard is not acceptable to this side of the House—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. On the point of order raised, I would remind the Honourable Minister of Justice that in his initial remarks there was some qualification attached to it. I had recognized the Honourable Member and asked for an unqualified withdrawal which he did give to the Chamber. I am satisfied with an unqualified withdrawal.

### Length of Layoff

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for The Pas, with his final supplementary question.

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with the 600 to 700 workers and their families who are without work today. We are not concerned with the machines.

Will the First Minister tell the House when the assessment will be finished? When can we expect the 600 to 700 workers to return to work? Is it going to be one month, two months, three months, four months, how long?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I share that concern for the workers and their jobs. I might say that I had that concern throughout the election campaign when I promised a course of action that would keep the jobs in The Pas when that Member's Party promised a course of action that would have wiped out those jobs. So those concerns are validly held today, but they were not very validly held during August and September in the election campaign.

We will ensure that the assessment is done as quickly as possible so that an answer will be available, because we too are concerned about the workers and their families.

### Shoal Lake - Water Quality Consolidated Professor Mines

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

The Minister told this House and has told us repeatedly that he had assurances from the former Liberal Government in Ontario that Winnipeg's water quality and conservation of our water supply would be foremost in the minds of the Ontario legislators as they came to deal with mining. Now we learn, in keeping with the former administration in this province's tenth out of 10 ranking, that the New Democratic Government in Ontario appears to have reversed its commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. James, kindly put your question now, please.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister about the New Democratic Party Government's press release from Ontario which states that Ontario supports sound mining development and that Consolidated Professor Mines has invested millions of dollars and has reached production stage.

Mr. Speaker, what is this Minister going to do about this apparent shift in position and emphasis by the new NDP Government which appears to have

gone from water quality and conservation to a rationalization for a pro-business stance on mining in Shoal Lake?

\* (1410)

**Hon. Glen Cummlings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it appears that perhaps the Ministers in Ontario have not necessarily been in close contact with their Premier. We received assurances from the Premier of Ontario that he would—

**An Honourable Member:** Premier Bob?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Premier Bob—

**An Honourable Member:** Premier Bob and weave.

**Mr. Cummlings:** —that he was very aware of the situation in Shoal Lake and very conscious of our concerns. I received assurance from the Minister of Environment from Ontario that she was very aware of our concerns and would do everything within her power to co-operate with us and make sure that that water quality was protected.

### Environmental Impact Hearing

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. James, with his supplementary question.

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate—and I appreciate his response and his prompt action—before Consolidated Professor and the eager New Democratic Government strike some kind of a deal, whether or not he has received a commitment that he had under the former Liberal administration that in the environmental assessment process there would be an assessment hearing in Winnipeg, for sure, at least in Winnipeg on the Manitoba side?

**Hon. Glen Cummlings (Minister of Environment):** Well, Mr. Speaker, let us not be too liberal about the protection of Shoal Lake. We want to make very sure that Manitoba's interest and particularly the City of Winnipeg and its water supply is the foremost concern.

As a matter of fact, one of the things that I have been attempting to address with amendments to The Environment Act is the capacity to have some direct ability to intervene in anything that might happen where there are cross-border impacts such as would be when a development of this nature would occur at Shoal Lake.

Let me assure Members of this House and members of the public that I will be pursuing actively with the present Government of Ontario nothing

short of hearings in Manitoba and the very highest level of examination that would be satisfactory, if anything should proceed. It is still my position that is not likely to happen.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. James, with his final supplementary question.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this Minister's conclusion that he does not think anything will proceed. I think the press release quite clearly indicates that they contemplate something will proceed.

### Consultations

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** My final question: Does the Minister agree that no risk as a result of a mining development is worth risking Winnipeg's water supply, and has he canvassed with the Ontario Government what arrangements may be necessary—and they may be compensatory arrangements of some sort—triparty, City of Winnipeg and Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, to make sure that Manitoba must be consulted and must consent before any development of any kind which puts our water supply at risk goes ahead on the other side of the border?

**Hon. Glen Cummlings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, being consulted does not mean that they will necessarily listen. I want to make sure that not only are we consulted and heard, but that we have every opportunity to intervene to protect water quality that comes to this city.

Make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we have already moved on this side of the border in terms of bringing in sensitive regulations. We have had them out for discussion and are prepared to work to implement them in order to protect the water quality of that waterfall for what is within our jurisdiction. That is the basis upon which we believe we have a very sound negotiating position to talk to the jurisdiction of Ontario.

### CBC Cutbacks Regional Programming

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** My question is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Manitoba lost close to 50 jobs last week at CBC Manitoba in the cuts announced by the federal Government as we see them continuing their destructive path across our national institutions.

CBC senior staff are now predicting the loss of all

regional news stations and their replacement with correspondents reporting to a central Toronto station, which would then select the news for all Canadians.

My question to the Minister is: Is she prepared to make clear to her counterparts in Ottawa that regional programming and regional news are essential to our sense of ourselves as a nation?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** The news of the reductions in CBC was upsetting news to our Government, Mr. Speaker. I do want to indicate our commitment as a province to our local culture and our local cultural industries.

We as a province have committed \$1.8 million this year in the absence of federal funding for our cultural industries. We will continue as a province to be in for that amount of money to our cultural industries and to maintain our support. We as a province are committed locally to regional activity.

**Ms. Friesen:** In view of the fact that the Prime Minister has promised further cuts next year in the funding for CBC, what will the Minister be doing, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, to ensure that regional public news programs, particularly for franco-Manitobans, will continue in Manitoba?

I would be interested in her response, particularly in the light of the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) announcement today that the best way to fight Ottawa is with alternative programs.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley is indicating that hypothetically something might happen next year, and we will have to attempt to put plans into place, but we have no indication at this time that those kinds of things are going to happen.

### **Multicultural Grants All-Manitoba Task Force**

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley, with her final supplementary question.

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** I want to again ask the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation: Given the current serious funding situation for communication and cultural industries in the province, is she willing to bring together an all-Manitoba task force with representation from across the cultural communities of Manitoba to make a united effort to inform the federal

Government of the impact of its recent cuts in our social fabric?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Mr. Speaker, we have been holding consultations throughout the province. We have consulted with the Native community in the northern areas on Native communications. We are providing support to Native communications in our province. We have consulted with cultural industries in our province, and we are providing support. We are doing our work and attempting to do the things that we can do as a province in support of our cultural industries here in Manitoba.

### **Fishing Industry Government Initiatives**

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Fishermen on Lake Winnipegosis are suffering because of low supplies of high-grade fish and lack of sales for rough fish. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some fishermen have already shut down their operations and many are closing down tomorrow. These people cannot afford to fish, do not have enough weeks for U.I. and are therefore going on welfare.

Considering the seriousness of this matter, what steps is the Minister of Natural Resources taking to assist these fishermen who can no longer make a living on this lake?

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Member for Swan River, who has raised this matter on a number of occasions, the Department of Natural Resources cannot do anything other than manage those resources that are there. The fisheries have been less than satisfactory, we acknowledge that.

I suppose the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) would have to acknowledge that the returns for this year to grain farmers in Manitoba have been less than satisfactory. We have done a number of things at the Lake Winnipegosis fisheries to ensure that in the ensuing years the fisheries will improve, but we will have to let time make that determination.

In the meantime, I can only express my concern about the fishermen. The fisheries is a part-time employment. They, like myself, are also involved in the raising of cattle in some instances, and fisheries is in that situation where other forms of income will

have to be looked for by those who are engaged in it.

\* (1420)

### Diversification

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, Christmas is coming for the fishermen too, and it is not going to be very good.

Will the Minister admit that this is a serious problem and call for a complete review of Lake Winnipegosis involving the fishermen to look at the problems of fish stock and look at ways of diversifying the economy in this area?

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I understand from my House Leader that it may be that my Estimates will be discussed as early as later on in the day, this evening perhaps. I invite the Honourable Member to raise this issue with me, at which time the director of Fisheries will be present to more fully respond to her questions.

### Rough Fish Market

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** There are large supplies of rough fish being wasted right now.

Can the Minister tell this House why there is no research being done at the Manitoba Research Council to look at possible ways for utilizing all of these species that are now being wasted?

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** I appreciate the Honourable Member's questions. These are very valid and legitimate questions, but we have the opportunity during the course of the Estimates to examine these more fully. I have asked my staff to be prepared to do just that when we get to the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources.

### Sport Select Sale to Minors

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries.

This fall a new heavily advertised lottery, Sport Select, was launched with a high profile media star, Don Cherry, inviting people to gamble on hockey games as well as football games.

What is the position of the Minister on the sale of such tickets to young people?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister charged with**

**the administration of The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act):** Mr. Speaker, there is no legal restriction for the sale of lottery tickets to minors. It is the policy of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation and the Western Canada Lottery Corporation to actively discourage the sale of those tickets to minors.

### Market Survey

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Can the Minister tell the House what studies her department has done on who is purchasing the tickets such as Sport Select?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that since the introduction of Sport Select, there has been one consumer complaint regarding the sale of tickets to minors. There have been two consumer calls to the Western Canada Lottery Corporation with inquiries regarding this matter.

### Sale to Minors

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Could the Minister describe "actively discourage"?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act):** Mr. Speaker—

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

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

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** I may have misunderstood the second question, but I thought the Member had asked for clarification on how many complaints there had been, and I was indicating how many complaints there had been.

The last time lottery retailers were communicated with regarding discouraging selling tickets to minors was in the summer of this year, and it is done on a regular basis.

### Palliser Furniture Ltd. Emission Levels

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, on several occasions over the last month I have had the opportunity to question the Minister of the Environment to try and determine what course of action he and his department were going to take to force the Palliser furniture plant to clean up its act.

Last week I received a petition containing the

names of some 250 east Transcona residents who are demanding that action be taken to stop this plant from destroying their quality of life.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. What steps are he and his department now taking to stop the hazardous emissions from this plant? Will he table any documentation to support any action that they may be taking?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to table the information, but I do not seem to have it in my house book today.

Regarding the fact that we have issued an order in relationship to the installation at that plant site, that order, I believe, the completion date is mid-January. It is certainly my expectation that everything will be in place completed or they will be in violation of order, obviously, but that the problem will be corrected and once again return the community to a situation where they have full enjoyment of the air.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion to go into Committee of Supply, it is my understanding that there is not a willingness at this point to waive private Members' hour. I would request, and I would serve notice that possibly around five o'clock I may be issuing further instructions with respect to House business at that time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Departments of Family Services in the Committee Room and the Department of Environment within the Chamber will continue to have their Estimates reviewed, both this afternoon and this evening.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, therefore, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**Motion agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Department of Family Services, and the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Environment.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY—FAMILY SERVICES

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Family Services.

\* (1430)

When the committee last sat it had been considering item 6.(b) Child Day Care: (1) Salaries \$1,679,800 on page 64 of the Estimates book. Shall the item pass?

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I am wondering if, before we get started, as has been a tradition at this Estimates, the Minister has any announcements for us.

**Hon. Harold Gillieshammer (Minister of Family Services):** I am going to break with tradition today and not have anything to present to you.

**Mr. Alcock:** There was so much talk about Christmas in the House. I am astounded.

On Day Care, just a couple of quick questions on this particular item to finish up, we had quite a lengthy discussion. It is unfortunate the Hansards are so far behind because it is difficult to pick up on the thread of some of the discussion that took place in the last session.

We talked at some length about the issue of schools and their relationship with day cares. I am wondering if it is the practice in schools to charge rent to provincially funded day cares for lunch and after-school programs that are currently operating in the schools.

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** I have a copy of a standard leasing agreement between the division, the landlord, and the tenants being the day care centre. If it falls under the jurisdiction of the department, there is a fixed minimum annual rent in the amount of \$1 paid.

However, there may be some cases outside of arrangements like this where day cares have simply gone ahead and negotiated with a school division for another amount.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is it the policy of the department that the department would be involved in the negotiations so that agreements like these are set up?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is the standard lease that is available from our department, but I can tell you that it is one of the items that is being reviewed by the committee on the use of schools as day cares.

**Mr. Alcock:** If a day care uses your standard form, and presumably that involves the department in the discussions, does it follow therefore that they get the space for a dollar?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The lease is one that is written and signed between the division and the day care centre. We are not involved in the finalization of that lease agreement.

**Mr. Alcock:** Could the Minister clarify under which circumstances they could get the space for a dollar? I mean, I thought it was simply that some had signed these agreements and got the space for a dollar and others, if they negotiated separately, often paid a rent.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The groups that have used this particular lease, it is our understanding, have used the information there and have signed the agreement based on \$1.00. We will check some statistics we have to see if there is much variation from that, but there are other groups that have gone ahead and negotiated without using this format for a lease where they have struck their own deal with the school division. I am not sure we have figures on how many of those there are.

**Mr. Alcock:** While you are searching out that information, I have a related question.

We talked the other day about situations where the schools are provided—or the school boards actually—with capital, additional capital from the Public Schools Finance Board to support the construction of a space for a day care or for joint use between the school and a lunch and after-school program.

Given that is the basis on which these funds are advanced, would the department then insist that the space that is created meets all of the public health requirements for a day care or lunch and after-school program?

\* (1440)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, part of the licensing is that they meet public health standards.

**Mr. Alcock:** I understand that—part of the licensing for a day care. The day care has to meet local public health standards in order to be granted its licence.

The question though is that when the

Government, through the Public Schools Finance Board, is advancing funds to a school division in order to create a day care space within a school or a joint use space for a before-lunch and after-school program in the school, would not the department require that the space that is subsequently created, given that it is partially being funded to place a day care in there, that that space then should meet local public health requirements in order to qualify for licensing?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, it would have to meet those standards to acquire the licence.

**Mr. Alcock:** It would seem reasonable, that being the case then, that the school division, the organization that is creating the school, would then be responsible for ensuring that those public health requirements were met.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There is an area of shared responsibility here. The board of the day care would be primarily responsible to see that public health standards not only are in place at the beginning but that they are maintained.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, certainly that would seem to make some sense. I am talking though now about the physical portion of that, the construction of the facility in order to meet public health standards as opposed to the ongoing maintenance of a healthy facility, and that it seems that when the Government is advancing money to ensure the construction of such a facility, the Government should then also be requiring that that facility be built to the standards for which it is going to be licensed to use. I believe the Minister said, yes, that was the policy.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** The Honourable Minister, I will ask you to just wait for one minute. We are just going to take about three minutes so Hansard can come check a couple of the mikes.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Public Schools Finance Board is the lead board in terms of the construction of the building and the discussions which take place between their staff, the school division and the writing up of a contract after architectural drawings and so forth have been studied.

The ultimate responsibility for a school building resides first with Public Schools Finance, and then they sign the building over to the board. The school board takes responsibility for it. Within that is a joint responsibility. Once you create a day care within the school building, you have another board which

actually is responsible for the running of the day care centre.

This is an area of shared responsibility that the group that is looking into this relationship will have to look at and come to grips with, but as far as building construction, that agreement is struck between the local school division through Public Schools Finance and the contractor.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I understand that they have the lead responsibility. However, when the Public Schools Finance Board is advancing funds that are based on the requirement to build a day care within the facility or see that the facility is available for a before-lunch and after-school program, that means certain public health requirements, given that children will be consuming food in there, that the physical plant would be built to local public health standards.

We did have a discussion about how these things were arrived at last Thursday. The Minister did indicate that there was joint consultation between the day care department and the Department of Education. The discussion went on. I am wondering how it could happen that such a facility could be built without meeting public health standards.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, existing schools were built to meet certain standards, including local health care standards. If a preschool day care for instance is set up in an existing high school, there may well be a variance with the needs of those preschoolers with the type of building that has been constructed for the use of high school students. This is one of the reasons this committee has been set up, is to do an overview and inspection of these facilities.

I think sometimes groups in their anxiety to put the day care in place have now run into the problem that standards may be more stringent for preschool day care than would exist, particularly with an older high school.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am aware of a situation in a relatively new school, the Fort Rouge School, which was only built a few years ago, for which funds were advanced from the Public Schools Finance Board to the school division to build that school. They built a joint use facility for a lunch and after-school program and the facility does not meet public health requirements.

So there are really two questions. How could this occur? How could we knowingly allow that building to go ahead without ensuring that it meets public

health standards, and then why does it become the responsibility of the day care to correct the obvious mistake on the part of the public health finance board and the provincial Government and the school board?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The school you speak of and the day care you speak of have what appears to be a minor problem to make additional renovations, but the issue becomes who is financially responsible for that? With the growth in school day cares, a number of these problems have come to light, hence the committee to review day care in schools, which is set up to identify these problems and to bring forward some solutions.

Just on another level, I think it is fair to say that everybody in the school system has not willingly accepted the concept of day cares in schools, and you have players in the system, custodians, who find out that any use of the school is an infringement on their work. I can tell you from personal experience that after working two months in July and August to ready a school, and the first day of school happens to be a rainy day, the custodians are just in a real state of frustration, because all that they have accomplished over the two summer months is destroyed in the first hour that the doors are thrown open.

\* (1450)

I use that to illustrate that there are issues, whether it is custodial staff or teaching staff, where somebody might have the audacity to use their room in their absence that it creates a problem. This has not been a marriage that has fully blossomed yet. I think that we are hoping with this committee to review day care in schools that not only can these issues be identified but solutions brought forward.

**Mr. Alcock:** I shall not belabour the point at all. I appreciate what the Minister has to say. It is however a difficult, while albeit a minor, problem to many, and certainly given the size and number of the problems that this department has to deal with, it is a small item, but it is a very significant item for a day care. As the Minister knows, they operate on very slim budgets. In this particular case in a brand new facility—or it is only a few years old now, which was built specifically for this purpose, they now discover that it does not meet health care standards, and there is going to be considerable expense involved in bringing it up to standard. I would hope that this would be reviewed. I hope that is part of the



mandate of this committee and that there is some clear policy.

I can understand that when you are talking about a change of use of an old facility and there being some capital renovation needs. That makes some sense, but to think that we went out and spent considerable public money building a brand new school that still does not meet public health requirements strikes me that there is a serious gap in the current body of policy. I hope that this committee will go some way to rectifying that.

I would invite the Minister to go out to the school and visit it, because I think it is a nice facility. I think the people there are trying very hard. Small items like this for what are relatively impoverished communities become of major significance.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Member has helped me to sort of make a point that I tried to make last week, that all the i's have to be dotted and the t's crossed before you enter into these agreements, because sometimes the fallout has significant negative impact later on.

I can tell you in rural areas where we do not get many new buildings erected, many schools have for instance put in cafeterias as sort of a latter day enhancement of their schools. Often it is done with patchwork funding from student councils and from one area and another. The furniture and the equipment that are brought in are not the latest available, and all of a sudden a health inspector, who has never come near a school before because there was no food involved, is called by someone and we run into these problems.

It is important, I think, no matter what the facility is, that we finalize everything before construction starts, because it creates some problems.

**Mr. Alcock:** In the case that has been referenced, given that it is new and that it was the department—or that the provincial Government did put funds forward to see that it was built, and it has been constructed with the idea of a day care using it. It is not a modification. It was built with that exact use. Will the department offer some assistance to the day care to see that the facility is built to the standards it was supposed to be built to?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We would attempt to facilitate the resolution of the problem.

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you very much.

I just have a couple of final questions on day care

on this particular item. One is, we talked about who was getting grants and what facilities were getting grants based on what criteria. I am wondering, has there been a study done on who is paying fees and levels of subsidization?

There has been lots of theorizing about who are the people who are taking advantage of subsidized day care spaces. Has there been any overall study of—

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I can tell the Member that 60 percent of the licensed spaces are subsidized, and the subsidy and the parent fee varies with the age of the child. We have what we would call an income profile for people who qualify for the subsidy, and the subsidy varies depending on income level. We do not have the information for those who do not get the subsidy.

\* (1500)

**Mr. Alcock:** I would certainly be interested in a copy of the income profile for those who do receive the subsidy, and presumably for those that do not, they are receiving no benefit from public funds. If it is possible to make that available, I would appreciate it.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** What we could do is give you the income ranges for those that access subsidy. That is what you are asking for.

**Mr. Alcock:** The overall numbers in the 60 percent who are receiving subsidy.

I have an indirectly related line of questioning. It goes back to the department as a whole, but is of particular significance here in day care. I note from the six-month statement that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) tabled in the House, I believe it was Friday after Question Period, Thursday or Friday. If my memory serves me right, the department was underspent. Can the Minister tell us, am I correct in my belief that the department was underspent and by how much?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I can tell you that we were underspent by 6.2 percent at the end of the second quarter. There are a variety of reasons for that. Some of the accounts are late receiving funding for them because of billing and so forth. For instance, payments to municipalities where we fund a portion of the social allowances was late going out. At some offices with some individuals, they have the capacity in social allowances to write cheques at the field level. They are given the full year amount to do that,

and we are only at the halfway point here. I think maybe that answers your question.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, what I would be interested in, and the Minister does not need to provide it all at this moment, if staff could work it out and we could have it. The first question is: How many dollars does that 6.2 percent represent? Is the figure \$10 million?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told it is approximately \$15 million.

**Mr. Alcock:** Fifteen million dollars. What I would certainly be interested in is a division-by-division breakdown of that \$15 million. I tell you why I am particularly interested in that right now. We encountered in the Estimates for the Income Security, as we looked at CRISP and 55 Plus, if I recall we encountered significant overestimation of the amount of uptake on those programs that resulted in reductions in the level of the programs in this year.

If I recall our discussions in the grants under Child Day Care, there was a similar overestimation of the amount that would be forwarded during the year. So I am particularly interested in those two lines, whether or not any of this \$15 million underexpenditure can be attributed to those two items?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I can give you some further information. I referenced Income Security and Municipal Assistance. We were underspent \$5.2 million in that area; 55 Plus and CRISP, we were underspent half a million.

**Mr. Alcock:** Each or total?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Total. Child Day Care grants and subsidies, \$1.4 million; Child and Family Support, \$2.2 million; Children's Special Services, \$.7 million; Employability Enhancement Programs, \$.4 million; and other, \$5.1 million. So again there is sometimes a lateness in which the paperwork is done. Clearly the biggest area was the Income Security going back to municipal levels of Government, where there is \$5.2 million to be flowed to them. It is primarily due to a variation in the timing of receipt and payment of billings from municipalities.

**Mr. Alcock:** If I understood the Minister correctly, we went through Income Security, 55 Plus and CRISP, Day Care, Child and Family Support, 2.2; Children's Special Services, .7; Employment Enhancement, .4; but then Other, \$5.1 million. Is that correct?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** Given that we have covered Income Security, Child and Family Support, Children's Special Services, Day Care, and Employment Enhancement, is the Other all in Regional Services—Other is not a small item. That is as big as the Income Security shortfall. That is one-third of the entire shortfall.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is the cumulative effect of minor variances that cross quite a number of appropriations that have to do with advances, capital advances and timing variations. That third, if you like, is because of a putting together of a number of these areas where timing has not allowed that money to flow at this time.

**Mr. Alcock:** When we look at these Other Expenditures then—and I understand the timing issue that the Minister is talking about, but when we look at, for example, the day care underexpenditure of \$1.4 million, is it—given that there are funds budgeted on an annual basis for a given number of spaces and no carry forward to create new spaces out of this additional money, does this \$1.4 million simply lapse?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** This underspending is simply for this quarter of the budget year. It is doubtful that we will be underspent in that area by the end of the year. The 6.2 figure that I gave you is simply a snapshot at this point in time.

\* (1510)

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I understand that in a budget this size just the way the money flows can change dramatically particularly with that 13-month year. However, we did see in day care last year when we looked at the reason for the increases, a significant underdelivery on the amount of money that was budgeted in that year's appropriation. When we questioned on that, I believe we were told that in fact, no, that had been taken into account and the amount that was budgeted in this year would come forward as new day care spaces and services. Now, six months into the year, we see we are \$1.4 million underspent in that line again.

Is the Minister assuring me that when we come to the end of the year that all of the day care spaces that were budgeted will be in place and operating, and that we will not be showing a \$1.4 million or somewhat greater number underexpenditure as we did the previous year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We are anticipating and

planning on meeting the commitments that we made with day care spaces, and we feel that the budgeting there has been adequate and that the estimate is going to be adequate for fulfilling those commitments.

**Mr. Alcock:** I appreciate the Minister saying that. We will have an opportunity to examine that when we are back in Estimates in the new year. We will have an opportunity to see how that has come out.

The \$2.2 million in Child and Family Support, where is that money from?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I would remind the Member again that this is simply a snapshot in time, and the timing is largely responsible for underexpenditures that we anticipate are going to be met by years end.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am accepting the Minister's assurance of that.

I am simply asking, this snapshot that he shared with us included a \$2.2 million underexpenditure in Child and Family Support, perhaps he could tell us where within that line the \$2.2 million has gone?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Most of this refers to some capital advances that agencies qualify for and an amount of this has not been accessed as yet.

**Mr. Alcock:** Would this be the deficit reduction funds that—

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** This does not include the money for deficit reduction, the money that is voted for. The agencies is shown at the beginning of the year and accessed—a portion of it is accessed at the beginning of the year, but it is shown here, and all of that money has not flowed as yet.

**Mr. Alcock:** We are showing a \$2.2 million underexpenditure, which the Minister said was for capital in Child and Family Support. I am trying to recall where there was a \$2 million capital item.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I did not mean to mislead you. It is a working capital advance.

**Mr. Alcock:** It is a working capital advance that has not been advanced basically.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Okay. Finally the 55 Plus and CRISP, a half million dollars—is that on line? Is it anticipated that will be taken up, or is that just the current rate at which the program is running, and at the end of the year we will see something in the order of half a million or a million dollar underexpenditure?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There are two reasons. There

is a lower than anticipated caseload that we have talked about before, but also the delayed processing of payments.

**Mr. Alcock:** So that the half a million dollars could in fact underrepresent the uptake in the—that may not be a good indicator, is that what the Minister is saying, that in fact it was just late payments? The program could actually be running at a fully-funded level. It is just that the cutoff date for this report did not capture the last round of payments?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** That is fine. I am satisfied with those answers, and would ask the Minister to be prepared in the next Estimates to discuss in detail the underexpenditure in his department with particular reference to those lines that we have noticed thus far that are so massively, sort of, overestimated.

With that, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I believe, as far as my questions are concerned, it is time to move on from Child Day Care. I believe the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) may have a few more questions in this area, but I am quite prepared to pass the line.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** 6.(b) Child Day Care: (1) Salaries \$1,679,800—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$438,000—pass; (3) Financial Assistance \$21,236,000—pass; (4) Grants \$19,602,200—pass.

Item 6.(c) Youth and Regional Services: (1) Branch Operations \$862,800.00.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** I have a lot of questions in this area, but I think I will leave most of them until a later time.

When I read over this grouping, I had a bit of difficulty, and I am wondering if the Minister can do a very brief summary of how the three areas operate, the Branch Operations, the Youth Programs and the Regional Employment Services.

Can he put together, generally speaking, an overview of how the three areas interact? It is unclear to me as to how they all work together. There appears to be some overlap. Things are not very clear to me, particularly when I look at the draft annual general report. I am wondering if the Minister can provide a brief summary of how it all works together?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Maybe I could just give you an overview of the services and programs that are

provided, and that would help to answer some of your questions.

The Youth and Regional Services Branch develops and implements employment policies and strategies which focus on the needs of students and youth. It is a decentralized program delivery through a network of regional offices. There is the Job Opportunity Service, the Student Temporary Employment Program, known as S.T.E.P., the Manitoba Youth Job Centre program, where their office is set up in communities across the province to bring together students who are looking for employment and businesses, industry or individuals there who are going to provide the jobs.

It also co-ordinates the Volunteers in Public Service program. It is involved with the Manitoba CareerStart program, the Northern Youth Corps and Regional Employment Services, which provides regionalized service to unemployed youth, students and adults living in areas of Manitoba outside of Winnipeg.

I hope that is of some assistance to you.

\* (1520)

**Ms. Barrett:** Yes, I think it will come clear as well as we get through the questioning.

The Branch Operations part of Youth and Regional Services, do those staff people work in Winnipeg? Is that a centralized operations or are they regionalized?

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** It is centralized here in Winnipeg.

**Ms. Barrett:** Could I get the background on the managerial and professional/technical areas? What kinds of people work in this department?

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** While I am getting that information together, I would like to introduce Mary Humphrey who has joined us at the table, Executive Director, Youth and Regional Services.

I will provide you with some further information. The executive director has a Bachelor in Home Economics. It may be called something else now. I have not gotten used to the new name either. The director of Youth and Placement Services has a B.A. The manager of CareerStart and Manitoba Youth Job Centre, a Bachelor of Arts. The manager of S.T.E.P., JOS and VIPS has a certificate in Education. The manager of Computer Services has some computer training from Red River Community College plus years of experience. The office

manager has been in the Civil Service for a considerable amount of time. The program administrator of CareerStart has some university training and private sector clerical employment. There is a policy analyst with a B.A. in Psychology. The co-ordinator of the Manitoba Youth Job Centre has experience in this position and as a student placement officer and also has a Bachelor of Recreational Studies. We have a volunteer consultant who has a B.A., a second volunteer consultant with a B.A. in Psychology and social welfare, and a third volunteer consultant with a Bachelor of Home Economics. The list goes on and on. Is this valuable?

**Ms. Barrett:** I would like to ask a question just for my clarification here. In the draft annual general report on page—well, what I have is 76. They were not numbered, and I think I numbered them properly.

Right under Branch Operations, there is the Job Opportunity Service. Can the Minister tell me where this is found in the Estimates?

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** Yes. It is part of this item that we are on now under Branch Operations.

**Ms. Barrett:** Most of the programs in this division actually place people. Branch Operations also places students and youths; it says here, 1,500 of them. Am I correct in assuming that virtually every one of these smaller parts actually does job placement?

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** Yes, that is true.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you. I guess a general question that I would ask about this whole division, again for clarification, is: How does a person access one or more of these programs? How would you access for example the Job Opportunity Service?

**Mr. Gillieshammer:** There are a number of ways of applying for positions. One can access it through the main office or through regional offices or, at certain times of the year, temporary offices are set up on the campuses of the universities.

I think as you get into some of the other programs with the high school students, they too put some of the office managers through some intensive training up at Gimli and then they open offices. I think we have referenced some 44 of them across the province. Those office managers go to the high schools that they are responsible for and make their programs knowledgeable to the students and do a registration.

**Ms. Barrett:** I am very familiar with Gimli and training sessions that have been held in that lovely community outside the city of Winnipeg.

The Job Opportunity Service then places students and youths within the Government. Is that correct? It says here. So people come to the Branch Operations in Winnipeg and they are placed in this department in this program into Government departments?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Ms. Barrett:** Are there particular guidelines for determining what students would be eligible for Job Opportunity Service programs as in comparison to other programs in this branch?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The primary focus of the program is for students who are in school and making a commitment to return to school.

**Ms. Barrett:** Is this in high school, or university, or community college, or a combination?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Well, it is a combination. The centres and the offices are designed to assist both high school and university students, and students in the three community colleges.

**Ms. Barrett:** I have a general question on most of the placement programs that are listed here. It would appear that there is very little change anticipated in the expenditures from '89-90 to '90-91. I am wondering, given our recent problems with unemployment and the economic situation, if there is some anticipated additional expense perhaps made to take into account those external changes?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The program which is reflected in this budget is one that, by and large, took place during the past summer.

**Ms. Barrett:** So I assume then that the budget process which is under way will for this next fiscal year, or which will be starting soon for '91-92, will take into account changes in external realities?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** My limited experience is such that I would not anticipate anything in the next budget. We will be entering into those discussions when we have the opportunity to finish this Session.

**Ms. Barrett:** Can you explain this note No. 1 under this S.T.E.P. program? Why are there 118 staff years when the departments are providing—it says here, the departments are providing dollars from their own appropriations?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the staff years show up in this department, but the payment of salaries for

S.T.E.P. students came from across Government departments.

\* (1530)

**Ms. Barrett:** The Manitoba Youth Job Centre has 1.16 staff years attached to it. Yet, when I read what the program is in the Annual General Report, it looks fairly extensive. I am wondering what the duties of that 1.16 staff person are.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is the staff years which reflect the central co-ordination of the program. When the temporary offices are set up, the local communities have boards which assist in the sponsorship of the local offices. A summer student is actually hired as the office manager. These are hired across the province.

**Ms. Barrett:** These students who were hired to manage the smaller offices were hired under funds provided by the federal Government, or where do those funds show up? Are they part of the grants or—

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Those office managers are provincially funded and show up under the Manitoba Youth Job Centre.

**Ms. Barrett:** Can the Minister tell me what page the Manitoba Youth Job Centre—no, okay, thank you. The \$177,000, that was my next question. That was a very nice salary for 1.6 persons, and I was wondering how I could apply for it. Those are the salaries for the regional summer people who are hired to actually implement the Job Youth Centre program.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think I referred to 44 regional offices being set up. The bulk of that would be for the salaries of the office managers.

**Ms. Barrett:** A couple of questions on Volunteers in Public Service. How long has this program been in existence?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Approximately 10 years.

**Ms. Barrett:** These two staff years—they work within the provincial Government to help the provincial Government deal with issues around volunteers.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, they co-ordinate the volunteer placement throughout the Government.

**Ms. Barrett:** Yes, I am particularly interested in—at the bottom of the page in the annual general draft report that talks first about this program, provide consultation on volunteer management to provincial Government staff responsible for the operation of

Government boards and committees. Is this Government boards and committees the boards and commissions that operate throughout the Government? Is that what this line refers to?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I believe the boards and commissions the Member is referring to falls under another department. This is put in place to provide consultation on volunteer management to provincial Government staff, responsible for the operation of Government boards and committees. I think you are maybe confusing two things.

**Ms. Barrett:** I may very well be. Could the Minister give me an example of three or four of those boards and committees that would be working with—that these volunteer and public service program would be working with?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** This body provides consultation on the use of volunteers. Maybe a good example that I can give you is, in many communities across the province there are recreation committees or boards which consist of representatives from the school division, representatives from the municipalities, representatives appointed by the town. The one I am thinking of I know has seven locally appointed volunteers, but representing various interest groups within the community. This committee would be prepared to go out and work with them to see that their committee or board operates in an efficient and proper fashion.

**Ms. Barrett:** That did clarify for me what was meant by that. I am wondering if it is possible to get a copy of Procedures and Standards of Operations for Volunteer Involvement, a guidebook?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, we would provide that for you.

**Ms. Barrett:** It also states that the staff provided a total of 82 consultations on volunteer management to 21 different branches of nine departments and to 13 non-Government agencies. Could the Minister give a sample of what the non-Government agencies might be?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Some of these examples perhaps are distantly related to other branches of Government, but local ambulance services, again, rely on volunteers. They do have more of an arm's-length connection with certain departments of Government.

**Ms. Barrett:** These 82 consultations, were they generally in response to requests, or did the staff actively seek out opportunities to consult?

\* (1540)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I would answer that it is a little bit of both, that they contact departments to let them know that the service is available but, by the same token, groups come forward and access assistance from this group as well.

(Mrs. Linda McIntosh, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**Ms. Barrett:** Madam Acting Chair, is this 82 consultations on a—how does it relate to the average over the last few years? Is it higher or lower or about the same as the consultations for previous years?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told the consultations were at an average level.

**Ms. Barrett:** Yes, I just have a couple of other questions on the Regional Employment Services. The Regional Employment Services are the southern and the northern provision of job creation programs for students? Is that correct?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, those regional offices are there to assist people in finding jobs, not only students, but certainly the student component becomes more evident during summer months.

**Ms. Barrett:** Could the Minister tell me if this regionalization has been in effect for a long period of time, or is this a fairly new situation?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, it has been in effect for a long time.

**Ms. Barrett:** Madam Acting Chair, I have I am sure a lot of other questions, but at this point I think I will pass on this for the moment.

**The Acting Chairman (Mrs. McIntosh):** Item 6.(c) Youth and Regional Services: 6.(c)(1) Branch Operations \$862,800.00. Shall the item pass?

**Mr. Alcock:** I have a few questions on this item. I would like the Minister to start by just fitting this together for me. The Branch Operations are Winnipeg based and part of what administrative structure? Are they located with the current Winnipeg regional operations? Are they a separate unit altogether? Do they have any joint responsibilities with people either in Income Security or in the Regional Services that are delivered by this department?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that they are altogether separate.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is there any intention on the part of the

Government to begin, now that it has brought all of these various services together under the umbrella of Family Services and has gone through a reorganization in the department, to make perhaps more efficient use of all these regional operations that it has? Is there some intention to merge some of the functions with other regional operations or is it the intention to keep them separate and distinct?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We will be reviewing our regional operations to make every attempt to make the best use of them possible.

**Mr. Alcock:** Will that review include the Youth and Regional Services as well as Income Security as well as the regional operations under the first division in this Estimates?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** In due course we will be reviewing the entire system. The Member speaks of some consolidation that was done by my predecessor and my feeling is that we have to in due course review the entire system. Once we finish our Estimates and finish our time in the House between Sessions I hope to have a better look at that.

**Mr. Alcock:** Just on a previous question, that would be a review of the entire organizational structure on the service delivery side of the department, or is it just in referencing these particular services?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** My plan is to have an overall review of the services that we provide and the structure which is presently in place.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is this review still in the conceptual stage, or has somebody been assigned the task of beginning to pull this together and beginning to develop a plan for approaching it?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is still in the conceptual stage.

**Mr. Alcock:** I recognize that ministerial time is precious at the best of times, but does the Minister have any sense of by when he would hope to have at least the first sense of how they might move? I mean, would that be in time for the next Estimates, or is this a year or two down the road?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I expect there may be some changes in the short term, but I think my perception is that this is a long-term process as I get to understand the department and have a better feel for things.

There are certain items that have come to my attention at this point in time that I think that I want to look at. As I have indicated, we need the time to back away from things like the Estimates process

and the work we do in the House making laws for the Province of Manitoba, and have a little bit of time to step back and look at the whole system.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am just trying to get the organizational structure for this division clear in my own mind. You have Youth and Regional Services and what we are looking at right now are the Branch Operations. Then you have Youth Programs which are funds made available for employment programs across a variety of areas. Then you have, under Regional Employment Services, a grouping of staff that are—it indicates under the activity, decentralized program delivery in rural and northern areas of Manitoba. One would presume no Winnipeg involvement, but that might be carried out by Branch Operations—I am not sure.

Then you have Special Programs and Immigrant Services which seems to be stuck in the middle of this. Then you have all the Human Resources Opportunity Programs which, again, are employment-related programs directed at people with special needs or people on Income Security programs.

I am just trying to get a sense of this—I mean, there is an administrative unit to this whole division which we have already passed on. Is this Branch Operations the administrative head of all the youth employment programs? Is that how it functions?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, that is correct.

\* (1550)

**Mr. Alcock:** Then the Regional Employment Services group, are they the program delivery arm for the youth employment services, or are they also involved in Special Programs and Immigrant Services, HROP and HROC and all of the H's.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, you were right with your first suggestion. They are not involved with the others.

**Mr. Alcock:** When we are talking about this service area, we are talking about Youth and Regional Services, Branch Operations, the Youth Programs, and the Regional Employment Services. Those three items make a package that results in the delivery of employment-related services to youth, primarily in the summertime, throughout the entire province.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** In the two operational lines, the branch and the Regional Employment Services, there are some 47 SYs. Are these annual, I mean they are

indicated as full SYs on this particular chart and yet most of the operations that they are involved in are related to summer employment. I am wondering what these 47 SYs do the remainder of the year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There is additional staff that are taken on over the summer period which run the job offices, the 44 offices I referenced, throughout the province. As a regional presence across the province, this branch also handles programs for other departments. I would just mention two of them. The Community Places Program, which is offered by Culture, Heritage and Recreation, staff from this department assist in the overseeing of those projects when they are in their planning stages and when the decisions have to be made on whether they meet the criteria and go ahead. They work with that department and also assist the Department of Education with youth training. There is ongoing work that takes place all year round, and then summer staff are put in place to look after the youth centres that are placed across the province.

**Mr. Alcock:** The 44 centres that the Minister referenced earlier, these are opened and closed, the bulk of them just for some three- to four-month period, and staffed by summer employment persons, presumably under the direction of this core staff in some way?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct. Those offices are open, I believe, in the latter part of May, and close about the second week in August. There often is a local committee, I guess there always is a local committee that oversees the operation of that office. Once that committee is put in place, they are sent a list of potential candidates who are leaving university or community colleges, usually around May 1. Those students are notified, and they can apply for the job. The local committee will interview the candidates who have shown some interest, assist in the opening of an office security space, get the proper furniture, get the phone hooked up, sort of oversee along with regional staff who come out for the official opening to have the ribbon cut, and then they make contact throughout the weeks that the program is in place.

**Mr. Alcock:** Forty-four offices. That is a lot of ribbons to cut. It must keep the Minister very busy. How many offices are permanent under this particular program?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think it is necessary to correct something the Member said. The offices are open

by the local committee that I have some knowledge with, and there will be 44 committees across the province. While they would all love to have the Minister come out and assist with the opening, I am not aware that the Minister has been involved in any of them. I think the appropriate attention is placed on the volunteers in the local community who give so willingly and freely of their time when these offices are opened.

**Mr. Alcock:** Under this constellation of staff and services, how many of those offices are open year round. I understand then the 44 are temporary offices that are open, but presumably the 25 staff in the Regional Employment Services live in some sort of office. How many offices are open around the province?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** In southern Manitoba there are offices in Steinbach, Teulon, Winkler, Killarney, Brandon and Dauphin; and in the northern portion of the province they are open in The Pas, Thompson and Churchill.

**Mr. Alcock:** These staff in these offices—oh, just before I do that, the Branch Operations, the Minister referenced other operations or other services that these staff provide. When we looked at the offices that are opened, we named offices in a variety of communities outside of the city of Winnipeg. Do then the Branch Operations staff, the 22 staff in 09-6C-1, do they deliver the same services in the city of Winnipeg?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** So outside of the summer activity, and presumably the work up to the summer being the busiest period followed by some reporting requirements at the end of the summer but the rest of the year once they have dealt with what must be a considerable amount of work, they are working with the Department of Education in youth training, and they are doing the initial studies and feasibility and planning work with groups that are seeking funds under community places?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Those activities I referenced were in the regional offices throughout the province, not in the Winnipeg office.

**Mr. Alcock:** So where does one access those services in the city of Winnipeg?

\* (1600)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I know that they are offered through the Department of Culture, Recreation and



Heritage, and Education and offices that they have in the city of Winnipeg. Those branches, particularly Culture, Heritage and Recreation, just do not have the field offices across the province. Education, at one time, did have field offices and field officers—at one time they were called school inspectors—operating across the province. That was scaled down considerably by the previous Government, and their presence out in the field has been displaced in many instances by local boards of education, superintendents, and auxiliary staff that they have hired.

**Mr. Alcock:** Given that the city is some 50 percent to 60 percent of the activity in the province, and there are 25 staff doing this other work during the off months from the summer program—the Community Placement and education service—what are the 22 staff in the city doing then in the off months?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Their function in the off season, so to speak, is the program evaluation of the previous year, planning for the coming year, the preparation of brochures and pamphlets, the reviewing of guidelines and the preparation to go into another season.

**Mr. Alcock:** The job opportunities service that this branch provides a central registration for, how long has that been in operation, how many years?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Since about 1970.

**Mr. Alcock:** How is this service co-ordinated with Manpower, and their student summer employment program?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that our people work very closely and co-operatively with Canada Immigration and Employment to make referrals and to see that there is not a duplication of services.

**Mr. Alcock:** This central registration and referral service that provides service to approximately 9,800 students, is this registration and referral strictly to the jobs that are provided under the various programs; S.T.E.P., Manitoba Youth Job Centre, CareerStart '90, and Youth Corps?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** And for all Government positions.

(Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

**Mr. Alcock:** Would any of these jobs be registered also with Canada Manpower, or does the Government only register with this Job Opportunity Service?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, they are not jobs registered with Canada Manpower.

**Mr. Alcock:** Of the 9,800 students that it was anticipated would be served through this appropriation, how many of them were placed?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There were 1,500 placements.

**Mr. Alcock:** Where did the others come from then? Where did the other people who were placed in these various jobs—how did they access those jobs if they are not cross-registered at Canada Manpower and if you only placed 1,500 of the 9,800?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There were some 9,800 who got registered. The 1,500 were placed. Others acquired their positions directly with the employers.

**Mr. Alcock:** It is just interesting in the branch operation which talks about a central registration and does talk about service to 9,800 students, and then under the program line there is the placement of about 11,000 students through the 44 centres and employment of 4,800 in summer positions, creation of 521.

Is it that those other jobs are just recruited word of mouth? The employers go out, dig them up and they know who they want? Is there a central access to those—well now, I am more confused—11,000 students placed in 5,200 jobs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Maybe I could give you some additional information that might sort of assist you. I have some figures here. The Job Opportunity Service will assist approximately 9,800 students and unemployed Manitobans and will place about 88 volunteers in career-related experiences. S.T.E.P. employed about 475 students in summer positions. The Manitoba Youth Job Centre program placed 10,905 students and youths. Manitoba CareerStart employed approximately 4,800 students and youths in summer positions. The Northern Youth Corps program created 521 positions, employing 824 students and youths. Regional Employment Services provided assistance in the creation of employment for approximately 2,600 students and youth under CareerStart.

So there are a variety of ways that students can access jobs and a variety of programs that are available.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I see that information in the detail here on the Supplementary Information, except that

one just wants to walk it through, because the 9,800 students who are referred to under the Job Opportunity Service, it is called a central registration, so presumably people who wish to have a summer job in one of these programs register with that central registration. That might mean that they are referred to something in the regions, I am presuming.

\* (1610)

That second one, the Manitoba Youth Job Centre, is what is referred to when we talk about the operating of the 44 summer offices so that the 10,905 students are not placed there, are not working in that program, this is another placement and referral service. Now I am wondering, is the relationship between the Job Opportunity Service and the 9,800 students that it provides central referral service for and the Manitoba Youth Job Centre, which deals with its 10,905, are these the same students? Are we talking about a total of 19,000 or 20,000 and some odd students?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Students may have their name placed both at JOS or at the Manitoba Youth Job Centre and as a result could be on both lists. These that we indicate here are actual placements. I can tell you that the Manitoba Youth Job Centre for instance works with some short-term job placements and as a result students do try and have their name placed as many places as possible. As far as the placing of these students, the Manitoba Youth Job Centre for instance did place 10,905 students.

**Mr. Alcock:** It is placing in jobs other than the ones that are funded under these programs then. If I follow the counts here correctly, there were 475 in S.T.E.P. and 4,800 in CareerStart. I did not quite understand, the northern jobs one was 521 positions. I think the Minister said some 800 youths had been placed in 521 positions. Presumably they are not working full time?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, those would be some part-time positions involved there.

**Mr. Alcock:** I come up with about 6,000 positions, even counting the 800 and 521. Yet we claim credit for placing 11,000 students. These are only in Government? I am just trying to get a sense of where the difference lies.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, they place students in the private sector as well. The Manitoba Youth Job

Centre placed some 10,905 students; most of those would be in the private sector.

**Mr. Alcock:** In the rural areas, is it fair to say then that under this Manitoba Youth Job Centre that they function like a Canada Manpower office? Is there a difference between the service they offer and one that a Canada Manpower office offers?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Well, they are dealing primarily with students, and the university students returning to those communities in the month of May would be dealt with first. Then they do a registration of high school students and try and place them in either full-time or part-time positions that come up in the communities over the summer.

A number of these are in tourism and service industries that relate to tourism.

**Mr. Alcock:** Does Canada Manpower not offer this service during the summertime in the rural areas? It does in the city, but maybe it does not in the rural areas.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Manpower in the rural areas is looking more at full-time adult employment. The program that is offered by the Manitoba Youth Job Centre certainly puts the emphasis on youth.

**Mr. Alcock:** I was just interested in that. I was not aware that Canada Manpower did not offer services to youths outside the city. That is something that should be raised with them, it would seem.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think it is fair to say that they work together with Canada Manpower where those Manpower offices are located. I am not sure of the number of Canada Manpower offices across the province. I can tell you I know they have a presence in Brandon and Dauphin in my area of the province, but the Manitoba Youth Job Centres are placed in a lot more communities. There is, I am told, some co-ordination between the Canada Manpower offices and the Youth Job placement.

**Mr. Alcock:** In S.T.E.P., the Minister referenced the change in the nature of the program, and it is referenced in the Supplementary Estimates here as a result of departments being required to provide the salary dollars, where in the past the dollars were made available to approved departmental projects to employ the people that they were employing for the summer. That was a significant policy change in this last year, where the funds no longer followed those decisions, that one had to find them within. Were departments able to come up with those funds?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I am told that they were able to come up with those funds. They employed 475 students, which is approximately the same number as the previous year.

**Mr. Alcock:** So the \$1,130,300 that was required to support 111.03 SYs, \$214,700 was supporting 118 SYs. Is that because departments are supplementing? I mean, where do the other, these 118 are they part of the 475 that the Minister has referenced, or are they over and above?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The 118.03 staff years are on a full-year basis and actually could employ almost 500 students for summer months.

**Mr. Alcock:** So then in the—yes, the two of them, the 111.03 for the previous year reflects the 474 that were employed, and the 118.03 reflects the 475 that the Minister has said were employed. Was there then an underexpenditure in this particular line?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No.

\* (1620)

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, do I understand the Minister right when he said that because of the part-time nature of the employment that in effect the 118.03 SYs reflected the employment base for this program. He used the number 500, but the actual number of jobs is 475. Is that how you are counting for the SYs that are created under this?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** There are some seven additional SYs shown in the detail that the Minister has provided here, and yet only seven additional full year SYs and only one additional body hired.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The seven staff were from the Department of Environment's Youth Environment Program, and the students on the project replaced trees killed by Dutch elm disease with green ash and basswood trees. The trees were replaced on private land in the city of Winnipeg where the owner agreed to the access and planting. These seven staff years were reallocated to the Department of Environment's Youth Environment Program.

**Mr. Alcock:** Those seven SYs in the Youth Environment Program presumably—I mean was this delivered as a S.T.E.P. component by the Department of Environment?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** Were the people employed in those positions, presumably the seven translate into what

12, 28 or 30 positions, are they counted in the 475 positions that the Minister has already referenced?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Then my question remains the same, 111 full-year SYs provided employment for 474 people and 118.03 SYs provide employment for 475 people. Those are the numbers the Minister has given us, and it would seem to be either that one individual is being paid an awful lot or—

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The variation in the length of time they were hired for would create what seems to the Member to be a discrepancy.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is it as simple as there were a larger number of university students employed this year and therefore there was a large number of weeks employed by all individuals?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It could be that some were hired for a greater length of time. I know that in some areas where university students might be available on the 1st of May and come on at that time others may access the program two weeks later. That would account for some of the difference.

**Mr. Alcock:** As this is all laid out, we show an SY allocation against S.T.E.P., the one we have been talking about that is really the way in which we have distributed the funds to employ people. Against the others we also show SY allocations, but one presumes that these are operational SYs. These are staff that are employed presumably full year to run the program, or staff that are employed in the core operations of this program, and maybe more in the case of CareerStart it is more than the 10.39, but again a part-year employment. They are operational as opposed to the bodies that are being employed under this particular program.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** The establishment of the S.T.E.P. programs are under the Branch Operations, and once they are decided on, the various units that are providing the employment take over the supervision and the ongoing operation of those particular positions.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, they are supervised within the departments.

**Mr. Alcock:** Then for the Northern Youth Corps there is no SY allocation against those in either year. Is that because they are determined and delivered by the Regional Employment Services individuals?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Why, on the operating lines, the Manitoba CareerStart and Northern Youth Corps, are there no year over year increases?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** A decision was made to operate that program with the same funds.

**Mr. Alcock:** Did it provide the same amount of employment?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, it provided approximately the same amount of employment.

**Mr. Alcock:** When the Minister was going through who employed whom in these various programs, he indicated that the JOS, the Job Opportunity Service, was providing employment primarily for students, but also for unemployed persons. How would unemployed persons who are different than students access this program? Can they just walk in and apply?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** How many such persons would one be providing service to?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We referenced 9,800 individuals, some students and some unemployed Manitobans. Of that number, 8,900 were deemed to be students, and 900 were deemed to be unemployed Manitobans.

\* (1630)

**Mr. Alcock:** Under Manitoba CareerStart, that program I believe has two components to it, one which delivers one-half of a wage rate plus a portion of expenses to private sector employers—and presumably the private sector employers make up the rest of the wage and expenses—and I believe a minimum wage amount to the public sector, public sector being not-for-profit organizations who apply for those funds where I believe the minimum wage is provided plus a benefit allowance of about 10 percent if memory serves me correctly.

Of the 4,800 students employed under this particular program, what proportion were private sector and what proportion were not-for-profit? In other words, which received half the subsidy, which received the full subsidy?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The breakdown of those positions were—those placed in business were 2,406, institutional placements 833 and non-profit was 1,355. So there is sort of almost a 50-50 split there.

**Mr. Alcock:** The institutional placements, would these be Government institutions? Would these be

things like St. Amant Centre? I am just trying to get a sense of what you mean by an institution.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Hospitals and school divisions. I can tell you just from observation that a lot of school divisions do additional items that are not possible when schools are being in use. I know divisions, for instance, do a thorough cleaning of their buses. They hire students to come in and do that.

**Mr. Alcock:** On the three core programs that actually deliver employment—S.T.E.P., the Manitoba CareerStart and the Northern Youth Corps—how long have each of them been in existence?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The CareerStart program started in 1983, and the Youth Corps dates back some 11 years further.

**Mr. Alcock:** So presumably 1972 on S.T.E.P.? Memory tells me S.T.E.P. has been around 10 years or so, but—

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I am told it goes back to 1970.

**Mr. Alcock:** Then that does bring up a question. In looking at the draft annual report for the department, and I recognize that this is a new area for this department, but would it not be possible to provide some tables that do indicate the year-over-year differences? I know for the summer employment resources and for the northern employment services there are some indications of placements in various programmatic areas. There is not an overall indication of who is placed through what programs nor what the year-over-year differences are, nor is there much on the City of Winnipeg.

So I would just ask the Minister to look at that as you are looking at finalizing that particular annual report to see if we cannot get a little more indicative information without having to work so hard among the various lines. That would also shorten the Estimates process too.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We will take that advice and review it.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, I think I am fine as far as this line that we are on right now, which is the Branch Operations, 09-6C-1. I thank the Minister for the information he has provided, and we can pass this line.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 6.(c)(1) Branch Operations, \$862,800—pass; 6.(c)(2) Youth Programs, \$7,045,200—pass; 6.(c)(3) Regional

Employment Services, \$1,481,000—shall the item pass?

**Mr. Alcock:** I notice in the Regional Employment Services the Transportation amounts have dropped rather significantly.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am glad the Minister can do the same math that I can.

It does indicate at the bottom here a loss of the cost-sharing agreements. Can the Minister tell us what the loss sustained was in this year and what the impact has been on the overall program?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The reduction was some 406,000 in 1990-91. This reflects some adjustments that had to be made when the Government of Canada did not provide funding under the Northern Development Agreement, and it has led to some rationalization of services.

**Mr. Alcock:** Am I correct in understanding that we have reduced staff in the Regional Employment Services by nine as a result of this reduction and presumably that is why we have—it is also referenced that is why we have this other reduction in Transportation and in Other Operating and Supplies, et cetera.

We have lost basically nine SYs. I am presuming these are full-year SYs, year-round service delivery people as opposed to an SY that represents so many weeks of part-time employment. We have lost those nine SYs, but we have still delivered the same volume of service.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There have been some adjustments that had to be made in the delivery of service, particularly in northern Manitoba.

**Mr. Alcock:** Could the Minister detail for us those adjustments? All the figures we have on the northern employment services seem to indicate that they are delivering the same amount of employment. What adjustments are northern communities having to face as a result of this?

\* (1640)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I can give you further information on that.

We have seen the closing of the Leaf Rapids and Lake Winnipeg region offices and reassigning that workload to Thompson, Eastman and Interlake regions. We have done some downsizing in The Pas, Thompson and the Westman South offices for a portion of the year. We have discontinued what

was called the Client Assistance Program. We had to terminate the Northern Metis Council grant, and we have recovered some of the operating expenses from programming delivered through CareerStart and Manitoba Community Places.

**Mr. Alcock:** I think the Minister gave us a list of offices and such that have changed—the workload that has been reassigned as a result of this change. Am I correct in stating that we are delivering the same volume of employment that we were formerly delivering with nine additional staff?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The statistics that we looked at, by and large, were from this past summer. The downsizing of these offices started in September and reflect the latter portion of this year.

**Mr. Alcock:** Are we saying that if we are cutting the equivalent of nine full-time SYs, but we are not starting to do that until September, so we are doing it over a six-month period instead of a 12-month period? Are we, in effect, cutting the equivalent of 18 positions?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, then were these nine SYs that are referenced here as being lost—if I understood the Minister correctly, then they were not laid off until September of this year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, that adjustment did not require layoff, but the adjustment was started in September.

**Mr. Alcock:** The adjustment, if I may use the Minister's word, is a reduction from 34.26 to 25.26, in other words, nine full-time staff years. Is that correct, and that did not start till September?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, in past, if one tried to eliminate a full-time position in six months that meant the elimination of the latter half of two full-time positions. So are we removing 18 SYs for the remaining six months of the year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, then how, if we operated with 34 SYs until the end of September, and we are now effective, presumably, October 1 going to operate with 25.26 SYs, are we managing to get rid of these nine additional SYs without encumbering more positions?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Part of the explanation is that some of those positions were vacant at that time.

**Mr. Alcock:** So we were not operating with the full 34 during the year. How many were vacant?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There were four vacancies.

**Mr. Alcock:** Now if we go back to my original question, so with four fewer positions than we were budgeted for, we delivered the same level of employment?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The numbers for this past year were similar to those of the previous year.

**Mr. Alcock:** The short answer is yes.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Now that we are removing another five full-time SYs, is it anticipated that the amount of employment delivered will decrease?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The answer is that you are asking me to speculate on what is going to happen next summer. The Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) is busy in Ottawa today. We are hoping that the federal Government will provide additional funding, but we have to prepare for the eventuality that they do not. We were able to access some funds in other places, for instance, to be able to maintain the Northern Youth Corps this past year.

We are going to be actively planning for our next budget in January or February or whenever we find the time to have that budget finalized and brought before the House again.

**Mr. Alcock:** How were you able to do this, to deliver the same amount of service with four fewer staff, other than effective management by the Minister?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** As the Member well knows, this all occurred before I became the Minister. So even if his analysis was correct, I cannot take credit for it. The service was provided very effectively.

**Mr. Alcock:** If I understand the Minister correctly then, there is some chance that the Northern Youth Corps program will not be offered next year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It appears that the funding level that the federal Government was previously responsible for is not going to be in effect. We felt very strongly that the Northern Youth Corps was a priority and still feel very strongly about that. We would hope that there is a way of being able to operate that program.

**Mr. Alcock:** The Limestone program, is it operated in conjunction with this part of the department?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think I am correct in saying that comes under Education and Training and more

properly would be addressed by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

**Mr. Alcock:** I am just looking here. I may be wrong, I thought I saw it referenced in the annual report. Yes, as a matter of fact it is. This report is not numbered but towards the end of the youth employment programs, under the table that talks about jobs created in Northern Employment Services regions, there is a two-paragraph reference to the Limestone Employment Support Services: Counselling service to the Limestone project in '89-90 provided by two departmental staff and one worker-advisor, et cetera. Has this been transferred back to Education, or was this just an anomaly that took place during the reorganization?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, I am told we still have one staff connected to Limestone.

**Mr. Alcock:** What are they engaged in now?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That person was involved in doing employment counselling and assisting people to find jobs.

**Mr. Alcock:** The Minister uses the term "was". Does this mean that this person is no longer with us?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, the person is still there. I am sorry I used the past tense.

**Mr. Alcock:** Do they function as a part of this Regional Employment Services? Is their SY part of the 25.26 that are referenced in this appropriation?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Do they operate out of an office up at the Limestone site, or are they down in Thompson?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The person is on site at Limestone.

\* (1650)

**Mr. Alcock:** The Minister, when he was going through the changes as a result of the loss of the cost-sharing agreement, to the Northlands agreement I believe it was, referenced the termination of the Northern Metis Council grant. Can you tell us what that grant was for and how much and for what purposes?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that grant was used by the Metis Council to assist in the relocating of people from the outlying areas into Thompson during the boom years of that development.

**Mr. Alcock:** It terminated as part of a natural progression, that the workload that it was provided for had—that the task had been satisfied.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It was terminated to that group for that purpose and part of the reduction of over \$400,000, a shortfall from the federal Government.

**Mr. Alcock:** Does this mean that the need—has it disappeared in those communities? It has been satisfied and the other offices are now able to take care of what level of demand remains?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the demand will have to be satisfied by the office in Thompson.

**Mr. Alcock:** Given the situation in Lynn Lake, were there special offerings made in that community to assist with some of the unique problems that were being faced as a result of the closure of the mine?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** If I recall from that period of time when we were in the House previously, there were staff from Health, from Education and other departments, including Family Services, who were in Lynn Lake to assist individuals in that community to cope with their new circumstances.

**Mr. Alcock:** I think those are all the questions I have on these preliminary ones. We will get to the more meaty areas, I suppose, in time. We can pass this.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 6.(c) Youth and Regional Services (3)—the Honourable Member for Wellington.

**Ms. Barrett:** Sorry, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but back on the Northern Metis Council grant, you said that the grant was cut, but according to the Grants to External Agencies, there is still \$42,900 for this year's Estimates. Can the Minister explain what that money is for?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That reduction was a part-year reduction of that grant. The grant was actually \$85,000 and was scaled back because of the lack of funds forthcoming from the federal Government.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 6.(c)(3) Regional Employment Services \$1,481,000—pass.

Item 6.(d) Special Programs and Immigrant Services: (1) Branch Operations \$145,700.00. We will ask the Minister to introduce the new staff member coming forward to the table.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Joining us at the table is Gerry Clement, Executive Director, Special Programs and Immigrant Services.

**Ms. Barrett:** This program, this department, if I could just recapitulate so I know that I am understanding at least the basics of it, is as well in three main categories: Branch Operations, which is sort of an overall administrative area, and

then—actually four—then the Human Resources Opportunity Program, Employability Enhancement and Immigration and Settlement Services. Is that accurate, that the Branch Operations sort of facilitates the implementation of the programs under the rest of this division?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Ms. Barrett:** It is so nice to be able to figure some of this out at least in a very basic sort of way.

I have one general question on the difference between the Human Resources Opportunity Program, the kind of people that this program is designed for, and the Employability Enhancement Programs.

In the annual general report under Human Resources Opportunity Program it says, specific attention is given to persons receiving or likely to receive social assistance. In the Employability area it talks about Employability Enhancement Programs to assist social assistance recipients.

Can the Minister explain the difference in the two programs and what kinds of people with what kinds of difficulties would be under these two different programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Employability Enhancement Programs are designed for people on social assistance and attempt to get them off the social assistance program. The Human Resources Opportunity Centres deal with sort of the same clientele, although they may not be on social assistance to access the latter.

**Ms. Barrett:** That is sort of how I read the two program descriptions.

How long has the Human Resources Opportunity Program been in existence?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told approximately two decades.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you. The Employability Enhancement Programs were first established in 1987 with a federal-provincial agreement?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is correct.

**Ms. Barrett:** Since the two programs would appear to have some degree of overlap of service delivery, has there been any thought of putting the two together, combining them, or are they enough separate that it would be inappropriate to do that? I am just again trying to get the distinction made between these two programs.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** One of the factors sort of mitigating against that is the federal funding that is involved with the Employability Enhancement. The other is that the Human Resources Opportunity Centres are spread through part of the province but not available everywhere.

**Ms. Barrett:** So what the Minister is saying, if I could rephrase it, is that No. 1, the funding guidelines for the Employability Enhancement Programs are either broader or narrower than the HROCs and, secondly, that the Employability Enhancement Programs are done mainly in Winnipeg where the Human Resource Opportunity Centres are decentralized.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, that is not correct. The point I did make is that there is some cost sharing with the Employability Enhancement Programs and, as a result, the federal Government is also involved.

**Ms. Barrett:** Yes, I am wondering, following on what the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) asked earlier on some of the other programs, if it would be possible to look at putting in some year-over-year comparisons on numbers of people served by these two programs in the annual general statement when it is finalized.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** As I indicated to him, we would take his suggestions into consideration.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** The hour being 5 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings for private Members' hour.

The Committee of Supply will resume sitting at 8 p.m.

## SUPPLY—ENVIRONMENT

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply come to order to continue to consider the Estimates of the Department of Environment. We are on page 55, item 2.(b) Environmental Management (1) Salaries \$3,212,300.00.

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson):** While I was preparing for questions I was looking at page 28 in the annual report from 1986 and '87, and there are some interesting questions I have about one of the charts there.

To begin with, it only shows that there were seven environmental assessments done and seven initial environmental evaluations done. Can the Minister

begin by giving the number of environmental impact assessments from the years since 1987?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Yes, Madam Chairman, we will have to provide that additional information, and I will make sure that it is in the Member's hands as soon as possible. I can assure her that if she is referring to assessments on projects that are brought forward to the Clean Environment Commission, those numbers have probably gone up considerably, but I do not have the numbers in front of me. I take it that was from '87 through to '90 she would like the numbers for, including '87 or starting with '88?

**Ms. Cerilli:** Starting with the year '87-88.

**Mr. Cummings:** Okay.

**Ms. Cerilli:** In looking at that chart one of the things that is striking is all but one of the environmental impact assessments for that year were conducted on Government departments. Even for this current year or the past year, what are the number of environment impact assessments that are done on non-Government development, and what are those developments?

**Mr. Cummings:** I think maybe where we are going to see some divergence of figures here is that in '87-88 and prior to, it was only on Government projects that they were required. That requirement is now expanded.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Can I have some indication of currently what private developments are applying for their environment assessment?

**Mr. Cummings:** Carrying out of inspections of specific operation to determine compliance with The Environment Act licence, condition of approval, and to assess the adequacy of mitigated measures imposed by the Department of Environment. We have two pages of projects that are under way: Potash, North Central Electrification, Reston-Virden Transmission Line, Conawapa, Bipole Transmission Line, Riel U.S.A Line, Shoal Lake Trans-Canada Pipeline Looping are all ongoing, as is land use co-ordination departmental input development plans.

New: We have the LGD Construction in Alonsa, road construction, Carman Flood Protection, Castle Dunes Golf Course, Charleswood Bridge, Fisher Branch Golf and Country, Glenlea Golf Course, Highway 75, Highways Department 227, 340, 584, 587, 589, and PTH 1, PTH 75, PTH 8, Shellmouth access, PTH 75, ICG Gas Pipeline in the Red River



Valley, Larters at St. Andrews Golf Course, Links at Quarry Oaks, Lorette Golf Course, Manitoba Hydro Bipole III and Transmission Line, Manitoba Hydro access road at Conawapa, Manitoba Hydro Conawapa Exploration Program, Manitoba Hydro Kettle Limestone Transmission Line, Manitoba Hydro Selkirk Fibre Optic Cable, Sherridon Transformer Station, Silver Transmission Line and Station, Mars Sandhills Resort, Netley Creek Golf Course, NorthStar Ski Resort, Pinawa Golf Course, Ridgewood South Golf Course, River Oaks Golf Course, Springfield Meadows Golf Club, Manitoba Hydro Conawapa Transmission Line, Loudoun Transmission Line, Lee River Golf Course, Players Golf Course, Department of Highways PTH 334, and PTH Morden-Winkler. Those are all ongoing and new proposals at this time.

**Ms. Cerlilli:** In preparing for environmental impact assessments, what is the department's role, and what is the company or developer's role?

**Mr. Cummings:** The proponent prepares an assessment, and then the department determines if that assessment is adequate and then asks for reworking, if that is necessary at that point.

**Ms. Cerlilli:** I was not clear on the answer. In the chart it says that guidelines are developed. I am interested in finding out how those guidelines are developed and what the relationship is between the proposed developer and the department in developing guidelines, and if there are other things that are involved in preparing for the assessment. I just want more information about the role of the Department of Environment and the developer in preparing for the assessment.

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, the list of information that I just put on the record it seems to me should to a large degree answer some of the concerns that the Member either implied or otherwise put on the record last week regarding the activities of this department. It is a very busy department, being involved in a great deal of environmental enforcement and regulation.

The discussion around whether or not we are involved up front adequately to make sure that the licensing process and the developments are environmentally sensitive up front is one of the more major responsibilities that we have. If we, through the assessment process, develop projects that have minimized or mitigated environmental impacts, then

the ongoing responsibilities of the department are considerably lessened.

\* (1450)

In developing the process, first of all the proponent will be given environmental assessment guidelines. The department lays down in a broad sense what guidelines the proponent should follow to develop an environmental assessment of its impacts. The department consults with a technical advisory committee and issues a draft set of guidelines to the proponents.

We then at that time have consultations with the public for larger projects so that there is an opportunity for the public to have comments on larger projects as the guidelines are being finalized and are still in a position where they could be amended. At that point, after having heard the public issues, the department will issue final guidelines to the proponent.

Guidelines spell out what areas of responsibility must be undertaken to assess any impacts on the environment. That ranges from everything between fish and impacts on adjacent environmentally sensitive areas. It could include construction of roads to a project. It can include of course a public process which follows the presentation of the assessment and the public input where the Clean Environment Commission has called for public hearings.

Really what it does is spell out a broad framework for the proponents to work within. As always, I suppose there are two ways of approaching that, but the way our legislation has been structured and the way the process has been put in place, the proponent is responsible for doing the work in terms of the assessment, very often done by professional consulting groups that would be brought in who have some knowledge of working in this area and know what the impacts would be, because companies might not always have those experts on hand, large companies, very, very large megaprojects being excepted.

In doing the environmental assessment, because it gets as complicated as it does, it seems quite fair and reasonable that expertise be brought in to make sure that the job is done right. The expertise in the commission and the Department of Environment, and ultimately the opponents of the project, if there are any, will take apart the proposal if it is not properly done when it comes forward for final

licensing. I guess I have to indicate that I could go on at great length, but I hope that answers the general direction of how these processes are developed.

**Ms. Cerlill:** Madam Chair, one of the things we are seeing is Governments seem to have a problem doing environment impact assessments on themselves or on branches of other departments of the Government. We have seen that specifically. It is something that I am going to get into shortly is with the Oak Hammock Marsh licence.

Does this Government have a policy to ensure that there is no conflict of interest or relationship between the company that is doing the environment assessment and the developer? Is there a written policy that would ensure that there is no conflict there?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Do you see any marks on the back of my jacket?

The fact is that there is a very careful distinction within Government and a very high degree of responsibility for professional ethics with consultants who would work for proponents in bringing forward assessments. A Government project is treated no differently than a private project; in fact, it probably receives more thorough scrutiny within because of the sensitivity, the fact that they are professionals working within the same large umbrella, if you will, of Government.

I have no doubt in my mind that when the Department of Environment was separated from the Department of Natural Resources, it was to enable a little bit more separation in terms of the regulatory department from the department that would have other responsibilities as well. Natural Resources does other regulatory work, particularly in terms of environmental assessment. The Department of Environment relies on its professionals to assess the work of whoever brings it forward. That also flows through the Clean Environment Commission. What that means is that there is a work that is brought forward and very often the departments will have a fair bit of discussion as to what are the guidelines that are imposed upon projects.

It seems to me that given, particularly the Clean Environment Commission process where there is public hearings and a separate body that gets involved wherever there are public hearings, that we have a pretty good separation of the decision-making responsibilities within

Government. The fact is that the Clean Environment Commission's recommendations as they come back to my department, if the director in my department were to put anything else in the licence besides what is recommended by the commission, he must publicly publish and put on the record what those divergents are and the reasons for making them other than the ones that were originally suggested by the Clean Environment Commission.

The fact is that there are a number of things that this department has the final say on. It determines what is studied and how it is studied through the guidelines, and that is a decision point that is made in this department. Given the quasi-judicial and independent status of the Clean Environment Commission, it seems to me that the process works fairly well. I categorically reject what the Member is suggesting, that Government has trouble assessing projects where a department of Government is the proponent.

More often the problems that you will see discussed in the public forum relates more to the fact that there are two jurisdictions involved rather than one. The federal jurisdiction, whether or not they screen out, screen in, or make a decision at all, has been, not only in Manitoba but all across the country, much more controversial than any decisions that are made within the department.

**Ms. Cerlill:** Is it not true that on the proposed development at Oak Hammock Marsh, Ducks Unlimited did the research that was used in the environment impact assessment?

### Point of Order

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), on a point of order.

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Madam Chairman, I have just entered the Chamber and realized that my friend is asking questions on the Ducks Unlimited project. I do have a conflict of interest which I seek to declare due to my employment, and I will be leaving the Chamber until my friend has finished questions in that area.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Cummlings:** This should not be viewed any different than having any other proponent, if they have professionals on staff. I understand from the department that of the work that was done on this proposal, some of it was done in-house, some of it

done by outside consultants. By in-house, I mean by Ducks employees.

The question is whether or not it is done correctly and professionally. That is the decision that is made by the Department of Environment, and that is why it is sometimes a lonely department.

\* (1500)

**Ms. Cerilli:** The question is: How do you have developer for a project doing the environment impact assessment on that project? I would think that there is a lot of concern of that kind of practice. I do not think that you can be assured that—I have seen from reading some of the letters and appeals that have gone through that there are lots of reason for concern. The research was not adequate, and some of the other research that was done to endeavour to protect the marsh was not considered.

Can the Minister explain why the Bovey Report, which was done by the Canadian Wildlife Service, was not considered at the initial stages of the environment impact assessment?

**Mr. Cummings:** Because it was not available. We undertook to make sure that it was considered in the process that the department undertook and considered any suggestions that were in there because the information had not been available during our public consultation process.

You know, I think the Member is straying, albeit I am sure with good intentions, into an area that she might not wish to really be in and her questioning seems to imply that there may be some incorrect or fraudulent work or information brought forward that was not professional in the assessment of that project or in other projects.

Frankly, the proponent is required to do the work and if it is a consultant he hires, or if it is an engineer who is on staff, or a biologist who is on staff, their work is assessed by the Department of Environment to make sure that it is technically correct and the work is done in the areas that we direct them to do it in.

I use the Repap example as one where massive dollars have been spent. Hydro is another example which you will see in the not too distant future where massive dollars are being spent to make sure that the environmental concerns are being addressed in the assessment process.

So I hope she is not implying that there was shoddy work or that there was something being

shoved under the carpet on this process, because if she is, I hope she is prepared to give me some specifics.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Can the Minister explain when the research for the environment impact assessment was begun or undertaken and when was it completed for the Oak Hammock Marsh development?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, the implication is that perhaps there was information used before, that was collected prior to the project being in a position to apply for a licence. I would suggest that type of information, as long as it is not outdated in terms of its scientific knowledge and its technical accuracy, is entirely suitable to bring forward as assessment of impacts as part of a project.

You only need to look at a number of projects to know, and I think again one could look to Manitoba Hydro to clearly indicate they have been working on environmental assessment in the larger sense for a long period of time, because there is such a massive amount of information to acquire. A proponent has to get out in front of it or they will simply get buried in time frames. They have to be out there.

Any environmentally-conscious proponent will be out there working to make sure they have the information on hand to deal with whatever aspects of a proposal are deemed to have environmental impacts. It would only be prudent and, if I were on the board or management of companies that were responsible for implementation of large projects that have significant environmental impacts, that is exactly what I would be saying. Let us get started at it. We have to have the initial information so it can assist us in responding to the initial guidelines, if nothing else.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I asked the question on when the research on the ecosystem in Oak Hammock Marsh was initiated for this project. The Minister seems to be implying that there was research that was used from the department. Is that what I am to understand? If so, can the Minister table research done in the department on the wildlife in Oak Hammock Marsh, or can he answer the question, when was the research initiated and when was it completed?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, I do not remember mentioning the department in any context in an answer that I just gave. The department gives the guidelines. It does not do the

assessment. It assesses the work that is done by the experts who are doing the assessment on behalf of the proponent. I gave the answer I did because there seemed to be some implication that it would be questionable to have work done before you had put an application in.

The fact is I cannot answer under what time frame they began collecting information. As long as the information was accurate and satisfactory to the professionals who examined it, it does not matter if it was collected six months before the application went in. It is still relevant information to make the environmental assessment decision.

**Ms. CerlIII:** The Minister has raised the issue of professionalism. Let us try and take a different tact with this then. Can the Minister give the names and the qualifications of the individuals on the CEC who looked at the research and information on the environment assessment for Oak Hammock Marsh?

**Mr. Cummings:** I would like a little clarification. Is the Member asking what are the qualification of the commissioners, or is she asking about the qualifications of anyone connected to the commission or the department who would have looked at the assessment that was brought forward?

**Ms. CerlIII:** As I understand it, it is the individuals on the Clean Environment Commission who are expected to make a recommendation or a decision on the development. I do want to know the qualifications of the individuals on the commission. If the Minister would like to also give information regarding other people involved with those recommendations, I would be happy to hear that too. If there is a need to consult with staff, I will wait for this one.

**Mr. Cummings:** First of all, Stan Eagleton, the chairman of the commission is a 25-year civil servant who has most of his life worked with environmental assessment and environmental regulation. Barrie Webster, Ph.D. in biology—chemistry I believe, and Betty Pawlicki, who would be I guess a citizen-at-large. I believe another member who might have sat on that panel would have been Arnie Barr, who is a retired Assistant Deputy Minister of Natural Resources. Three out of four are very definitely, from a professional point of view, trained in that area.

Off the top of our heads, those are the four we recall who would have sat on that panel. If you will

give me a minute, I want to consult the department for further information.

To further expand on the topic of who would have had comment and who would have provided some professional assessment of what was being put forward, there would have been about 20 people from within Government, some of whom were in my department. The members who make up the technical advisory committee, who would have had input and had observations on the technical capacity of the work that was brought forward; those would all be professional people.

I think to a great degree one should be satisfied that, from a technical point of view, what is brought forward within the guidelines—and the guidelines are struck through a very consultative process involving both professionals and the public. Then at the hearing process, our people are called forward to testify as to the technical correctness of what is there. They are asked questions based on what is seen in the report. There are a lot of checks, and balances, and cross-checks, and rechecks in the system.

\* (1510)

If we live in a society that believes in the jury system, as it will, where you can find 12 good men and women off the street who are not prejudiced, and they could make this life or death decision, I think this process should also provide some comfort, because not only have we taken people from a fairly broad cross section of society, but we have also a very large technical aspect to it to make sure that the work is done properly.

**Ms. CerlIII:** As I understand it, there was a split decision initially with the panel. I was not aware initially that the panel was as small as it is. Can the Minister explain the grounds for rejecting the proposal that half of the members of the panel took?

**Mr. Cummings:** We had a majority decision. If she is asking me to defend the minority decision, or explain the minority position, I think that works rather much the same as when we have a split decision of the courts. The majority does make the decision. We based our decision on the information and the recommendation of that commission. Plus, it is given further technical evaluation by my department and adjusted in the issuing of a licence. That adjustment in this case involved the fact that we felt the commission did not have, within its mandate, the right to tell Ducks Unlimited or Natural Resources

how much they should charge at the gate. We are getting a little away from what was even environmentally a concern.

**Ms. CerlIII:** I think I have a reasonable question. The Minister has just said that there were people on the panel, or the commissioners, who had qualifications in biology and a number of years with the department. Even if there was only one of them who, based on their experience, chose to reject the proposal, I think it is a reasonable question to ask what were the grounds on which they were basing those objections.

**Mr. Cummings:** It really baffles me when we are not even, to my knowledge—or I have never been made aware of which two members, if indeed there were two, who objected. Perhaps the Member has a pipeline into the CEC that I do not have. Maybe she would like to tell me who objected and why, because we do not have a minority report.

**Ms. CerlIII:** To clarify my question, I did not ask who objected. I asked the grounds on which they rejected the proposal. I would think that in the report of the CEC, that would be made clear. I think that this is one of the projects that is involving the department at this time. The Minister, I am sure, can get the information. It is a project that has a lot of public concern, there are a number of appeals to the project. Can the Minister explain what were the reasons given by members of the panel for rejecting the proposal for Ducks Unlimited to build their corporate office at the Oak Hammock Marsh?

**Mr. Cummings:** No. Perhaps I should expand on that a little bit. The fact is, I do not have a minority report. The report that I have is the one that is the public document. Anything that you read in there is the same as what I read. That is why I explained earlier that when the commission reports, the department then has to publicly indicate and state whatever changes they would have made in relationship to anything that did not coincide with the recommendations of the commission. What you get is what you see, and what you see is what you get.

The implications that somehow this commission is manipulated by the Government of the Day, is perhaps a reflection on her predecessors, because this Act was structured under the previous New Democratic Party. The fact is that we allow, as with our Crown corporations, that they should make their decisions based on the best information, and the best knowledge that is at hand. Sometimes that is a

little frustrating, I would admit. The fact is that if we are to maintain the credibility of this body, and I very much believe that their credibility is intact, it is important to the public that this body continue to be independent and credible. That is why we have people like Stan Eagleton as the head of it. He has been there and involved in this process for a long period of time. He runs the process, as I understand it, in a manner that allows for very casual input, if you will.

The public is allowed to come to the hearings and have an opportunity to be heard. He does not run it in an excessively legalistic approach. I get pressure from people who say, this should be more of a courtlike forum. When you get into the larger processes, the CEC does have to have its legal counsel on hand. Sooner or later, we have got to make a stand on behalf of the little people of this province, and the way Mr. Eagleton has been running the CEC allows him to have some comfort in coming forward to these hearings without having to hire a \$100-an-hour lawyer to represent them.

I am very much defensive in terms of keeping the process so that it is open to the public. The proponents and the larger processes will undoubtedly unfold into a more structured program, but this is not something that is run under the thumb of the Government. They operate in the manner that I have explained and their recommendations are used as recommendations. Ultimately the decision lies in my department to which I am the appeal, unless it is a higher level project and then the Cabinet would be appealed to my decision. That allows for that one last sober thought, if you will.

\* (1520)

**Ms. CerlIII:** It was an interesting answer to hear the Minister again say that the law should not be used to protect the environment. There seems to be a lot of concern that lawyers and the law should be kept away from protecting the environment. That seems to be one of the major concerns of this Government. If the Minister is not able to answer the questions, if there was no consideration of the opposite side, I would think that in the CEC both pro and con were considered and both sides' views were considered. I think it is important in a project like this that people who are opposed to the development be given a fair hearing and have their concerns considered. I would hope that the Minister would know what the concerns are of the CEC on this matter.

What are the main concerns that the commissioners had in terms of the development this project?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, in the hearing process I know what concerns were raised in the public forum. I do not get a minute from the Clean Environment Commission which indicates to me what minority position is. One could naturally assume that it was related to some of the objections that were raised by those who were the opponents of the project. But if the Member feels that there is some importance in forcing those members of the commission who are of a dissenting opinion to come out and explain that position, then I think she misunderstands and misrepresents how this information gathering and recommending body operates.

They do have a responsibility to take in all points of view that are represented at the hearings. Unless you think the Minister should chair these meetings, and I am sure you do not, then why would I be privy to their internal discussion on the toing and froing of how they reached this decision? During the course of the appeal which I will undertake in the not too distant future, the appeals that we have received—I will get professional opinion on the validity of the appeals that are brought forward and balance that against the recommendations of the CEC and the best professional information that I can obtain. I think the Member is truly treading in an area that is not conducive to the health of the commission if you are suggesting we should single out those members who may have been dissenting.

Some of them may have already said publicly what their concerns are, but in their decision-making process they have to take into context all of the concerns that are raised. Certainly it is my intention to keep the integrity of the Clean Environment Commission above reproach, and one way of doing that is to give the assurance in fact and in practice, that I do not direct the actions of the CEC.

**Ms. CerlIII:** And around and around we go. Let us try a different approach to this.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Cummings:** In my opinion the critic for the NDP, the Member for Radisson, is reflecting on the quality of the CEC and the integrity of the Members, and if she does not have enough guts to stand up and say so, quit playing around the bush.

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over facts.

\* \* \*

**Ms. CerlIII:** Some of us are having difficulty understanding why -(interjection)- Some of us on this side of the House, some environmentalists are having difficulty understanding why -(interjection)- Most environmentalists, all that I have talked to.

Madam Chair, I would like the Minister to explain why Ducks Unlimited has made the decision to build their office at this particular site.

**Mr. Cummings:** The Member accused me a moment ago of going round and round. Our responsibility is one of licensing. I do not have to go back and explain the intentions of the proponent. We respond to the environmental impacts. If there are any emissions to air, water or land—I am sure what the Member is driving at is that some body of citizens in this province question whether or not there should be any development on that site or not. That is an issue that was raised at the hearings. It is an issue that probably will never be totally answered, but it is not an issue that needed to be addressed by the Clean Environment Commission. Their job was to assess environmental impacts, whether or not they could be mitigated or eliminated. They made recommendations on that basis and the director issued a licence on that basis. But the other thing that the Member and I both have to be somewhat cautious on, is that I am still going to be hearing the appeal on this licence, and I would rather not get into too many details on the discussion of the licence itself, or I will have to be like the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and leave the Chamber as well because of a conflict of interest, and then the Member will have a problem asking questions.

**Ms. CerlIII:** The Department of Natural Resources and Ducks Unlimited have produced pamphlets that show that they are partners in this development. I would think that there would have to be some benefits or some good reasons why there would need to be this structure from Ducks Unlimited to set the precedent of building on a wildlife management area. Again, I feel like my questions are very legitimate. What are the advantages to Ducks Unlimited to have their office building on the marsh?

**Mr. Cummings:** I suppose that would be better phrased within the Natural Resources Estimates,

and because of what I just talked about a moment ago in terms of the appeal, I think that we have probably come to the end of questioning on this area.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Are there any environmental research benefits to having this facility in the marsh rather than on Waverley Street in Winnipeg?

### Point of Order

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, on a point of order.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** It is not my wish to interfere in my colleague's Estimates, except let me try to be of this help, as he has tried to explain it. His job, the department's job, the Clean Environment Commission's job is to assess the environmental impact of a particular project. His department is not a proponent of the department. My department is. In collaboration with Ducks Unlimited Canada. I am more than prepared, in fact I invite the Honourable Member's questions as a proponent of the project to explain the advantages to the department, to the Government, to the research facilities of the province with respect to wildlife, but I do not think it is appropriate, in fact it is entirely inappropriate to ask the Clean Environment Commission in itself to comment on this matter, and it is inappropriate to ask the Minister who is currently being asked. I know he is a man of integrity, who is considering a number of appeals with respect to the final licensing authority of that project.

The questions that you legitimately ask of this department are the workings of the Department of Environment with respect to the impact of the project on the environment, and that is contained in the report, Madam Chairman. If that has been in any way helpful to the deliberations, that is how they were meant to be.

\* (1530)

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources does not have a point of order; however, he is attempting to clarify departmental jurisdiction.

\* \* \*

**Ms. CerlIII:** Part of the facility is being touted as an environmental education facility. I would think that would mean that the Minister for the Environment (Mr. Cummings) will be involved. The longer we

pursue this area though, becomes more clear—now they are consulting—that we have good cause for wondering about the reasons for the decision to build this facility at Oak Hammock Marsh. Again, my questions seem, I would think, reasonable. There has been what is a controversial decision. I am asking the question, what are the research benefits in terms of research on the environment, be it habitat for wildlife, be it research—there is going to be a lagoon there that will have to be monitored very carefully—on how to monitor a lagoon such as there will be there, so that there is not adverse effects on the environment. What are the benefits or the functions that are going to be done at this facility that could not be done elsewhere or at the existing facility for Ducks Unlimited?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not going to take advantage of what I think would be a situation where I could chastise the Member rather severely. Her questions are legitimate. I am simply saying that this is not the department to ask. We have no money involved. As well, we do not, during the licensing decision, make decisions related to that management aspect.

As in a number of licences, a large number of licences, whether they are public or private, the monitoring information that is gained from a project is very useful. I do have some thoughts about the educational aspects, but those fall in the Department of Natural Resources. If I respond today, I would be very sure that I will be eating my words on the public record very quickly, because I am still hearing the appeals to this licence. If the Member wishes to pursue this line of questioning, she simply will not get any useful response from me.

**An Honourable Member:** Pass.

**Ms. CerlIII:** I am on my feet here.

**Madam Chairman:** Does the Honourable Member for Radisson have a question?

**Ms. CerlIII:** You bet. I just want to make sure I will follow the Minister's comments. I understand, I will not ask questions about the licence. We will have to wait for that.

One of the concerns with the project is that the plans do not seem to be complete. Has there been a consideration of what will happen to the facility if Ducks Unlimited chose to vacate the premises?

**Mr. Cummings:** The licence is a licence to operate and would not necessarily fall only on the proponent who brought it forward. In terms of what might happen in this hypothetical situation you stated, I

believe that should also be asked of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). I am not a student of the agreement that was struck.

**Ms. CerlIII:** At the facility at Oak Hammock Marsh, what plans are being made to monitor the water quality?

**Mr. Cummings:** That is a condition of the licence. To that extent, I am not sure how far I can go in answering the question. The standards are set in the licence as to how it will be monitored and the levels. I am not sure I can comment beyond that. I am not sure if I get the direction of the question.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Were plans for monitoring the licence part of the environment impact assessment?

**Mr. Cummings:** The two would not be necessarily connected. The departmental licence—the conditions attached to monitoring are part of the licensing, not part of the assessment process.

**Ms. CerlIII:** These are the kinds of things that I am concerned about the project. There has been a licence then granted that would include monitoring of water quality, yet there was no inclusion of a description of how that would be done in the licence. Can the Minister explain how that occurred?

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

**Mr. Cummings:** This is one aspect of the licence where we do not ask the proponent what to do, we tell them. The department will be the monitoring body. The conditions are in the licence—in reference to any discharges on the specifics of this licence, however, as I have stated, this is under appeal. Let me talk about the larger context, and that is that we will be responsible for the monitoring and control of those standards as a department. It is not something that we consult with the proponent on, it is something we direct them on.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Just let me clarify what the Minister has said. It is the department's responsibility to direct the operator of the facility on how to monitor water quality. That was not part of the environment assessment. Initially, in answering my question, the Minister said a couple of questions ago, that was going to be included in the licence. Who is monitoring the water quality, and who is responsible for putting those procedures and ensuring that happens and putting that in place?

\* (1540)

**Mr. Cummings:** I think the confusion is either in the questioner's mind or mine. It does not matter. You

mentioned waste water, but I think you were talking about the conditions in the licence of monitoring, which is the water quality of the bog. That was contemplated in the assessment. That is where we require the proponent to do the monitoring. They are required to do it by standards that are set by the department, and the procedures that are set by the department.

The lagoon process is a different matter. That is what I am referring to as where we set the standards and they must follow them, and we do the monitoring.

**Ms. CerlIII:** One of the other concerns that I had when starting to research and read material regarding this development is, what kind of alternatives were considered when the site of Oak Hammock Marsh was selected for the Ducks Unlimited facility? Can the Minister explain what alternative sites were explored and the reasons that those were rejected?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Member has raised this question in the House, and I think again it is more correctly directed to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) on the selection of this site. The fact is that in defending why that is there, we are going to get into the discussion of the appeals that I have in front of me because one of them is in fact related, if I am not mistaken, to the location itself.

I have to go back to the answer I believe I gave in the House, which is at the Clean Environment Commission hearings, was the opportunity for those who opposed that specific site to propose alternatives. I believe they did, if I am not mistaken. That does not mean that because an alternative is proposed that through the process that they have gone, they needed to necessarily accept that.

We are getting dangerously close to discussing the appeals on the licence, and I would ask the Member again, not to pursue questioning along this line.

**Ms. CerlIII:** I have a number of other concerns, and I am trying to select things that are not going to address the issue of licence that would jeopardize the appeals. One of the other concerns I think that would have direct relationship to the Department of the Environment is the issue of use of herbicides and pesticides on or near the facility. Is there a policy or provision to ensure that this area, which is environment education area, will not permit the use of pesticides and herbicides?



**Mr. Cummlings:** I would respond to the question this way. Inasmuch as they will not be treated any differently than any other user, which means that they are controlled by regulation, and certainly would not be using anything without permit, and where they are talking about using it, and what they are talking about using, ultimately dictates what would be in a permit.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Does the Government have a policy that disallows the use of pesticides and herbicides in wildlife management areas?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Each application is treated separately and all of the relevant concerns are considered in whether or not a permit can be granted, and for what. Do not contemplate situations that I can give as an example of a wide variety that would encompass also situations like Ducks Unlimited, but if you are talking about this specific site, I do not know what applications would be made. I can only indicate that, if any were made, they would be handled in the way that I just suggested. For obvious reasons you are not going to be permitting anything that I can think of that would be used in that location, but if you are asking me to give you 105 percent assurance, I do not think I can give you any greater assurance than the fact that this is handled through the process that I indicate.

Are you saying that this could even relate to whether or not you use hand control methods in a lagoon, for example, which would likely be the case? I do not contemplate that there would be usage there, but if you are asking me if there is a regulation which specifically bans it in that location, there is not. But I can tell you that—and I am looking at the staff as well—I cannot contemplate any situation where something would be permanent in that respect.

**Ms. CerlIII:** One of the other questions that I had asked was the feasibility of having very much of an increase of tourism into that area and how that would detract from the number of people interested in taking part in the kind of activities and recreation at this kind of a facility. I am speaking specifically about the environment education facility.

Can the Minister clarify what studies have been done to show that having this facility, which is going to hopefully attract more people I would think, is not going to detract from similar facilities like Fort Whyte in Manitoba in the near future.

**Mr. Cummlings:** Those sorts of questions are more correctly directed to the Minister of Natural

Resources (Mr. Enns) than to this department. We are a regulatory department charged with the responsibility of making sure that the impacts of projects are properly dealt with or if the projects are to proceed.

I could give you a long answer on educational aspects and impacts on other educational communities, but I think that should be asked in Natural Resources.

**Ms. CerlIII:** In the last say four or five years, what have been the number of staff—maybe this again is something for Natural Resources, and I will have to join my colleague when we go into that department. Let me rephrase that then. Are there staff from the Department of the Environment who will be working at this facility in the future, and what have been, historically, the number of staff working there in the past?

**Mr. Cummlings:** None in the past and none contemplated.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Just to summarize then, what will be the Department of the Environment's involvement in an ongoing fashion from now with the operation of this facility at Oak Hammock Marsh?

\* (1550)

**Mr. Cummlings:** Our assuming that the licence is upheld and the project proceeds, our responsibilities would be to monitor and enforcement.

**Ms. CerlIII:** I am going to move on to another area now.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Sveinson):** Shall the item pass?

**Ms. CerlIII:** No. One of the things that this Government has talked about since I have been in the House is the limestone development, the Limestone Generating Station. When I was reading the annual report from '86 and '87, page 28 showed that there had been an environment impact assessment completed and that monitoring was ongoing. Is this annual report correct?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Yes, that is correct but this is a post-evaluation rather than pre-. If environmental assessment is to have any meaningful input into the development of projects, it has to be done before they get so far into construction that it cannot be altered.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Sort of like what we are trying to avoid with Conawapa. Can I get some clarification then?

When was this environment impact assessment started in relationship to the development of Limestone, and who did the assessment?

**Mr. Cummings:** I think the Member should simply talk to her leader or some of the other Members, the more senior Members, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) can explain why some of those decisions were made in the manner they were. It is not this Minister's job to defend what was done poorly under a previous administration.

The fact is that most of the assessment work was done after the fact. The impacts are probably not mitigable at that time. What you end up doing is paying for them, rather than mitigating them in advance. It was probably, I suppose, started about the time that the project was well into construction. The major portion of the cofferdam was certainly in place and most of the footings were being blasted by the time the assessment was begun.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Can the Minister explain the results of the monitoring of the Limestone plant?

I was just going to say that I am open to having the staff answer the questions, if that is easier.

**Mr. Cummings:** The results of the monitoring are reviewed annually. I am told there have been some operational changes that are being mitigated.

That is the position that we are in. When you have a project that the operation was not necessarily spelled out in a pre-licence, is that you react as you see certain things unfolding. If the Member is meaning to imply that Limestone, in and of itself, was of a benign nature, that it did not require assessment, it in fact probably had far more impacts than Conawapa will have because Conawapa is a downstream and largely contained within the riverbank. Limestone, the area of retention has broader impacts. Both of them, of course, are downstream from other large projects that have already had their impact on the flows in the river.

**Ms. CerlIII:** My question was a direct question. I am trying to get some information that would explain what is being monitored, and what are the environmental impacts that Limestone has shown since it has been completed?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I will undertake to provide all of the information that we have on the annual reports that indicate what is being monitored, and what is being changed or mitigated as a result of that.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Will that be an annual report similar to the one that I have been looking at?

**Mr. Cummings:** No, it will be specific.

**Ms. CerlIII:** It will be a specific annual report. Okay. The reason I am asking that question is I am trying to develop an understanding of how the department is using information from the environmental impact of one hydro dam to developing the guidelines for a second dam.

Can the Minister explain some of the considerations that will be in the Conawapa guidelines, which I can see from the annual report have been developed for some time, or if there have been changes made to these guidelines since this report was developed?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not sure, Mr. Acting Chairman. If the Member thinks that all of the information that is available to the department has not become part of the body of knowledge upon which the department makes decisions, then you are not giving us very much credit for intelligence. The fact is that part of the reason that you keep a department intact is in order to access that body of knowledge, if it is on paper and with the technicians.

The technical advisory committee that is working with Conawapa and developing the guidelines, of course, encompasses all of the expertise that should be gleaned from any information, not only in Limestone but all of the water-quality situations that we have related to hydro electric generation. The information related to impacts of the original transmission lines will be critical towards what is done in terms of developing guidelines for a new transmission line as well.

**Ms. CerlIII:** My question was, have there been changes to the Conawapa guidelines for the environmental impact assessment since '86?

(Madam Chairman in the Chair)

\* (1600)

**Mr. Cummings:** The final guidelines have not been set. I suppose you could say we are in the predevelopment stage of exchanging information. The technical work Hydro has done can be used to assist us in developing guidelines, and combined with the information we have from previous experience and from technical advice that we have, to develop what will eventually be the final guidelines for the process.

Hydro has done a great deal of work and so has

the technical advisory committee, but it is not at its final stages. In other words, there is information exchanging and information going both ways, but primarily the technical work is being done by Manitoba Hydro and this is where they are incurring some rather large expenses getting started on this information-gathering process.

**Ms. CerlIII:** One of the other things I wanted to try and get a better understanding of is the relationship between the initial environmental evaluation and the environment impact assessment. Can the Minister clarify that?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** First of all, an initial assessment would not be something that we would worry about in terms of Conawapa because we know there is going to have to be a complete environmental assessment.

Other projects where it is less obvious might have an initial environmental assessment done in order to determine if you should move to the next stage of a full-blown environmental assessment process with hearings and all of the additional processes that need to be entered into.

So Conawapa will simply move into the second stage because we know, without having to study it very long, that will be required.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Can the Minister explain then the procedure or what is involved in an initial environmental evaluation?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** An initial stage assessment is one where we use existing information to make a determination if we need to go further. In other words, we do not require a lot of studies to be done. We use existing body of information to decide how much further we want to push the process.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Does that mean that there is—I would not think there is involvement of a panel. If I am to understand the Minister correctly, he is saying that there is an assessment done based on existing research and there is no new research. Is that a good summary?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** The work is done by the technical advisory committee using existing information. We do not strike a panel.

**Ms. CerlIII:** I would like to ask some questions now regarding the United States-Canada clean air agreement. Can the Minister explain what Manitoba's involvement is in this agreement?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** As the Member stated, it is an

international responsibility. My involvement has been primarily through the Council of Environment Ministers. Manitoba's involvement has been because we have two of the larger points or submissions in the province, in the Hudson Bay and Inco and we have been involved at that stage earlier on when the objectives were originally set. Beyond that it is handled at the international level by the federal Government.

**Ms. CerlIII:** The Minister mentioned Hudson Bay Mining and Inco. Are there other industries that have been targeted that would be affected by this agreement?

**Ms. Cummlngs:** Madam Chairman, I referenced them because they are the two large contributors to emissions. At this stage there are no others. Obviously, any limitation which is imposed has not only limitations for them, but for any future development in this province. That is why nationally Ministers of Environment sometimes get a little sensitive about regional quotas because it has direct linkages to industries within their province. We only have the two at this point that would be affected to any large degree.

**Ms. CerlIII:** So there would not be any other industry in Manitoba that would be affected by this agreement? Am I understanding that correctly?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** Any industry that emits, well, sulfur particularly, would be impacted within global limits that are set down. If the Member is asking do we have any other large smelters or large sources, we do not, which I suppose speaks to the fact that Manitoba is not a heavily industrialized area. Alberta, of course, has a different problem and the industrialized east has a rather large problem.

**Ms. CerlIII:** Under the agreement, what industries are being targeted?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** The only subagreement that is moving or being worked on and looking to actively pursue further limitations right now is on acid rain, which would be sulfur emissions, and consequently we would only have the two industries in this province that have any large direct resulting impacts.

\* (1610)

**Ms. CerlIII:** On dealing with this agreement, would there be any need or plans for new legislation in Manitoba?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** Madam Chairman, we are well

within our guidelines and the targets that were set for emissions from this province. The only thing that I would be reluctant to do is commit myself to no regulatory or legislative changes in the near future.

We will be having public discussion in the next year about reaching our targets, but that does not necessarily result in any regulatory or legislative changes, but the fact is that Manitoba is in a pretty good position. We have, particularly at Inco, a very good operator who has moved to meet their targets primarily by a different sorting method in order to get the high sulphur ore out of their ore stream. They have upgraded their smelter, and Manitoba is well within its capability of meeting its targets.

**Ms. CerlIII:** That surprises me. It either means that things have changed a lot up North with these plants, or the standards are not going to be that meaningful. Has there been a large decrease in the emissions from the Flin Flon Hudson Bay Mining or Inco?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** Well, I indicated one of the ways that we will be meeting our target is with the initiatives Inco is taking. The deadline for us meeting the targets from each of the two main areas is 1994. That is quite achievable in my mind.

The other thing that is very interesting is, in terms of acid rain in eastern Canada, modelling does not support the fact that we are contributing directly to the problems that are happening in southern Ontario, but that nevertheless does not lessen our responsibility to reduce our emissions.

**Ms. CerlIII:** What the Minister is saying, that there has been no decrease in the emissions, but time is still on our side, so to speak, because there is still some time before we are expected to meet the targets that have been set? Is that correct?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** I certainly did not say that there has been nothing happening. I am told that emissions are reduced about 25 percent since 1981, and the goals, the levels that were set, frankly were set by the previous administration, and the deadline was set; 1994 is the one that they were prepared to accept and one that we have in discussions with the corporations continued to enforce, and the goal that they are continuing to meet.

I want to point out that they are not just putting pocket change into meeting these standards. Inco has spent mega bucks in getting ready to comply with this. In getting into this position, one should not think that in terms of best use of the product, if you

will, that this is necessarily going to enhance our capacity by tighter sorting.

Inco is not going to have access to some of the ore that has a fair bit of nickel in it. They are going to end up rejecting it, because it has too much sulfur and is burnt in their process. It is a double-edged sword. We are reducing our capability of producing nickel at this point.

**Ms. CerlIII:** What then are the emissions currently in Flin Flon and at Inco, and what are the targets that we are expected to reach in '94?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** I would be glad to provide that detail. We do not have that information with us, but if the Member is doubting, can we meet the 1994 levels, that will probably still rest ultimately on the upgrade of the smelter as well. That will be a multimillion dollar undertaking.

**Ms. CerlIII:** In part of the plans for meeting the targets, what is being done to ensure that money is going to be available, or some of the money is going to be available?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** I hope the Member is not implying that Government should be refinancing in totality what we are asking these corporations to do. The primary responsibility lies with the corporations. The Government is actively working to do whatever we can to work with them, negotiate on their behalf and with them, wherever that is deemed reasonable.

The Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has spent innumerable hours working in that area. Let us not for one minute minimize the cost to the province, the cost in terms of jobs if they cannot meet these emission standards, but the cost to the corporations involved. In setting very high emission levels, or very low emission levels, if you will, compared to what they have done, is a multimillion dollar undertaking on behalf of the corporations.

Inco in particular has undertaken this reformation of their operation entirely on their own.

**Ms. CerlIII:** The Minister just indicated that we are in pretty good shape to meet the targets by 1994, but his most recent answer makes it sound like the money is not going to be there, that it is just going to cost too much. What are the targets, or what percentage of the target are we expected to reach by 1994?

**Mr. Cummlngs:** We are expected to reach 100 percent of the target by '94. That is the deadline.

**Ms. CerlIII:** How realistic is that deadline given the

current plan to reach the deadline, given the current emissions? I mean are we shooting for something that is realistic?

**Mr. Cummings:** I think so. I think it is achievable. The corporations are both aware of it, and Hud Bay of course knows that the mill that they have has had a long life. I would like the Member to indicate whether she is suggesting that perhaps I should be negotiating an extension to that? Is that what she would like me to do?

**Ms. Cerilli:** If the mining and smelting companies do not meet the targets that are set right now, then what happens?

\* (1620)

**Mr. Cummings:** They will have to be brought into compliance, but I am wondering if the Member is perhaps urging some leniency on our part, that perhaps we should be negotiating with our provincial and federal counterparts and the mining companies that are obviously strapped for funds these days? Perhaps we should be a little more lenient? Is that what the Member is urging?

**Ms. Cerilli:** I am trying to get a clear idea of how we are progressing with dealing with what I understand is an acid rain problem near Flin Flon. Can the Minister indicate the most recent meeting with the management of either of the plants we have been discussing, and indicate what was the nature of the meeting?

**Mr. Cummings:** Officials are in touch with the corporations on a regular basis, and I do not think meetings I have had or would anticipate having are relative to this discussion. We have a joke in this House about referring to tabling your phone calls. The fact is this is not relevant to the discussion about how often or what date and topic of discussion between myself or any other companies—the fact is they do not negotiate with me. They are more likely to approach other ministries in terms of their operation. We are the licensing department, and they operate within the terms and conditions of their licence. I have no reason to meet with them beyond that.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, the Minister will recall some year and a half ago that I raised with him the issue of stubble burning and how that impacted on some urban residents, in particular residents of my constituency who tend to get hit every year for a good couple of months with stubble burning problems. As he knows, there are those with

breathing problems, in particular seniors but as well others who suffer when stubble smoke comes into their neighbourhoods. It has also posed safety hazards on occasion, in terms of visibility. I know that the Clean Environment Commission looked at this, and I know that they made a recommendation which was largely education based. I think their agenda was to educate farmers saying that it was basically a poor practice and hoping they would go on to stop the practice.

Now having still experienced some significant problems since the CEC recommendations, no doubt less but some significant problems, is the Minister of the department looking at any further action, in particular with respect to immediate buffer zones of major urban areas such as Winnipeg? In particular of course, not limited to my constituency, but there have been ongoing regular problems.

I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) showing an interest. Either one I would suggest could answer this question. I would like to have an update on how that is going and if any further action is contemplated?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture and I worked together on this, and I think he has the most current information. I would like him to respond if the Member agrees.

**Mr. Edwards:** Yes, certainly.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** The industry of agriculture is also aware of the severity of the problem it can create in terms of a traffic hazard and people with asthmatic conditions. The department spent quite a bit of time and effort this past year trying to do the educational process through brochures and examples and visiting farmers who were traditional burners. Outside the city, certainly the amount of straw that was produced this year was much higher than normal so the conditions were right for a lot of burning.

The statistics in terms of the percentage of burning last year versus this year is much the same outside the city, out in the true rural area. Inside the boundaries of the city of Winnipeg, in other words on lands owned or within the city of Winnipeg where there is the requirement to have a permit for burning, where a by-law exists that says no burning, unfortunately the amount of burning doubled this year. So you know it does prove that having regulations makes it still impossible to enforce. We were still working with those people inside the city

limits trying to get them to do less. It is unfortunate that the level of increase occurred in the worst area with regard to access to the city.

The type of burning that happened this year in terms of when it did, the number of days when there was smoke in the air, was much less than the previous year. I think some farmers who were burning were also burning more in the daytime, so-called burning smart, so there was less smoke. They would get the job done with the least impact in terms of producing smoke.

So I would have to say I feel we have made major progress, although we have not totally eliminated the problem in the vicinity south and west of the city. East of the city and almost all the rest of the province there was virtually no burning of stubble done, at least not enough to annoy people. We still have the problem around the city, and it is going to take a continuous ongoing effort of trying to work with the farming community and show them the hazards, show them the benefits of putting it back into the soil.

This past fall was a very good fall for working it into the soil, early harvest. I hope that those who did change their ways, in terms of not burning, working it in, do not change their mind next year. We are going to continue to work on it.

The idea that we could regulate the process—I think that what has happened in the city proves that regulating it, or having a by-law, is not going to work.

**Mr. Edwards:** I agree that a regulatory regime in and of itself is not the answer unless you enforce the regulation or the by-law. Enforcement is the key.

The Minister seemed to indicate that enforcement was not working. Is that in his view because there has not been a concerted enough effort on the part of the city that is enforcing it, or is that because the by-law itself, he is saying, cannot work, or is it just that it does not work because the enforcement is not taking place?

**Mr. Findlay:** I cannot always give you the reason why, but obviously it is not working. I also think there is another little factor at play here, and that is when you tell somebody they cannot do it they are more apt to do it than when you do not tell them they cannot do it, and you try to educate them to change their ways.

That is why I think we are more successful outside the city limits than we have been inside.

Clearly, we have more work to do on those people

who have land inside the city limits of Winnipeg, there is no question.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is the provincial Government playing a role in attempting to get that message through to people within the city boundaries? Is there a co-operative effort at both levels of Government, or what role do they have, and have they brought it to the attention of the civic authorities that there is this problem, there is this apparent discrepancy in the true rural versus the urban farmer?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) has explained the process that his department has been involved in. I have been part of a couple of informal processes within the city where members of the Department of Agriculture were in attendance and explained the situation somewhat as the Minister has just explained it.

As a matter of fact, one of the things that the Minister of Agriculture and myself I believe will be wanting to strategize before next spring is what discussions we enter into with the City of Winnipeg about enforcement of that by-law.

The fact is it does reflect that while it is the city being impacted here, the city does have the means by which to control it. I do not as I understand it think there is a weakness in the licence. There is a burn permit required within city limits.

\* (1630)

There may very well be a legitimate question that needs to be discussed with the city. While I have not done it yet, I will be undertaking to raise it, as I am part of the Urban Affairs Committee, and I will raise it there when given the opportunity.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is the conclusion to be drawn then from these comments—and I do not have a map outlining the City of Winnipeg boundaries in front of me—that the land owners who have the direct impact on the urban area are within the city boundaries, or are there those outside of the city boundaries who still burn and do have an effect?

I have not gone out and searched out where these properties are. It depends on which way the wind is blowing as to where it is coming from. There does seem to be a consistent problem which persists at least in the west end of the city.

**Mr. Cummings:** Both areas are correct. There is burning still going on in both areas, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) indicated.

What is ironic in the figures that he has compiled

is that where there is a permit required, the burning actually increased this past year. Outside of the city where permits have not been imposed, through education and other means we were able to get it slowed down and reduced significantly. So I do not know if there is a lesson to be learned from that. Perhaps there is an obvious tool we can use to get the amount of smoke within the city boundaries down, through the city exercising its authority for burn permits.

I am sure that in discussion with the farmers out there they would a lot sooner have some options than lose the opportunity within the city boundaries. So it is going to require some further intensive work by the Department of Agriculture, and my department is involved where we have had severe situations previously. I cannot speak without asking the department, but we have on occasion had monitoring equipment and I believe we—did we do any additional monitoring last fall?. The previous fall we had done additional monitoring to determine what levels were getting into the city. In fact, that was the year it was the worst within the city boundaries.

So it is a joint effort. We do not have the answers at this point to completely eliminate it, but it is not done yet.

**Mr. Edwards:** Would the department, and I do not know the details of the City of Winnipeg permit system, but would the department be adverse to a permit system? Not banning stubble burning, I mean I certainly have never suggested that it should be outright banned. The issue it seems to me is that it is a relatively minor thing to ask a property owner, and I would suggest perhaps within 10 miles or so of the city limits where there can be an effect on a major urban centre, to require some notification or a phone call to a specific number in the department which would then grant on short notice, a permit based on known wind conditions, known weather conditions. The key is that if burning takes place, it takes place at the time when it is least likely to have an adverse effect on many, many thousands of people.

Would there be any problem in setting up that kind of a system for that buffer zone, which I do not think is the city limits? I think it goes beyond that, which can have a direct impact on the city. What are the Minister's thoughts on that type of a system, which is used to my knowledge, in other situations, other urban centres? I remember at the time looking into

this, that there were many in the United States that had implemented this around urban centres, implemented that type of an urban buffer zone where they required that type of permit which had not proven to be unduly onerous on the land owners.

**Mr. Cummings:** I will not reject the Member's suggestion out of hand except to indicate that this is generally handled as a municipal responsibility. The Department of Environment—I do not think we have any precedent where we would have done that, or the Department of Agriculture. It is usually handled through the municipal authority.

I will undertake again in response to that question—I am part of the Urban Affairs Committee and the committee where the surrounding municipalities and the city meet. I will request to have it put on the agenda there in that context because it is clearly understood I think, that we want to use the education process. We want to reduce the amount of burning in the first place or if burning must occur that it be done the right way.

The experience that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) just put on the record, however, is that having a licence does not mean anything, that the city is the one authority that has the licensing provision in place. They have the population, they have the land right within the city limits where the burning is occurring, and it has actually gone up instead of down there.

Perhaps with further communication to the other authorities—but I can tell you right now that the municipal authorities, when it has been raised before, have not been one bit interested in getting involved in this process. They see it as difficult to administer and very difficult to enforce.

Administration may be simple. As you say, phone in and get a permit, but the permit would only probably be able to impose limitations such as burning during certain periods of relative humidity, certain periods of wind direction—

**An Honourable Member:** Preferably when it rains.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, yes.

The fact is that you very often cannot prove who lit the fire. I have some knowledge of this through experiences that MPIC has had in trying to recover damages when accidents have been caused on the highway by a fire. If they cannot prove who lit the fire, even though they can prove whose property it is on, then it becomes very difficult to make it a litigation effort.

I do not think that there are any of us on the Government side who are saying anything other than that we want to get it reduced, eliminated if possible, and we are open to all suggestions.

**Mr. Edwards:** I want to thank the Minister for undertaking to put it on the agenda, and I will look forward to hearing from him. I appreciate that there may be some problem in proving who lit the fire. It is known in the law, and I am sure the Minister knows, that you can impose a stricter level of liability and simply say that if it is on your land, it is in your responsibility, your onus, to prove that you were not the one who lit it.

That type of an arrangement, of course, is well known in The Highway Traffic Act, probably more so than any other Act, a reverse-onus situation.

In any event, moving on, we are all anticipating the announcement of the Green Plan tomorrow federally and looking forward to that, although there are early indications that it is going to be a relative disappointment. In view of the early indications and commitments that were made, I believe it was \$5 billion -(Interjection)-

Yes, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) believes in remaining optimistic until the last possible moment. I share that desire, and I will. I simply want to—I do not want to be naive, however, and the indications are at the outset that the initial plans of some \$5 billion in investments in the Green Plan are now shrunken substantially. We will see tomorrow how far down they have gone.

\* (1640)

My question to the Minister on that is: Have there been discussions between federal and provincial authorities on the Green Plan, and will there be an expected level of participation in its implementation with the provincial officials throughout the country?

**Mr. Cummings:** I have had a number of briefings on the Green Plan. That is what they were, briefings. As Ministers, we had an opportunity to provide some suggestions. The briefings that we had were confidential, so I am not going to reveal what it was that the Minister put in front of us. It was not the kind of detail, however, that would give me cause to assume the \$5 billion figure or whatever other figure—the dollar value was not given to me.

The plan in itself—I know the highlights, the areas which it touches and the initiatives that would be contemplated. I am hopeful that it will be a useful thrust. As the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr.

Enns) indicates, it is always good to be positive, particularly when we are talking about initiatives that are for the improvement of something.

I am sure that there will be plenty of naysayers who will indicate that it is either not enough money, it is not restrictive enough or whatever. An initiative to improve environmental quality across this country needs to be acknowledged as that, and I am looking forward to how Mr. de Cotret will flush out what he had indicated to us previously.

I understand my officials will be at the unveiling, and I will respond more formally at that time.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, one of the things which was being considered under the Green Plan—and of course I am not asking the Minister to belie any confidences that he has entered into in discussions with federal officials—but one of the things which I felt was particularly important was, as I understood it, a co-operative national training program for enforcement officers was being considered.

I know that there were commitments made by the Government, there were financial commitments made with respect to a training program. What has happened in discussions with federal officials as to a training program for enforcement officers? Clearly, as we learn in the discussion with respect to environmental officers in Killarney, there is a need for expertise in this area.

Is there any reason for hope with respect to a national program, a joint program to train enforcement officers, environmental policemen as it were, in this country which of course we desperately need?

**Mr. Cummings:** I cannot respond to that question except to comment that the position we were unable to fill is that of a health inspector at Killarney who is an environment officer as well. It is not the environmental qualifications that are their problem. It is the health inspection qualifications.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister indicate—it is a fairly broad question, but it is not that big a department as such. There have been structural changes in the management of the department in the last year, it is my understanding.

One of them has been to increase the number of directors and take it to rural or district offices. Can the Minister indicate what the structural changes within the department have been in the last year?



**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chair, in response to organizational changes, I can provide a schematic of the departmental structure to the Member.

Essentially what we have done is, reporting directly to the Deputy Minister there is Environmental Management Division, Financial and Administrative Services, Community Relations, Planning and Innovation, Legislation and Interjurisdictional Affairs, Environmental Operations.

That is not a structural change. Where the structural change comes in is that we now have five regions that report to the Environmental Operations Division—one is the Winnipeg Region, one is Southcentral Region, one is Parkwest Region, one is the Northern Region and one is the Eastern Interlake Region. The directors at the regional level will be able to provide for licensing approval within their regions.

There is a new Approvals Branch that reports to the Environmental Management Division; and along with Technical Services Laboratory and Environmental Quality Standards, all report through the Environmental Management Division. That is how the departmental structure breaks down as much as we have more presence in the regions rather than having people go out from Winnipeg to do some of the work.

We will have people in the regions who will be capable of handling the work as it comes forward. The department has always been, as I understand it, in attempt to make best use of personnel because of the nature of the work that they can use officials, they do not have to stay only in their region if there is work in the neighbouring area that needs to be done. That does not preclude using an interchange of staff as workloads shift. They will be located in those areas that I have indicated.

**Mr. Edwards:** What has been the staff level increase overall for the department in the last year?

**Mr. Cummings:** Thirteen.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister give us a breakdown of those 13 positions?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, we went through this at the start of my Estimates. I will provide the information again unless the Member wants to refer back to the original Hansard. It will take me a minute here. I think it is included in the speaking notes that I delivered at the start of my—we have one staff year working on The WRAP

Act, six on departmental monitoring and inspection, including two reallocated staff years, two respecting Administrative Support Services at the regional office level, two respecting approvals in the administration area, two in the Clean Environment Commission, plus two more that were reallocated. That is 13.

**Mr. Edwards:** The six departmental monitoring positions that the Minister spoke of, are those environmental officer positions? What are those positions? How are they grouped together?

**Mr. Cummings:** It would be correct to refer to them as environmental officers, yes.

**Mr. Edwards:** With the reorganization setting up the district offices, the individuals who head up those five offices, what level are they? Would they be included in that environmental officer or enforcement officer level, those new six? Where did those people come from?

**Mr. Cummings:** Functionally they are environment officers. Their job classification is as managers. In other words, they can probably do the work that you are referring to, but they also have management responsibilities.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister indicate with respect to those five regions how many enforcement officers work out of each?

**Mr. Cummings:** With the exception of the secretarial component they would all be capable of environmental enforcement.

**Mr. Edwards:** I am sorry, I realize they are all capable of environmental enforcement, except for the secretarial, the administrative support. What are the numbers in the five regions? Does the Minister have those available?

\* (1650)

**Mr. Cummings:** We have them all listed individually here. We have not added them up precisely. I will have the answer in a moment. The Northern Region is six. Winnipeg Region is 25. Park West Region is 14. South Central Region is nine. Eastern Interlake Region is 10.

**Mr. Edwards:** Do those numbers include then the heads of those particular district offices? They would be included in those numbers? I will ask as well, would the managers or the people who are in charge of those offices be involved in day-to-day enforcement of the regulations?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is there in fact an ongoing need in Manitoba for further officers? Would the Minister say that we have a lack of or a shortage of well-trained officers?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not getting any help from the staff here inasmuch as they all have a conflict of interest.

The fact is, if the Member is asking by implication, should we have a lot more enforcement people on the ground, I consistently have said that we have a variety of ways of enforcement that go beyond the department itself. I have named them before. We have the police, we have the Natural Resources Department that is deeply involved, we have the city police certainly as well. Our health inspectors who are part of these regional areas are out and about on an ongoing basis.

I had the discussion with the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) earlier about whether or not environment officers are going around peering under flat rocks to see what they can find or if it is a matter of enforcement, of going where you expect to have the emissions or whether you respond to problems as they are reported. We have a central line in the province where people can phone in and report accidents.

We believe that we respond quite adequately to the enforcement responsibilities, because no matter where you go, you cannot predict that there will not be an accident. In terms of enforcement, we have a monitoring capacity in the licences that we issue that require an awful lot of information being collected by the operators, which through spot checks provides us with a pretty clear picture, believe it or not. When you have monitoring that is periodically checked, you can have a good understanding of what any discharges might be, for example, from a lagoon.

When you get out in the regions of course the responsibility is probably fairly easy to define in terms of municipal discharges. The City of Winnipeg, the other area that I did not touch on in terms of enforcement of the Act, has a large number of people involved dealing with their responsibilities who are environment officers and who work on enforcement in this area.

I think that there is an ongoing need for development in this area. I would not deny that at all, but if the implication in answering that is that we need more officers within our department, we can

always use more, but I have not had it identified to me where we are not adequately responding.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, the Minister used the word spot checks. I wonder if he can indicate what level of activity of the enforcement officer's work is in fact that preventative type of spot checking on those who hold licences to make sure that they are complying with them? I simply draw as an analogy the Workplace Safety and Health, which I have some familiarity with, where there is very little time. There just are not enough officers to do the spot checks of workplaces, and they wait until the crisis comes up. When the call comes, then they will show up, when the problem arises, but there just is not enough manpower to do the preventative work.

Is there in fact a preventative aspect within the enforcement officer's duties? What level of time do enforcement officers have to commit to that preventative work?

**Mr. Cummings:** I think that is one of the advantages of regionalizing our department, inasmuch as the regions will be able to focus more carefully on what needs to be monitored and at what level. The licences that are given to operations do specify what tests or what monitoring needs to be done, and that is verified by the department. Certain lagoon discharges, for example, are totally monitored by the department. Others may be licensed in such a way that they only discharge after they have been monitored. If you are talking about continuous discharge operations, then it becomes more of a monitoring of the testing that is being done to confirm that it is being done, that the right process is being followed and, by intervening, to check back on itself. Monitoring is followed up.

I am sure I could show you a spectrum from a very small number per year to a large number per year, depending on the licence that we are monitoring. It is only where there are licences in place that we would be following that process. If you are talking about something different, then that would be a different matter.

**Mr. Edwards:** As the Minister knows, there is an ongoing controversy and dispute between scientists and engineers over the effectiveness of sewage lagoons, and indeed septic fields as well, in our climate.

It has come to my attention through Mr. Dalmyn who I know has been in touch with the department extensively on these issues—and of course he

himself having been a professional in the area for many years—that there is a concern that these simply do not work in our climate. There are constant problems with the release of raw sewage, be it through the sewage lagoons or septic fields, which eventually makes its way into our water stream and ultimately poses health hazards.

Can the Minister indicate what is going on in the department to effectively monitor, in particular I will direct my question at this time to sewage lagoons, many of which face spring runoff problems when the raw sewage does end up in the river system which of course is unfortunate. Is that a problem the Minister is concerned about? What is the department doing to ensure that problem happens as few times as possible?

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m. and time for private Members' hour, committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

\* (1700)

Order, please. Sorry. The hour being 5 p.m. and time for private Members' hour, I am leaving the Chair, interrupting the proceedings and will return at 8 p.m.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 5 p.m., it is time for private Members' business.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

### RES. 9—CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) is in the Committee Room right now in the Estimates. If there is no will to wait, I would be more than happy to introduce it on his behalf, if there is leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave to allow the Honourable Member for Inkster to introduce Resolution 9 on behalf of the Honourable Member for Osborne who is in the committee room? There is leave? Leave.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), that

WHEREAS through the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation (MHRC) the Government supplies subsidized rental accommodations to thousands of Manitobans that are in need of good, affordable shelter; and

WHEREAS many of those who live in Government housing would like to own their own home but for a number of reasons are unable to; and

WHEREAS converting where possible MHRC-owned housing into housing co-ops will, in the long run, be cost efficient and provide many Manitobans with the opportunity to become owners of their own homes; and

WHEREAS housing co-ops are run collectively by the residents, and all members have input to decisions made regarding their homes; and

WHEREAS people that live in housing co-ops have the security of ownership and control over the operation of the building.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Department of Housing to examine the need for co-op housing projects and identify non-profit housing which may be converted to housing co-ops and to develop a plan to initiate such conversions.

**Motion presented.**

## Point of Order

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

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I believe the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) would also like to speak to this resolution. Now he has started to speak. He has read it into the record. I would also like to speak to it. I can speak now, as long as he does not lose his ability to speak to it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would there be will of the House to allow the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to speak on this resolution even though he has introduced it on behalf of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), who was coming from the Committee Room?

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. So it is deemed therefore that the Honourable Member for Inkster has not spoken on this resolution? That is agreeable? That is agreed upon. The Honourable Minister for Osborne with his resolution.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Members of the House for giving leave for that because I must inform the House, and I think it is only right to do so, that it was the Member

for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) who was the originator of this particular resolution when he was Housing Critic in the last Session.

He has done a considerable amount of excellent work in looking at some of the issues that face this province in the area of providing adequate and appropriate housing for people and this resolution is a product of his labours. So I am very pleased that he will have an opportunity to speak to it. In fact I would have relinquished my spot if that were not the case.

This resolution I trust will have the broad support of this Chamber. It is one that really calls upon the Legislative Assembly to urge the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) and his department to consider a different way of organizing control within facilities that it currently operates.

We offer subsidized housing to a very large number of people on an ability-to-pay basis and what this resolution calls upon the Government to do is to begin to give people who are tenants in subsidized housing an opportunity to move into a shared-ownership position.

It really is funded in the belief that all persons would like to own their accommodation, would like to own their own housing, that some people for reasons of disability or low income are unable to access such housing. We recognize that when we provide subsidized public housing for these individuals.

We know also—and there has been all sorts of discussion about how difficult it is to maintain such housing. Often ownership in a facility is something that enhances the maintenance of a facility. People take more pride and put more effort into housing that they own as opposed to housing that is provided for them.

What this resolution asked people to do is to follow up on programs and opportunities that have been offered in other countries and in other parts of this country and allow people to move into co-operative ownership.

There is a concern that has been raised through the policy actions of the Government over the last little while that they have been less than encouraging to co-ops.

We think that co-operative housing—I have an excellent example in my own riding. The seniors in the south Osborne area got together many years ago and put together a group that eventually

resulted in the building of a co-operative seniors' unit at 360 Osborne. I would invite Members to go down and tour it, because it is a building that is the product of a great deal of hard work and examination on the part of a very large number of seniors. They built a building that is very appropriate to their needs and one that they take a great deal of pride in, and one that they work very hard to maintain and see that building stands as something that they and the community that surrounds it can be proud of.

They as a committee make the decisions about what happens in that building, and they as a committee make the capital as well as the operating decisions. They determine the future direction of that building. There is a procedure for that and there is legislation in place that allows it.

We think it is a very appropriate way to go because it does involve people directly in the ownership of their own housing and allows them to develop a little equity in that housing.

I have other examples in my riding, and I am sure there are lots all over the city, where that same level of pride and involvement in the management of the facility is not as evident. This is an issue I have spoken to the Housing Minister (Mr. Ducharme) about. We have tried to allow tenants to become more involved in the operation and ongoing management of the units that they live in. We feel that it would allow them to again take on more responsibility and through that more ownership, personal as well as factual, of the places in which they live. We think that would lead to a higher quality of life and to a better quality of management of the facilities that are currently operated.

\* (1710)

There are about 18,000 MHRC-owned units in this province that we currently provide and subsidize. I think helping some of them, where the tenants are interested and prepared to become involved in the ownership of the facility, helping them move to a co-operative ownership of those facilities, I think, would be a very productive and very useful way for the Government to facilitate disadvantaged groups into moving into a somewhat more powerful position.

Another good example of that exists, and a number of these facilities, of course, have been built to deal with people with specific disabilities. Ten Ten Sinclair is an example.

I have, in my riding, 285 Pembina Highway, which

was built in co-operation between the department and the Kiwanis for the use of the deaf community. The deaf community, as it matures and as it has become more active in taking responsibility for its own programs and services, wants very much to take over the ownership of that facility.

The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) has been quite helpful in allowing the members in that community to take over the board of that facility. They are currently in the process of hiring a deaf executive director and will take over all program responsibilities for the building in the near future.

There is one other step, and this is a step that community is currently discussing, that is, taking over control of the entire building. Then, as a community, they also own a tangible asset. That asset can reinforce the work their community wants to undertake and gives them a base upon which to build other services that are of interest to their particular community.

There are a number of ways in which these arrangements can be brought about. I think the key is to be as flexible and as supportive as possible of the leadership that is there in the community and the leadership that will be provided by other people in the community. I think it would suit this province well and be of significant assistance to the people who we currently encourage to live in this housing, if we went the next step and allowed them to take control of the operation, management and ownership of such facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think having said that, I will allow other Members of the House some time to speak to this. I am interested in the reactions of the Government in particular. I am looking forward to hearing from the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) as he has done so much work in this particular area.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** I am pleased to speak on this Resolution 9. I would like to, at the beginning, introduce an amendment.

I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), that the resolution be amended such that

1. By removing the period after the word "conversions," and the following be added: "which shall include a plan to establish co-ops with 100 percent of the members in receipt of a rent subsidy."

**Mr. Speaker:** I am satisfied that the amendment falls within the normal practice of this

House—respecting the relevancy of amendments in private Members' hour and complies with the commonly referred to Beauchesne citations respecting amendments.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Burrows, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett)—

Order, please. It was moved by the Honourable Member for Burrows, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, who was in her chair at the time the Honourable Member moved his motion, that the resolution be amended by removing the period after the word "conversions" and the following be added: "which shall include a plan to establish co-ops with 100 percent of the members in receipt of a rent subsidy."

**Mr. Martindale:** Thank you for your two rulings in my favour. I would like to say first of all that I support the idea behind the resolution, and I think I am familiar with some of the reasons for why it was brought in. In fact, I was not at all surprised that the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) gave credit to his colleague, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), because I was aware that the Member for Inkster had proposed this idea. In fact, I had proposed this idea as early as 1980, and the previous Member for Inkster, the Honourable Don Scott, had proposed this idea as well. I think it came out of a particular concern, and the concern was the large-scale public housing projects.

I am going to address my remarks to the problems of the large-scale public housing projects and why this resolution would attempt to address some of those problems, and why my amendment in particular would improve upon the resolution in addressing those problems.

The public housing projects that I am referring to in particular are those owned by Winnipeg Housing Authority and referred to as the developments: Lord Selkirk development and Gilbert Park development. These developments were the result of the slum clearance mentality in the 1950s and '60s also known as the "bulldozer approach" to slum-like housing conditions.

Fortunately, these large-scale housing projects were stopped by the Honourable Paul Hellyer when he was Minister of Housing about the year 1969. Today, 20 years later, we still have these public housing projects, and the problems are still there. I

think this resolution is an attempt to address some of these problems.

We have a concentration of people who are on social assistance. There is nothing wrong with the fact that they are in receipt of social assistance; however, these projects have been labelled as ghettos. Why is that? It is partly because of the 25 percent rule. That is the rule that these people pay 25 percent of their income on rent. Although in theory I am in favour of the rule, and it is a good idea, it allows people who are in need of public housing to take advantage of public housing, there are some inherent problems in the 25 percent rule. For example, there is a high turnover of tenants. The reason for this is that once their income goes up—for example, if they get a job or if they get a promotion or a raise—then they tend to move out. As soon as they get a job, their income goes up, because they are income tested, their rent goes up. As soon as the rent goes up higher than the private market, then they move out to get cheaper housing.

The result is that there is a constant turnover of tenants and a concentration of people on social assistance, people who are of low income, and the lack of people who are working but poor.

So in these projects, people do not grow old, because they do not stay there long enough. There are very few people who are 55 or 65 in these mainly family housing projects.

Another problem is that tenants have tried to organize—and many tenants' organizations have been attempted. They have run into many roadblocks, not least of which are the attitudes of the housing managers and the harassment of individuals when they join tenant organizations.

In addition, there are unrealistic rules for tenants' organizations, which are laid down in the housing manager's manual. For example, they must have something like 50 percent of all the members at the organizational meeting, which is an extremely high quorum considering that the quorum in this place is only 10 percent.

\* (1720)

At subsequent meetings, they must have certain numbers of people. The reason for that is there is a procedure, a set of rules and guidelines in order for people to qualify first of all to be recognized as a legitimate tenants' organization, and secondly to get grants, to get money, from the Government, which go to the tenants' organization.

The management are not well disposed or predisposed towards tenants' organizations. They seem to have an anti-tenant philosophy. The result is that when tenants join or become part of the executive, they face a great deal of harassment and attempts to kick them out.

The most recent example is that a motion was before the Board of Directors of Winnipeg Housing Authority to recognize the most current tenants' organization. It was deferred and some illegitimate roadblock was thrown their way by the manager of Winnipeg Housing Authority, and so they still have not been recognized in spite of a considerable amount of work on behalf of the tenants.

There needs to be major changes and major improvements in the public housing projects. The suggestion that co-op housing would improve their situation is a good one.

Why is that? There are some good reasons. It would give the tenants, who then would be called members, of the housing co-op democratic control. In a co-op, people elect their own board of directors by the means of one member, one vote. They would have their own committees on which they would sit. They can elect people or delegate people to committees. They could even set up a membership selection committee, which is very common in housing co-ops.

There is no reason why it will not work in public housing. In fact, Logan Housing Corporation has a tenants' committee on which tenants sit, on which they choose their own tenants. This is a very successful housing corporation. If you look at their waiting list, you will see they have a very long waiting list, but they have a very low turnover, because people are happy living in the Logan rental properties. They do not want to leave.

If you look at Logan and compare it with some of the public housing projects, you will see that they not only have a lower vacancy rate and lower turnover rate, but much lower costs, in terms of maintenance, upkeep and repairs. People when they are happy where they are living do not damage their units, they look after them. Whereas in many of the public housing projects, there are problems with tenants causing damage to their own units.

I think one of the best ways of overcoming this is to give tenants more responsibility, put them in control, give them the financial statements and show them how much repairs and damages are

costing and where they can save money including their own rents.

In addition to the Logan Housing Corporation, there is another model that exists already, and that is the MAPS Housing Co-op. MAPS is an acronym. It stands for Mountain Andrews Parr Selkirk. It is entirely within the boundaries of Burrows constituency, and it is an excellent housing co-op.

In fact, they had to change some of the rules in order to set up as a housing co-op. The structure is entirely that of a housing co-op, but the subsidy is that of people in public housing, so that 100 percent of the members of MAPS are on a housing subsidy, yet they elect their own board of directors, they appoint their own committees, they select their own tenants and are running a very good co-op. In most co-ops, and the reason for my amendment is that only 25 percent of members are in receipt of a subsidy. What would happen if, perchance, the private resolution were to actually succeed and be acted on, would be that most of the members would have to move out. That is not necessarily true, because there are co-ops with 50 percent of the members in receipt of a subsidy. There are one or two examples of co-ops with 100 percent of the members in receipt of a subsidy.

The reason for my amendment is so that all the members, all the tenants, can stay in the public housing where they are living. That because it changed to a co-op, they would not have to move out or be forced to move out. I guess the danger is that they might be treated like the housing councils in Great Britain where, when they were privatized by actions of the Prime Minister's conservative philosophy, Conservative Government philosophy, a lot of public housing was lost to low income people, because they were sold in a private market.

I would not want to see this resolution having a similar effect, in that because it became a co-op, 75 percent of the people would have to move out. My amendment says, keep the current tenants but, yes, turn it into a co-op, but a hundred percent of the people being eligible to stay, because a hundred percent would be eligible for a rent subsidy similar to the model of MAPS which I mentioned.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of problems in the large-scale public housing projects. The problems are not entirely the fault of the people who live there and are not entirely caused by the people who live there, although I would say that

some of the problems are attributable to people who live there. A much greater source of difficulty is the fact that so many low-income people of similar socioeconomic conditions are concentrated in one place and that basically they are powerless. They have tried to organize. They have tried to become tenants' organizations. Many of them have been harassed. In fact, people who have joined the tenants' organization have been sent eviction notices. Legal Aid is helping one such tenant right now to fight an eviction notice and not very successfully. In fact, they are trying to negotiate an out-of-court settlement.

The situation could be greatly improved. It could be improved by a more enlightened philosophy on the part of the manager. It could be greatly improved by changing the whole model of tenant-management relations and the whole model under which the public housing is governed.

This resolution suggests that co-op housing is the best model. My resolution suggests an amendment by which 100 percent of the members would be in receipt of the rent subsidies so that they could stay. They would not have to move out. Basically, the idea is that of empowerment, of giving tenants responsibility, of making them responsible for the financial statement, making them responsible for the bottom line, making them responsible for the amount of money that is spent on repairs, as opposed to the amount of money that might be given in lieu of repairs to a tenants' organization, or to buying recreation equipment, or to outings for tenants, which now they do for the seniors who live at Lord Selkirk development.

There are many, many improvements that could be made. In fact, one of the major improvements, if this resolution were to ever be enacted, would be that they could hire their own housing manager. Then instead of having somebody who had an anti-tenant bias, an anti-welfare bias, and harassed people and evicted people, they could hire somebody who could work co-operatively with the tenants, and who understood co-op philosophy. In fact, co-ops have been around long enough now that there is a great deal of expertise in the co-op movement which can be shared with new co-ops. We have resource groups. I was in a resource group hired by Winnipeg Housing Rehab Corporation to work on the Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op and personally gained a great deal of experience for that and saw what members of a housing co-op can do.

In fact they did something very creative in the past year—well, a number of creative things. One was that they had a vacancy rate of 6 percent, so what they did which was comparable to the private rental market, they doubled the number of people on a subsidy from 25 percent to 50 percent. The reason for that was that the people who were on subsidy were amongst the best members. A woman who was formerly on welfare was president of the housing co-op when it was first organized, and now is president again.

People who are on rent subsidy, people who are on social assistance are doing a variety of things. When this co-op was set up, it was set up by myself on a model whereby the members did 100 percent of the office work, except for the monthly financial statement, and 100 percent of the maintenance. People in this very unusual housing co-op, Charles Cathedral Housing Co-op, are vacuuming the carpets, washing the walls, washing the windows, cutting the grass, raking the leaves—something that would make the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) proud, to see people totally responsible for their own housing, doing all their own maintenance, including people on a subsidy. Another member types all the minutes for the board of directors, types all the minutes for the committees. This person is handicapped, and this is their contribution to the housing co-op.

\* (1730)

It can be done if you empower people, if you give people permission, if you let people have responsibility for their own accommodation, if you make them responsible. In fact it can be argued, Mr. Speaker, that when you make tenants into members, they become even more officious in a way, more concerned about the kind of housing they live in so they are tougher when they come to screening new members. When it comes to evictions, they feel even more strongly than a housing manager might, because these are their neighbours they are talking about. These are the people they have to live with when it comes to noise and parties, et cetera. I know that from personal experience, having lived in a housing co-op.

I hope the Members opposite will support the amendment. I believe it is a good one. I believe it improves on the resolution. We in this Party support the resolution, and I would like to see this amendment included. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to recognizing the Honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I would like to draw the attention of all Members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon 25 Brownies from the Winnipeg 1276 Brownies. These Brownies are under the direction of Darlene Daley. This Brownie troop is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render). On behalf of all of the Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** I am pleased to rise and put a few words on the record on Resolution 9. The resolution urges the Government to examine the need for co-op housing and to identify non-profit housing which may be converted to co-op housing.

Mr. Speaker, it may be of interest to Members opposite to have some background information on the subject of the co-operative housing situation in Manitoba. Manitoba has the distinction of developing the first non-profit housing co-operative in Canada some 25 years ago. I was doing some arithmetic, and 25 years ago I believe takes us back to the Conservative days. I think it is somewhat important that it was a Conservative Government that brought in the first non-profit housing co-op in Canada. I think that is very significant to put on the record.

Members opposite always like to think they have the exclusiveness of caring for people, when in reality people on this side of the House care for people, and not only talk about caring for people, really act in doing the things that people need.

Today we have some 84 housing co-operatives incorporated in Manitoba representing more than 3,600 housing units occupied, under construction, or in planning stages. Housing co-operatives in Manitoba form the largest part of the co-operative sector. Funding for co-operative housing projects comes almost entirely from two sources, those being the federal Government housing programs managed through CMHC, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the 100 percent provincially-funded initiative, the co-op HomeStart Program.

Since the CMHC program deals almost entirely with new construction, our own co-operative HomeStart Program was designed primarily toward



conversion and renovation of older housing and commercial stock into co-operative housing units.

Under the CMHC program Manitoba, like other provinces, is allocated a specific number of housing units annually. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that this allocation is not sufficient to meet the demand for co-operative housing units. At the present time some 30 co-ops representing 951 units of housing are waiting for allocation. Twelve of these co-operatives are designated as senior citizen housing and represent 520 units.

Mr. Speaker, we are continuously expressing concerns over this situation to federal officials. As a matter of fact, as recently as October 15, 1990, at a conference of Ministers responsible for co-operative development, I personally expressed my concern over this situation.

Members opposite may be aware that CMHC has recently concluded the evaluation of co-operative housing programs, particularly the ILM, or the Index-Linked Mortgage mechanism, which terminates on December 31, 1990.

I wish the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), who spoke so eloquently, would want to hear my comments. He seems to have a concern. He seems to be in dialogue with his neighbour.

It is my understanding that the evaluation was generally favourable to co-operative housing. The Co-operative Housing Federation of Canada, which is a central organization for housing co-ops, has made its response to the federal evaluation document and is recommending that federal co-operative housing programs be set at a level that will finance at least 5,000 units per year. Because the present ILM program expires on December 31, 1990, it is my understanding that the federal Cabinet will be asked to consider CMHC recommendations in early December.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the position of the increased unit allocations to Manitoba in order to satisfy the demand, a very much needed demand, we agree.

Resolution 9, Mr. Speaker, urges the Government to examine the need for co-operative housing projects. I am pleased to inform Members opposite that examining co-operative housing needs and opportunities is an ongoing, ongoing activity of the Department of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

I want to stress that "ongoing." It is not something

that has happened or will happen. We are continuing—ongoing that work.

In this area we work closely with MHRC and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) may want to comment in this area himself.

Indeed we are not only examining new opportunities, but we are also looking at other programs within housing co-operatives and senior citizens homes, which would enhance the quality of life and reduce the costs and the need of providing personal care facilities earlier than they may be needed.

We are currently working on a pilot project that would establish a co-operative whose function would be to provide, at a seniors residence, at least one nourishing hot meal a day at cost to the residents. The meal operation, Mr. Speaker, will be managed by a part-time, paid position supported by volunteer residents who express eagerness at this opportunity to become active.

This service will allow many of the residents to extend their stay by years rather than having to seek expensive personal care accommodation. In addition to the meal operation, members of this co-operative who are all resident seniors will provide other services such as floor warden to check daily on others, recreational activities, fund-raising events, et cetera. Comments made by the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) earlier, it is people working together to help each other—in the case of seniors, checking on each other to ensure that everybody is fine in the morning, doing these little things to save money.

Mr. Speaker, our department—and we have got a very pro-active department that is working on co-ops—we have had as much activity in co-op development as the previous Government ever thought of having. It is important that you just not have lip service to co-operatives, that we do have action, and our Government is pursuing action. I will be quite happy to keep the Members informed on the progress of this particular seniors' project to see how it works out. Maybe we can build on it and do others.

Mr. Speaker, another comment is on the recommendation that the Government examine the opportunities for converting public housing to housing co-operatives. While there are merits to this proposal, it must be remembered that Governments do not and should not impose co-operatives on

anybody, residents of public housing included. The co-op housing is a voluntary program of people working together. Being involved in the co-op movement is no new thing to me. My father was a founding member of a co-op back in 1946; it was a vegetable growers' co-op. I know the meaning—

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** My grandfather was involved.

**Mr. Connery:** Yes, the Member for Lac du Bonnet's grandfather was involved, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet's father was one of the co-operators in the vegetable sector. I worked very closely with his father. So I look with a lot of pride that his son would be sitting in this Chamber just one seat over. I think it is a great thing, Mr. Speaker, that we would have something like that happening.

The fact that people are co-operating, working together, is something that I am very involved in. I am a member of the co-op in Portage la Prairie which we buy a lot of our things from. So the co-operative movement on this side of the House is indeed in good hands. It has been the feeling that, you know, the co-op sector belongs to the NDP. Well, I can tell you that in Portage la Prairie there are very few NDPers to start with. The co-op movement is filled with Liberals and Conservatives who are really the true people who are concerned about people.

We talk about concern for people and the need for co-ops, and I can tell you that when it gets down to co-operating in such areas as the United Way, I do not see the socialists out there busting themselves going door to door. I see the Liberals and the Conservatives going door to door to collect money, to raise money, for people. So let us not, the Members opposite, think that they have some sort of control or own that sort of feeling for people, Mr. Speaker. I really resent that sort of implication that Members opposite give us.

\* (1740)

### Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Burrows, on a point of order.

**Mr. Martindale:** Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs would entertain a question or two?

**Mr. Connery:** We will see, Mr. Speaker, how the time is. I know the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) wants to have his 15 minutes. We will

see if I am finished before quarter to, then I would be happy to do that. We made an agreement that the Member for Inkster would get his opportunity to speak. He is concerned on this subject, so we will be prepared to let him speak. If there is time, I am sure that I would be quite happy to entertain questions.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Connery:** Mr. Speaker, it must be the people themselves who have a common need, who are willing to make a commitment to support the co-operative—that initiative, the formation of a co-op. Our department, maybe the Member should know, only assists people in the establishment of co-ops. The funding comes from the CMHC or the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The funding comes from those areas. The department of co-operatives helps people in the formation of a co-op. We will give them some amounts of money, maybe \$500, \$600, \$700 to help establish the co-op through the sense of sending out mailings to people to encourage them to come, to find an office or a hall where the meeting can be held. We will help them with their by-laws and that sort of assistance in the establishment of co-ops.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave the impression that I am negative on the resolution. On the contrary, I think it does have some merit, and it does deserve some further consideration which as a Government we are doing on an ongoing basis. While I support the content of the resolution, the resolution really only mirrors what the Government is doing today.

Over the next while I will be discussing and consulting with my colleagues, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey), and others whose departments have been involved in co-op housing. The purpose of these consultations would be to examine the needs and the opportunities in the co-operative housing area, which will no doubt include conversion of public housing into co-operatives, where prudent and feasible.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock)—I think I heard him right, and I do not want to put any misinformation on it, I think he said that you could gain equity in co-op housing. I think that is what the Member for Osborne said. I want it to be very clear when you go into a housing unit, into a housing project, that you might put in your down

payment, but there is no gaining of equity in that unit. When you move out, you do not take out any more than the money you put into it. I think it is important to know that there is no opportunity to gain equity by joining a co-op unit. That is, in my estimation, a little bit of a downfall in that sense because if you move into other housing—

I remember the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) in one of his first speeches saying we should tax equity on housing. He mentioned the name John Turner and said he should tax equity on housing. People go into a starter home, young people go into a starter home, they save, they fix it up, and then they get some equity in that house, they sell it, they buy a little better house because now they can move up the ladder. The Member for Burrows then says, tax that, tax it. It is in Hansard. He said tax it. Then those average working people who are attempting to improve, which I support and hope all people would move up the ladder, but the Member for Burrows suggests, and I question—I should not question NDP philosophy, I have been so disappointed in it in the past.

I think that it is a shame the Member would say that if you raise some equity then you should be taxed on it. That means any average working person who works hard and maybe after 15 years has amassed some additional equity of \$15,000 in his house and wants to sell it to move into better housing—maybe he has a larger family now, he and she, and they want to have more bedrooms. He wants to tax that equity so that they just do not have that opportunity.

The Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) mentioned that as a department we are somewhat less than encouraging to co-ops, and I take umbrage with that statement, Mr. Speaker. Our department of Co-op Development is very, very pro-active. We are working with all groups who come to us and want to assist in developing a co-op. They will also advise them as to other means of establishing something, because maybe a co-op in their particular case is not the right thing. We do not go out and say make it a co-op, make it a co-op. We listen. The department listens to the needs of the group. Yes, indeed, if the co-op is in their best interest they work with them, but they will also advise them on the other things that are there, that maybe a partnership, maybe a loosely held organization or maybe even a corporation might be better. So they are there to ensure that when people come forward with a

concern, that concern is addressed in the most appropriate way. Also, Mr. Speaker, there was a comment—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister's time has expired.

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to make an announcement on House Business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a desire that you come back to the House in your role as Speaker at eight o'clock before we break into committees, so that further instructions might be provided to you at that time.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to speak on this resolution which the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has introduced. As he had mentioned, we have done a considerable amount of work at ensuring that we provide for Manitoba an alternative to non-profit housing.

Mr. Speaker, we have currently approximately 20,000 non-profit housing units throughout the Province of Manitoba. I believe it is in and around 12,000 in the City of Winnipeg which are basically administered through over 140 different types of authorities. One of the roles that I feel co-op housing can play and the Liberal Party feels co-op housing can play, is as an alternative to non-profit housing.

In the past, a concentration of efforts, whether they be the current Government or the previous administration, has been on the unit allocation straight into, whether it is Winnipeg Regional Housing or Winnipeg Housing Authority or Churchill or whatever it might be in terms of a subsidized unit.

The co-op housing, which is relatively new to North America—actually I have the distinct privilege to say that the Willow Park Co-op which is located in my riding, is the first housing co-op in Canada and some have told me in North America. I have not been able to verify that fact, but it would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, because it is a fairly new idea, co-op housing.

We have seen in England where it has been around for quite awhile, they have gone a step further where they have seen some of the co-op housing converted into homes or condominiums for those who have lived in the premises for a number of years. Now, although I would not necessarily agree with the manner in which Great Britain has

seen to move into housing co-ops in terms of the transition into home ownership and as an alternative to non-profit housing, the idea in itself is a good one.

The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) has introduced an amendment to the resolution that does concern me to a certain extent, Mr. Speaker. In the comments he made regarding the resolution and the amendment, he is proposing that the resolution was going to have people who currently live in non-profit housing units, and he drew the example of Gilbert Park which is in my riding, too—he said that these people would be forced to relocate out of Gilbert Park.

\* (1750)

Mr. Speaker, we are not suggesting anything of that nature. If we read through the resolution, there is no place in the resolution that suggests or even hints that we are talking about having people relocated out of non-profit housing units.

What we are trying to explain or trying to convince the Government, and to some degree the official Opposition, is that you can have housing co-ops, and these housing co-ops are a viable alternative to non-profit housing. You do not need to have those who are currently living in non-profit housing relocated into what was traditional in the past in terms of non-profit housing. Both can be accomplished.

You can have those residents who are currently living in, and we will use the example of Gilbert Park because I think Gilbert Park—and I am sure if the Government did have a study of sorts would find that Gilbert Park would be an excellent candidate for a co-op conversion, because of the make-up of the Gilbert Park.

Mr. Speaker, I had a great deal of correspondence, both verbal and written, in the past five years with people who live in non-profit housing. Actually as a student I did an interview of what is known as Blake Gardens, which is in Winnipeg Housing Authority, and many of these individuals have been living inside Winnipeg Housing, in particular Blake Gardens, for generations.

It was not uncommon for myself to go to the next block and find out that so and so's daughter or son is living in the same complex and grew up in that complex. For those individuals, for those who do not have the ability, for whatever reason, to move into a home of their own I believe—and the Liberal Party believes—that this is an alternative to that.

Someone who cannot afford to go out and put down the deposit or the high rental payments, if we have co-ops that are available it is the next best thing to a single-family dwelling or a condominium, if you will, because a co-op in itself allows the members of that co-op to run the operating and the maintenance costs, to make the decisions that they feel are in the best interest of the co-op.

It is a part ownership. In many of the conversations that I have with tenants in current non-profit housing scenarios I often make reference to the fact that in a co-op you are not a tenant; you are a resident. For me, Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference, because as a tenant there is a landlord-tenant relationship; in a co-op I like to think of it as a resident relationship with those that live and own the co-op along with you.

There is an excellent system that ensures there is accountability, that ensures there is participation. That is really one of the nice things about co-ops, is the community involvement. I have I would say several co-ops in my riding and the United Housing Co-op, which is at the north end of the riding, has an annual fiesta, if you will, and the participation is just fantastic. I do not believe you would get that same type of participation from the residents or the tenants in a private sector as you would in a co-op, because there is a much higher degree of interest in terms of the property, how the co-op itself looks.

That is to some degree why I would suggest that non-profit housing would do well if we moved more toward housing co-ops, because you will get the people who are living in the co-ops wanting to participate, and they will be more aware of what is going on outside. If there is a dirty hallway or a window that has been broken, there is that much more of an interest, because it is their property in terms of replacing it, in terms of watching over it, in terms of making sure that things are all right overall.

Another big benefit of a co-op, of course, is that they are not profit oriented. In the private sector, where you have a tenant and landlord scenario, the landlord—and that is the way it should be—is there as a business and is there to make money. A co-op, on the other hand, does not have that as a primary nor does it play a role in its charging for monthly rents. There is no profit, or there should be no profit for co-ops. Co-ops are obligated to ensure that they have reserve funds. Those reserve funds are used to ensure that the co-op is viable, so that when there

is a need to have capital expenditure, that in fact that capital is there and coming.

We know for example in Winnipeg Regional Housing there is a need of in and around—and I have never had it confirmed, but nor has it ever been objected to—\$20 million in terms of bringing up Winnipeg Regional Housing stock.

I do not believe that if we had that type of stock within our co-ops that we would have to worry about the same type of capital investiture that would be needed, because people would be more inclined to take better care of the facilities if they in fact were owners.

That reminds me of a meeting that I had just earlier this week at a co-op in the riding in which someone had brought up to me that we have programs that are available to ensure co-ops get off the ground. There is nothing in place to ensure that those co-ops are eligible for any type of grants or subsidies in any degree in terms of ensuring that some of the needed capital work be done.

This co-op meeting I was at was in fact the Willow Park Co-op which is, of course, now between 20 and 25 years old. It is looking at that stage in which it needs to replace some of the windows and doors and so forth.

Ideally the reserve fund should be able to cover

for it, but where the Government can ensure that co-ops remain viable by having programs that will assist in the co-op being there, not only for today, but also 25, 30 years from now, it is a responsibility of the Government to ensure that in fact takes place, to ensure that these co-ops do survive over the long term. So that if we wanted to move a step further from those who live in non-profit housing allowed to go into the housing co-ops through conversion, and then 15 or 20 years later those who have lived in the co-op for a great number of years have an opportunity in which they can acquire their particular unit as a condominium. I believe Great Britain has moved in that general direction, even though I would disagree with selling it off to the private sector.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have two minutes remaining.

At 5 p.m. the proceedings of the Committee of Supply were interrupted for private Members' hour with the understanding that the committee would resume at 8 p.m. Is there leave of the House to resume briefly at 8 p.m. with Mr. Speaker in the Chair before the Committee of Supply resumes Estimates consideration? Agreed? Agreed.

Therefore, the hour being 6 p.m., this House is now recessed until 8 p.m.

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, December 10, 1990

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Tabling of Reports

Audit - North Portage Development Corporation Manness	2689
---	------

#### Oral Questions

RCMP Services Doer; McCrae; Filmon	2689
---------------------------------------	------

Manitoba Nurses' Union Wasylcia-Leis; Orchard	2690
--	------

RCMP Services Carstairs; Filmon	2691
------------------------------------	------

Federal Government Carstairs; Filmon	2692
---	------

RCMP Services Carstairs; Filmon	2692
------------------------------------	------

Firearms Control Chomiak; McCrae	2692
-------------------------------------	------

Repap Manitoba Inc. Layoffs Lathlin; Manness	2693
---	------

UIC Claim Processing Lathlin; Filmon	2694
---	------

#### Matter of Privilege

Request for apology of Mr. Plohman Manness; Ashton; Lamoureux; Plohman	2694
--	------

### Oral Questions

Shoal Lake - Water Quality Edwards; Cummings	2696
---	------

CBC Cutbacks Friesen; Mitchelson	2697
-------------------------------------	------

Multicultural Grants Friesen; Mitchelson	2698
---	------

Fishing Industry Wowchuk; Enns	2698
-----------------------------------	------

Sport Select Dewar; Mitchelson	2699
-----------------------------------	------

Palliser Furniture Ltd. Reid; Cummings	2699
---	------

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Concurrent Committees of Supply

Family Services	2700
Environment	2718

#### Private Members' Business

Res. 9 - Co-operative Housing Projects	
Lamoureux	2737
Martindale	2739
Connery	2742
Lamoureux	2745