

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 18 April, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** The committee will please come to order. We are on Item 4.(a)(1) Water Resources, Administration: Salaries; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister will recall a few weeks ago, myself and the opposition critic for Natural Resources attended a meeting at which the Minister was present with the Big Grass Marsh Association discussing their long-standing problem with flooding, and, of course, now, I realize that the subject is a little difficult to talk about because the main issue is before the courts and can't be discussed at this time. But I was wondering, from that meeting, if the Minister having seen the area and maybe getting a little better understanding of what the problem is, if he has been able to undertake anything in his department with a hope of an eventual solution to the problem?

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

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the solution to the problem I suppose, ultimately, is money, whatever amount that's going to take to resolve that issue in a major way. Major capital works is the only thing that will do it. I'm not sure how much it would take, but I gather it's quite a huge sum - in the tens of millions of dollars. — (Interjection) — That's right. I think it's about 30 million. It's a good thing we have the Minister of Finance here because we're talking about one little project for about \$35 million, and the credit rating is going to drop if we go back one more time. On the advice of the opposition, we don't want to do that, and therein lies our dilemma.

But, seriously, yes, it was an interesting tour of the area. There was no evidence there that I could see that detracts from the need for us to make certain that we clear the air via court action however, because the court decision would be a benchmark decision if it were to be sustained as it is now and, therefore, I think it's a public duty of ours to make certain that it goes to appeal to determine whether or not in fact that decision stands or doesn't stand. The implications are enormous, not only for Manitoba, but for all of Canada, depending on that decision. So, I think we have a duty to make sure that we have no doubt whatever as to what the right answer is and that can only come through the judgment of a court.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I would hope that the Minister would use all his persuasive powers to get that case expedited because the people have been waiting for a long time for the results. They

thought they had won their case and of course it's gone to appeal. So, they're really not too happy about looking forward to another several years of waiting.

In the meantime, when I look at the departmental report, it says that there is some activity going on in that area in the line of double diking at Waldersee and the Big Grass Marsh, and also a study of the feasibility of diking Westbourne. I can certainly see that diking will certainly help the people in that area, but does the Minister not feel that the more of this work that's done in the area, the worse the problem gets downstream? So there should be some way of overseeing the work or co-ordinating the work so that it isn't just continually compounding the problem.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, I think I have to respond to the member in the way I would respond to general water management problems, rather than specific to that particular situation. We have a problem province-wide with respect to trying to satisfy the demands and some legitimate needs. That area is no exception to that.

I wouldn't want to go beyond that statement, because we do have the matter before the courts. That's as far as I am prepared to go.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Has there ever been, in the history of this long-standing problem, any suggestion of ponding that water and storing it for other purposes further upstream instead of sending it all into that one narrow riverway eventually into Lake Manitoba. Of course, I guess the problem is that the more water goes down there, it fills it up and compounds the problem in that the outlet to the lake gets smaller every year, especially in flood years.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the words that are being used can be used in a court case, therefore, I don't want to respond to that case specifically. The arguments that are being made, however, can be made anywhere in the province in a general way. I think we have to leave that specific one for the moment. For me to comment on technical aspects right now would be improper. I think that's correct.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** You can't comment either on any plans that the department has been involved with over the years of, say, water storage?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we've stored water in many places in Manitoba, and the largest storage area is for Manitoba Hydro. So it depends on the purpose, the need, circumstance. Shellmouth is another example. So the capacity to store water is engineering capacity and expenditures of capital.

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to follow up on the Member for Gladstone's concerns in

that area, I had the fortune of attending the same meeting as the Minister and the Member for Gladstone did. Obviously, this problem is a long-standing one because, talking to Mr. Weber from Water Resources, the first concerns were raised or a survey was done in 1900, using his figures. Obviously, it's been there for a long time. I don't want to touch on things that are in court, you know, on appeal and whatever the case may be, but potentially there is a major concern that if all of a sudden the court case should go against government it would be a major financial impact.

Surely, with our engineering staff that we have available nowadays, and in spite of the fact that various alternatives have been looked at, and maybe here I come back to the argument that I used with the Minister before that maybe our engineering staff, in terms of the way they look at things and plan things, possibly the costs sometimes seem totally out of reach. But when based on the map that was submitted to us and the type of area that is being drained all into one little outlet, referring to the Whitemud River basically, surely if we really put a priority on it we could work out some kind of alternatives other than trying to widen the Whitemud River.

I am still intrigued by the possibility of maybe having a by-pass of some kind that cuts through - I understand some of the problems and I am sure I don't understand all of the problems - but maybe we should be a little bit more sincere in terms of trying to look for alternatives, because what has happened here in a sense, Mr. Minister, is that we have started from the wrong end in my opinion.

We have started creating drainage at the far end, coming off the mountain areas and created drainage that feeds into sort of a single outlet. I am sure the Minister would agree that the normal approach is - at least coming back to my childhood days when we had water in our yards, my dad taught me one thing, he said you start from the bottom end and move up, you don't start from the top end and move down. That is a very basic logic. Surely, our engineers, qualified as they are, must have, over the period of time, used that same approach because it doesn't take a very professional approach to figure out that you start from the bottom end and move up. You don't start from the top end and move down because the problems are related.

Not making light of that, very often municipal drainage has taken place that way and even government drainage has taken place that way to some degree where you start from one end and you start channeiling it down without realizing the full impact of it. In my first years as reeve, I bore the consequences of that kind of drainage in some of the government drains that we had at that time, where actually people were being flooded. In a time of stress of that nature, people will take matters in their own hands and they literally took and tore open roads to let the water go, because the system was not adequate. I am wondering whether we are reaping the rewards of that kind of an approach in this whole system here, and it's a major system.

All I would like to do is maybe reinforce the Member for Gladstone's concerns that I think surely, with the kind of professional help that we have available, that there must be alternatives that we can look at - I realize we are talking big dollars to some degree, but we should

be looking at alternatives. There must be some alternatives in terms of taking this kind of pressure off, because we are following within a certain reasonable distance from the major lake where the water feeds through. Instead, we channel it for many many miles in a big curvature until it finally ends up in there, and I'll accept the fact that we have maybe a major ridge or something like that running through, but certainly, Mr. Minister, somewhere along the line . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** We're talking about the Ridgeville ditch, aren't we?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** No, I'm talking about the area out there.

Mr. Minister, somewhere along the line - and I rely on you as a seasoned Minister that some of these things have to be dealt with, we can't continually keep fudging them - I would implore you, I would ask that you set your mind to it, and if you do, the staff will comply. But what has happened over the years is that we've created a big image out there in terms of dollars, that we say, well, we can't deal with it, we can't deal with it.

In the meantime, the problem keeps escalating and somewhere along the line I think somebody has to get a hold of this thing and try and deal with it. It's not going to happen overnight, but the initiative has to happen, because with all due respect to your staff, it's been sort of looked at as an impossible task and left alone. One of these years, Mr. Minister, certainly one of these years, the situation is going to be synchronized in such a way that we're going to have a lot of water coming down there and then we're going to have a lot of problems. I think that if we initiate it, and the Minister can do that now. In spite of the fact that, you know, in the conversations I've had, that it's been looked at every 15 years, things have maybe been looked at, I think it is time to start doing something positive. If the Minister is trying to tell me, well, it's too big to handle, I don't believe that. I believe there are ways to handle everything within a reasonable scope and if we look at the cost benefit ratio type of thing over all the lands that are being drained, coming back to the point that we've started maybe at the wrong end.

Now, maybe that is not justification for whatever the case may be, but the situation has to be resolved. If the Minister is going to get his staff on it in a serious way, I think alternatives can be worked out.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Is there anything in this long-range 10-year program study you were talking about concerning this problem?

**HON. S. USKIW:** The planning for the future for the Whitemud has to be carried out by the district board, unlike those areas where they are not governed by districts, so that, in essence, we give support of services to the district board.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** So, you're telling me in essence that the Whitemud Watershed Board make all the decisions for what happens in their own district and the department has no input at all except to carry out programs.

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman, we had to approve the programs and our engineering support services are there for the purpose of assisting the districts, but in essence, the policy decisions have to be made at the local level. — (Interjection) — conservation districts, yes. With respect to their own drainage basin, oh yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** What you're telling me is if the district decided that they were going to do major work in this area, if they came up with a plan for it, all they'd need to do was to get it approved and go ahead. Of course, there would be the big stumbling block of bucks. Have they ever come forward with the plan?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Depending on what the plan would be. Obviously, if they were to intrude into other jurisdictions, then there would be other mechanisms in force that would try to deter that or prevent it from happening. I'm thinking in terms of the planning act and things of that nature. But we still have to give our approval - not only approval, but there has to be funding capacity. The ability of the district to raise their own money has its limitations.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** That was going to be my next question. What total budget do they operate on and does this department fund them to some extent? Are the municipalities funding them? What is their structure?

**HON. S. USKIW:** We did touch on this one yesterday. We put up, on average, 75 percent of the capital for projects that are approved for conservation districts. They have a ceiling of 10 mills that they may raise locally.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2)—pass.  
4.(b)(1) Water Licensing and Approvals: Salaries - The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I just want to gather a little bit of information on this aspect of it under the Water Licensing thing and in view of the elimination of the well-drilling program which the Minister submitted to us, I wonder if the Minister could give us a little background as to where we are because I understand the irrigation system comes under this. How many applications are coming in for irrigation? How many are approved, rejected? What is the rationale for the removal of the well-drilling program at a time when water is a major concern for all Manitobans.

I would like to know the direction the Minister and his staff are moving in with this aspect of irrigation and wells because the Member for Arthur was indicating that PFRA had their 50th anniversary the other day and I think PFRA has played a very meaningful part for many years, in terms of dugouts and dams and stuff of this nature and I think their role has maybe been diminished to some degree. Is the Department of Water Resources picking up that kind of slack or where are we? I'd just like to see a bit of direction from this Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, our role with respect to irrigation is that we license the use of water and we license the sourcing of it, but we do not fund any of those programs. We don't have financial support.

Just one point, Mr. Chairman, yes. We have taken the well-drilling program out of this department, but it is now within the Department of Agriculture under water services. So it's been a consolidation actually of water services programming.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** First of all, you know, Mr. Chairman, that's a very short - I was hoping for a little bit of a broader statement from the Minister in terms of what's happening in terms of irrigation and where he wants to go.

The other question I want to raise is that, if it's been removed from Water Resources, the same service is still available under the Department of Agriculture. Is that what the Minister is saying?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there has been a shift of financial support to Agriculture in their particular program need area, but the well-drillers per se are going to be virtually on their own henceforth. The assumption is that it's a mature industry, if you like, and they are able to handle the situation themselves without provincial input.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Coming back to irrigation, could the Minister give me an indication as to what the trend is in terms of irrigation? When we look at our American friends across the line with Garrison, can he indicate, do we have more applications? Do we have less applications? How many are refused?

I was asking before whether he could give us a bit of a general type of statement, and he makes it very short which makes it very hard to understand exactly what's going on.

**HON. S. USKIW:** We do have statistics for both surface water use and ground water use. We've had 100 applications in surface water of which two were for domestic use; four for municipal; 30 for irrigation; four for waterfowl conservation; 69 for - no, that inspection sites and 10 complaint investigations in that.

With respect to ground water we had 54 applications: one for municipal; two for industrial; 23 for irrigation; two for air cooling; one for recreation.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Can the Minister indicate where all these applications, the 100 and the 54 - how many rejections were there or were they all approved?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, out of the 100 we were able to service 40 applications.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Sixty were refused?

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, we don't refuse them. What we do is allow the numbers that the volume of water warrants. In other words, when we run out of water, we cease approving application. It's not that we refuse them but there just isn't a water resource to supply them.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Do they then get approved on the basis of first come, first served in terms of an application?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised it's based on dated applications, yes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Since water, I think, is probably the most important resource that we have in terms of effect on the people of Manitoba and, I think, probably using the example of the American situation and other parts of the world, I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, to what extent is there exploration work done in terms of finding new sources of water.

Why I raise that question, I want to indicate that just to the south of my constituency in the Lancaster area, they have identified a major water aquifer, and not that terribly deep. Apparently, a major source of water out there that the Americans are tapping and since aquifers don't necessarily realize that there are boundaries, this one extends well into the Manitoba area and there's been some initial research done on it and I don't think it's ever come to the fore to any degree, but people are aware of it to the point where even the Town of Emerson has been looking at the possibility of hooking into that from the American side for their town water or for the possibility of establishing our own source of water from that underground source.

Mr. Minister, I have to indicate that it's just gossip, basically that I'm pawing through, but apparently that source of water is there. What are we doing in terms of identifying the extent of that water? What are we doing in terms of trying to harness that source for our benefit instead of having the Americans draw it from us as they are doing right now from the American side?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the department does know the water sources. We do have programs ongoing all the time to determine the capacity, I suppose, and volume, and whatever. We have four main aquifers and the one that the member is referring to, of course, is the additional one east of the Red. We are aware of it. We know it's there and I don't know what the member wants to know beyond that.

The American draw on it is not interfering with our interests, I'm advised.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, the Minister gives me virtually no information because he says they know it's there and we know it's there, — (Interjection) —

**HON. S. USKIW:** So, what's the problem?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** What I want to establish is, is there any planning or is there any concern about identifying the extent of the resource we have there which in my opinion is a major resource that's available. The Minister makes light of it. I take exception to that because I think we want to identify that. When we talk of cost of processing water in the Red River, a poor quality water, when we have a source of very good water from out there, why couldn't we utilize maybe a major plan or start looking in that direction.

I think the department has been negligent in terms of trying to pursue and establish exactly how much we have. What is the kind of resource we have there in terms of the aquifer underground out there? When the Minister says we know it's there, I know it's there. Many people know it's there, but what are we doing in terms of finding out how much is there. What can we do with it?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I alluded to the fact earlier in the Estimates review that we have a Canada-Manitoba

Water Study with respect to the four main aquifers and that's ongoing and will be complete this year - or it is complete? This fiscal year.

With respect to the one east of the Red, I'm advised that it's a managed aquifer on an ongoing basis. We know exactly what is happening with it on an ongoing basis. For every well that's drilled, the water that's pumped out additional to what has been there before, so that it is a monitored aquifer. It's not as if we're ignorant of its existence or its capacity.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I don't want to be difficult about this. For many years it has been identified that we have water aquifer east of the Red River. The LGD where it is located, the municipalities in the surrounding areas, the towns are looking always for a good source of water and we've never been able to get anything from the department in terms of, here we have a source. This is the amount of source - we can tap in it or stuff like that. Is the Minister trying to keep a secret here? If not, then let's get it out so that the people can have some idea exactly what is available.

We're talking of an area that is basically marginal in its ability for agricultural production. Maybe if we can set up an irrigation system somewhat similar to the Garrison, we have this water right there. I'd like to have something come forward in terms of the availability of this.

For example, somebody in that area wants to move in there, a bigger operator, and he's got the funding, would he be able to get a permit to tap into this aquifer and irrigate maybe 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 acres?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the branch is not impotent with respect to providing that service to whoever needs that information. They have it readily available or they can get it in very short order.

I neglected to mention one other area of study that is under way and that's the entire Municipality of Franklin. That is now underway for that very purpose that the member's alluding to.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Now we're getting somewhere. I appreciate that when the Minister comes forth and he tells me where it's at, because the people in the area know some of these things that are going on, but they don't have any detail.

They know that the Town of Emerson, for example, the mayor is a very active individual. He has been talking about the possibility of tapping that kind of water to supply the Town of Emerson. It could also supply the Village of Dominion City. He's asking me, can we get some information, and seemingly this information isn't forthcoming.

So what the Minister is telling me if the Town of Emerson will write this Minister — (Interjection) — I have trouble getting his attention from time-to-time. If the Town of Emerson will write this Minister and the Department of Water Resources as to the availability of this water, the whole picture about what's happening with that aquifer out there, they can get that information, am I correct?

**A MEMBER:** What's the population of Emerson?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, we need a few more of those and I'll tell you something, we'll have a real rhubarb, you know.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the towns and villages are aware as to what the procedures are with respect to getting that kind of information. Essentially, they deal with the Water Services Board, whom we service as well. It all works together and that, of course, is managed through the Department of Agriculture.

So if Emerson has a concern with respect to water supply, we operate through the Water Services Board to deal with that concern, whatever it is. This department puts in the technical input and the report is going to be revealing to the community of Emerson equally.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Fine, okay, because what has happened is that in talking to the Mayor, he indicates to me that he has difficulty in getting the kind of information that he needs in order to make a decision. I don't know what the problem was in terms of - you know this has to deal with the Water Services Board to some degree, who I think are responsible for supplying the water - but because I believe this falls under this category in terms of knowing exactly what is there and what can be done with it, because the Town of Emerson is looking at getting the supply through the Lancaster area - the water system that they have and the costs are going to be less to them than if they try and set up a plant that is going to process and make water available through the Red River system. But because it is from the American side, apparently we have difficulty getting some arrangement made in terms of cost-sharing and that. That is why the Mayor has been asking and trying to get information as to the possibility of maybe tapping this source for that area.

Somehow along the line, Mr. Minister, I'm sure the communities that are looking at this source, if they were told it isn't feasible - you know the cost is too high or something of this nature - they'll accept that, but right now they seem to have difficulty getting information forwarded through the Water Services Board as well as the Water Resources, in terms of what is available and you know the costs in fact of these things.

So that is why I raise these concerns with the Minister and I hope that when I inform the communities that they can come back and enquire about information that they will not be fudged around, which has happened over the past while, Mr. Minister. Information has not been forthcoming and I want to assure them that it will be forthcoming. I will make sure that this department, as well as Water Services Board, will make that information available, one way or another.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the Member for Emerson that if he gets the information before I do, I hope he conveys it to me.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** If that's the case, then I would like to replace the Minister, and as soon as possible.

**HON. S. USKIW:** It depends on which documents are missing, from where.

**A MEMBER:** You may anyway.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur is first.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the Minister on the Water Licensing and Approvals. Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, the question is, what is the current policy as it relates to the transfer of irrigation permits when land or property changes hands? Is the permit first made available to those individuals who are buying the property or leasing it? The transfer of irrigation permits - the first right to get that permit goes with new purchaser or leaser of property?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think the member knows the answer, but for whatever it's worth, the department decides the allocation of the licence, but logically it should follow the pattern of ownership. There is reason for that as the member is well aware, and I don't know that it's fruitful to get into that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes it is.

**HON. S. USKIW:** It is? I'm not sure whether the member is alluding that we should allow the transfer to take place with the sale of the asset, because that gets us into the whole question of whether the permit is worth more than the farm sometimes. That's something we wouldn't want to encourage.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the current policy is. I want to make sure that if an individual sells his property and there's an irrigation permit with it, that that individual has the availability of the water to go with the property. The Minister may not think I'm serious - I am serious.

I think he as well - seeing as he's somewhat of a rookie Minister - that he should apprise himself of the information. I mean this is helpful for him as well, being a rookie Minister, he should learn at the same time we are, so he can give us the information. But I do want to know if a person transfers his or her land, if there's irrigation on it now, the water rights automatically go with that transfer or do they have to go through the Water Resources to get permission?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that it's a learning process around this table.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** And that you are a rookie.

**HON. S. USKIW:** The Member for Arthur might be aware that last year we amended the act, The Water Rights Act, as I understand it . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I thought you should know that.

**HON. S. USKIW:** . . . and to change that provision whereby under the new provisions the Minister may transfer the licence to the new owner. Under the existing law, the original owner gives up the licence, the new one must apply; therefore it's a little more convenient under the provisions that are being proposed, that should be proclaimed rather.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, have there been any difficulties with that? Have there been any irrigators or people wanting to dispose of, or potential irrigators, bring forward any concerns? Is it working fairly smoothly or is there some difficulty with the way in which it now is?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we're not aware of any difficulties at all.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you.

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the municipalities of north and south Cypress, there are these water testing spots. I wondered if, during the last period of years when it's been so dry, has there been any marked decline in the available water for irrigation there?

**HON. S. USKIW:** What area is this?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** North and south Cypress. Carberry area, Carberry-Glenboro.

**HON. S. USKIW:** We're not aware of any problem area as far as water supply is concerned or any major change.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** So there's still ample water for irrigation in that area, should people be applying?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, under the general heading of Water Resources, I wonder if I might inquire of the Minister as to whether or not he or his staff are contemplating any possible amendments to The Crown Lands Act or other related legislation which has to do with the beach properties which are so extensive in Manitoba with regard to the use of vehicular traffic on those beaches, whether they may be Crown owned or whether they're privately owned or whatever, given the extensive increase in the numbers and the advertising for those vehicles in the Province of Manitoba.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there are some regulations of all terrain vehicles in parts but not on Manitoba beaches, per se, but it's a very valid point that the member raises and we are concerned with it as well.

We've had many complaints from various quarters about the whereabouts of all-terrain vehicles on Crown land and even private lands being trespassed, so it is becoming a problem and I'm afraid we're going to have to deal with it in some legislative manner. Probably we need some input from various groups to help us develop the kind of legislative framework that we might be able to live with.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister will know that there has been in existence for generations the law which prohibits the use of any power vehicle in a marsh and that is for the good and sufficient reason that it could, at different times of the year, interfere with the habitat and the breeding habits of, whether it's deer or waterfowl or whatever, so we've got to keep some of these areas in a pristine state if we're going to enjoy the resource that flourishes from them.

Equally, in terms of the beach, there are areas in a beach that members of his staff will be as familiar with as I am, where there are - I can think of one portion of a beach on the southwest corner of Lake Manitoba which is a peculiar breeding habit for a very rare bird, but if that habitat is disturbed at all by motorcycles, three wheel or four wheel vehicles, will result in the ultimate destruction of the breeding grounds for that bird.

I'm just wondering if the Minister is prepared to give consideration, either to regulatory amendment or, if need be, a statutory amendment that would extend the umbrella of protection that we have had for many decades over our marshes to the shoreline of major lakes in Manitoba which require, I think now, this protection in order that the natural waterfowl, to say nothing of the humans who habitate that beach, will have protection from vehicles moving back and forth. I can give him examples, as I know senior members of his staff can, of a particular beach that many of us are familiar with, north of Portage la Prairie, called the Delta Beach where many of us were raised as young children; and when we were put out there, in earlier stages when we were not at a walking stage, we had no danger of being run over by three or four wheeled vehicles. We may have been tripped over by other people but there was no danger of our being run over. For that reason, there are some who are sitting around this table tonight who are here who might not otherwise be here.

That being the case, and my family now having grown to the stage where they are not subject to that kind of problem, but my grandchildren, God willing, when they come, may be subject to that problem. I'm wondering if it commends itself to the Minister and to his department and to his officials to consider extending that umbrella of, I would call, really common sense protection of a great natural resource to the beach areas, whether it be the Victoria Beach area, the Grand Beach area, which the then government of the province bought, I think, for a quarter of a million dollars in 1960, that huge area was bought and given over to public use, if that were to be, as an example, turned over to three and four wheel vehicles for use racing back and forth that would, I think, be contrary to the public interest.

I can't, without caucusing with my colleagues, tell you that there would be unanimous support by the opposition, but I think there would be generous support by the opposition if the Minister were to consider bringing forward some amendment, either in the regulatory or a statutory way, which would confer that umbrella of protection on the beach areas of our province.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the member raises a very valid concern and I'm led to believe that we

probably have sufficient statutory provision now, but it would require a regulatory provision to be placed by Order-in-Council to enforce it and I'm prepared to take a look at that.

**HON. S. LYON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. S. USKIW:** In fact, maybe there ought to be a mechanism broader than just the department to establish the rules that we would like to set down and I certainly would invite members opposite to participate in that.

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to get back for one question on the water licensing and the transfer of these irrigation licenses.

In cases where we have an individual who has a license to irrigate and he sells his farm and operation and the new individual who's buying it, I would believe there would be a subject clause in there subject to the transfer or approval of a license because the operation would probably be contingent, based on the continuation of that irrigation system.

Is this Minister and this government going to have a concern about the price that is involved in terms of a sale of this nature? What I'm asking for - the Minister of Agriculture has indicated there should be no value on quotas of dairy herds transferred - is there a concern in this aspect of it, that if somebody sells a set-up where irrigation and a licence is there and the sale is subject to that, is this Minister and this government going to indicate that there should be no value, or are they going to control the price of the sale of the operations?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there's a very good reason why there's a break between the vendor and the buyer with respect to control of the licence, and it is to try to offset that kind of value added to the asset that is being sold. But there is no regulatory provision that allows us to interfere with the negotiation as to price of the asset that is being sold.

The wording in the act, as I understand it, is that the Minister may transfer a licence to the new owner and the provision "may" is in fact the key word, so that it isn't taken for granted. So there is room for intervention. It's hoped that it's not necessary to interfere.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just a little further on that then. If the Minister felt that there was a hidden value on that licence, that he has the option of saying, I will not transfer that based on the fact that some individual might be capitalizing on the fact that he has a licence.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, this provision was debated apparently at some length in committee, and just for the benefit of the member - perhaps his memory is not serving him well - the provision is Section 11 on Page 9 of The Water Rights Act, wherein it states and I quote: "Where an estate or interest in land is transferred, any subsistence licence relating to the estate or interest expires automatically as of the date

of the transfer, unless the Minister, upon the application of the transferee, transfers the licence to the transferee. So it's quite clear as to how it's to function.

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

4.(c)(1) Water Management: Salaries; 4.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 4.(c)(3) Waterway Maintenance - The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur doesn't have to do that. I will recognize the first one who raises.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Okay, thank you. You're moving along very rapidly and I do have a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman, dealing with Water Management.

The question to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, is what is the intention of the department to reverse the trend, or the unfortunate mishap that has taken place this year, and I'm sure other years, in the Pelican Lake area where there appears to be a shortage of water to maintain the winter fish habitat? Are there any proposals or any recommendations that the Minister is looking at as to not see that disaster happen again in this coming year?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there are two areas in question. One is in the area of fishery, which we're not yet discussing, and the other of course has to do with what we do with lake levels, if you like, and that's what we are discussing.

I have written to the Honourable Jack Murta with respect to that issue and have yet not received a response. The suggestion that we put forward is that federal-provincial agreements or terms of reference be broadened, so that we might take into account more than just cost benefit relative to agriculture interests, and take into account community and recreational needs as well. That was the suggestion offered to him in the letter. We have not had a response yet. I'm hoping to receive a response.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, if you don't have the water, you don't have to worry about the second, that being the fish.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well no, no.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** It normally goes hand-in-hand, that if you have the water you're able to have the fish, and if you don't have the water then the second part is not part of the whole question.

The former government, under the Minister in the Lyon Administration, had made some preparation, had in fact purchased equipment and planned to go ahead to sustain and to maintain the water levels. What has happened to that whole program, Mr. Chairman?

**A MEMBER:** Sterling, you're in trouble if he's supporting you.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the point that I was making in my response to the member was that we recognize there's a shortage of water from time-to-



time. So what we have to do is develop a capacity for more water availability for the lake and that's wherein lies the need for joint federal-provincial participation.

I believe something will come of that dialogue and hopefully within the next short few months we will know just what the attitude of the Government of Canada is.

With respect to the specific proposal that the member alluded to, my understanding is that that program was abandoned two or three years ago, that proposal.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'd be interested to know if it was the decision of the department to abandon that or whether it was the decision of the elected officials? Because I think there hasn't been any change, or to my knowledge there hasn't been any change of those people working for the department. Has the department changed their mind on whether or not the proposals that were put forward at that time, is that where it comes from, or is a political decision as far as financing is concerned? Because as I understood it, and I'm sure many of the people of the southwest area understood it, there were materials purchased, plans to go ahead and now it has been abandoned. Was it the department that abandoned it or was it the politicians?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it was a budgetary exercise, ministerial.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** So one would have to compare it to the Land Titles Office in Boissevain. It was a matter of a decision made by the politicians not to spend the money in the southwest corner, that it was their decision and leaving the fish to suffocate or to run out of water, to have a proper place in which to spawn and to live. It's unfortunate. I can only condemn the government and the Ministers who were responsible for those decisions because we have enjoyed - the many people of the southwest have enjoyed the fishing in Pelican Lake - and I think it's extremely unfortunate that a valuable resource has been left to be destroyed by that kind of a decision.

I would hope that the Minister, in his efforts to get federal support, that he would not totally leave it with that, that it is a Provincial Government responsibility to look after the fish and the water levels. One can only again tell the people of the southwest that this current government really doesn't care about the resources or the people.

A further question dealing with that, Mr. Chairman. Have there been any studies or any work done in the area of Oak Lake as to the water levels and the amount of water that's available to the relationship of the sustaining of the fish in the Oak Lake area? Has any work been done, Mr. Chairman, or is it just a matter of not really paying attention to the water levels in relationship to the fish in that area?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful if the member would just leave that item till we get to the Fisheries section, wherein, I would hope that we have staff here from Fisheries to be able to respond to that.

I know that we have done some work with respect to air pumps on some of the lakes, some with some

success and some with virtually no success. I don't have the detail here at the moment.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm quite prepared to wait till the Fisheries but, again, I point out to the Minister, if you don't have the water, you don't need the Fisheries Department. It appears as if we've got a problem within his department and I can only blame the former Minister for not making sure that there's a good working relationship between Water Resources and Fisheries. You don't need your Fisheries Department if you don't alert your Department of Water Resources and make sure there's enough water for the fish to live in.

I will bring forward my comments during Fisheries, because I have to put on the record that one Bill Henderson at Oak Lake has proven some very effective ways in which to put oxygen back into the lake. I think some support could come in the manner in which I suggested earlier that additional fresh supplies of water during winter months not only in the Oak Lake area, but possibly some work on the Pelican Lake could be extremely helpful. If the Minister is unable to take the heat of the questioning and wants to defer it to the Fisheries Department, then I'm quite prepared to wait.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No innuendoes here.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is right in this sense that there is a problem of water supply in certain parts of Manitoba and has been for a long, long time. Many, many governments have gone by and not satisfied the issue.

**A MEMBER:** We're waiting on you, Sam, to do something.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I wouldn't be the first one that hasn't been able to respond positively - we might be able to get the survey pegs out. Hopefully, through a broadened federal-provincial agreement, we might be able to undertake some of these sizable projects.

I happen to believe that there has to be a lot of work done in that part of the province, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, but we need the money. That's all it comes down to.

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you. Before we move on, I want to raise the same issue that the Member for Arthur raised, but I'll raise it under Fisheries - I think probably that's the area where we can deal with that.

Under this aspect of it the Minister indicated that this is under Waterway Maintenance is where the maintenance of drains, etc., is taking place, and the amount is the same as last year. I suppose the money has been allocated where it's taking place or is that an ongoing basis?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, the process with respect to the allocations is a regional one, Mr. Chairman. Each region has been given an allotment or a budget and their responsibility is to interface with local government and then carry out the projects in accordance with whatever



the results of that process are. It does involve local government.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just for clarification - this is where the regional engineer in conjunction with, let's say, municipalities and everything depending on where the work is required, they come to an understanding and this work is undertaken on that basis. Is that correct?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(c)(1)—pass; 4.(c)(2)—pass; 4.(c)(3)—pass.

4.(d)(1) Hydro Technical Services, Salaries; 4.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, could the Minister just clarify that section for us, Hydrotechnical Services. Lest I get a wrong impression of it, I wonder if the Minister would indicate exactly what is involved in this department.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think the member has already exhausted the issue, but I'm going to relate to him just what the area covers in any event: surface water and ground water investigation; ground water and surface water hydrology; ground water regulation; surface water-ground water supply investigations; services to conservation districts; ground water management and development; flood reduction and studies; flood forecasting; issuance of well-drilling licences - yes, that still stays - water quality testing; water treatment investigations. That's all done under the Hydrotechnical.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'd like to add to the Minister then, that with nearly \$1 million in the Salaries aspect of it and almost the same amount of money on Other Expenditures, then possibly the research for the water aquifer in the eastern region could be tied in there and a report made available to members of the Legislature.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is misunderstanding the nature of this section.

There are 30 staff years, and I would suspect they're all highly paid technical types. The Other Expenditures are really, by and large, payments to the Government of Canada for the operation of water gauges throughout the province. About a half-million dollars of that goes as a direct payment to the Government of Canada for that service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(d)(1)—pass; 4.(d)(2)—pass; 4.(e)(1) Regional Management, Salaries—pass; 4.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

4.(f)(1) Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement, Salaries; 4.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister maybe indicate what's happened in terms of the Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement. I see there is no appropriation under Salaries in this area. Has this agreement terminated now and, if so, are we looking at having a renewed agreement?

**HON. S. USKIW:** This particular item, Mr. Chairman, will be the final phase of our ground water investigations and this item will expire at the end of this fiscal year. The program will be complete.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is there is any need or desire to renew an agreement of this nature or has all the work been completed to the satisfaction of the government of Manitoba?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that we will have a final report on this by next March so that, in essence, the program is complete.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** So, what is the Minister is saying is that in view of the work that has been undertaken in the past on a joint basis that we have established basically our water sources and the Government of Manitoba now can use that information to proceed on developing programs for the future, based on this information.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(f)(1)—pass; 4.(f)(2)—pass.

4.(g)(1) Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Agreement: Salaries; 4.(g)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, under the Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Agreement, first of all I'd like to ask, how long is this program in effect? Is there a termination date on this program and, if so, when?

**HON. S. USKIW:** The general agreement terminates on December 31st of 1994. This particular aspect terminates December 31st, 1989, another four years to go.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is the area where, for example, not the physical aspect of it, but the planning aspect of it, for example, the Ste. Rose diking comes under?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, this is the mapping of the areas. This section has to do with mapping, towns, villages.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I don't quite understand. Is this, for example, where the Town of Ste. Rose, where the project that is being contemplated under Capital, the designation and mapping of it would have taken place under this area here?

**HON. S. USKIW:** That's right; that's the first phase. There are three stages. The first is mapping, then there's the designation of the community and subsequent to that, of course, is the capital project, if you like, construction.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the Minister then, in view of the Ste. Rose project that is undertaken, I suppose it went through stage one which was the mapping, then the designation and now the physical aspect of it taking place. Where would the floodway around Carman, for

example, be in this category? Has the mapping taken place and is it now a matter of designation?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised that the mapping has been taking place and it has been designated and all we need is an agreement with the Government of Canada to cost share the costs of construction.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Not to belabour it in the wrong area, if I want to pursue that area - and I want to pursue it somewhere - would this be the area where we would pursue the aspect of Carman versus Ste. Rose or would I do that under Capital?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I have no particular problem with where it's done. Obviously it will not be duplicated, in any event. I don't think it's Carman versus Ste. Rose; I think it's Carman and Ste. Rose. I don't think it's a trade-off situation. I think that we have problems in a number of communities of which Carman is one and Ste. Rose is another one and there are many others besides that; so it's not either/or, it's how do we do them all.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I don't intend to have repetition of this aspect of it, maybe I should delve into it now to some degree because under our Capital Program there's a fair amount of money that is expended for flood protection for the Town or Village of Ste. Rose, and I wonder if the Minister could give me the breakdown as to is it totally a provincial undertaking, is it shared with the town and province or is there federal participation in there as well?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there is no money here for Ste. Rose. It doesn't begin until the Valley Town dikes are complete. There is an agreement only on Ste. Rose but no allocation.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Fine, if there's no money in it for this here, certainly there is under Capital and then I want to pursue it there because I want to go into depth as to the financial arrangements, how they're taking place, in terms of the project that is designated for Ste. Rose for flood protection by way of diking, versus the proposal for the bypass or whatever you want to call it, for the Town of Carman.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to deal with it wherever the Minister wants to deal with it, but deal with it I will. Again, I'm prepared to wait until we come to the Capital Projects but I intend to deal with that in depth and the Minister can just indicate to me where he wants to deal with . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think it's as appropriate here as anywhere - Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction. To the extent that we're successful in getting money for these projects from the Government of Canada, it could be debated there. Although we don't know that we will be, it's somewhat hypothetical; but I have no problem with dealing with it under that heading.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Fine, then maybe we should just have a little discussion on it right here now.

If the Minister is indicating that it's hypothetical in his Capital Projects, there is a fair amount of money that is designated for that program there. What I'm asking him then is what is the cost-sharing arrangement that is being proposed if it is hypothetical? Is the Federal Government putting in money and, if so, what percentage, what percentage is the Town of Emerson putting in and what percentage is the government putting in?

**HON. S. USKIW:** The present formula is 45 percent federal, 50 percent provincial and 5 percent local.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, then on the basis of the cost benefit ratio that was established some time ago where the Town of Carman had a .7 cost benefit ratio and the Village or Town of Ste. Rose had a .6 cost benefit ratio, can the Minister indicate how this was arrived at, because when we were in government we were coping with that aspect of it and it is at the point of one to one, cost benefit ratio, where the Federal Government then would pick up the 50 percent.

At that time there was activity afoot, in terms of having . . . I just want to use the example of Carman, where the cost benefit ratio was .7 and a proposal came forward at that time where the Provincial Government, in conjunction with the Town of Carman, would then pick up 15 percent each, and based on the ratio of 100 percent, that the Provincial Government would then pick up the balance of the 35 percent and the Federal Government would kick in 35 percent? That was on the .7 cost benefit ratio.

Now what the Minister is telling me is that the Federal Government is kicking in 45 percent. Has there been a change in the formula with the Federal Government in terms of how this is applied, and if that is the case, has the cost benefit ratio changed between the Town of Carman and the Town of Ste. Rose? What I'm trying to establish is how one community, that was lower down on the cost benefit ratio, now benefits for the privilege before another community does and how this was arrived at?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the member is not correct with his statistics. Ste. Rose has a factor of 1 or more, and therefore qualifies under the existing program; whereas Carman is .7 and the feds don't recognize it as qualifying under our current agreement. That is the reason why I wrote a letter suggesting to them that we not look at these things simply on the basis of pro cost benefit, but we take into account a whole host of other things, such as community needs, recreation needs, the regional service needs, and so on, to broaden those terms of reference. It was with respect to the needs of Carman that that is very important.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, then to the Minister, it is likely that maybe I got wrong information, but when did the Town of Ste. Rose, for example, reach the 1-1 ratio, has the cost benefit ratio always been there or has it changed lately, that there's been a reassessment which brings it into that category at this stage of the game?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, if the member is willing to accept it, we can offer to him the report on Ste.

Rose, which the Government of Canada, Treasury Board had to scrutinize and approve.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Has it always been on a 1-1 ratio for the Town of Ste. Rose?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there were a number of project proposals. Not all of them would have qualified.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That doesn't necessarily answer the question that I was asking, whether there has been a reassessment on it, whereas Ste. Rose is now on a 1-1 ratio. If this has always been the case, then I want to apologize and have no further argument in that respect, but the information that I have indicates that the Town of Carman had a higher cost benefit ratio than the Town of Ste. Rose had when we were government and now all of a sudden, we have it on a 1-1 basis. That is the thing that creates some concern for me.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the project was modified to lower the cost of the project which brought it within the formula. So the size of the project was reduced in order to qualify for the formula. The cost benefit analysis has to be different when you have a different cost factor.

The difference between Ste. Rose and Carman, since that's the comparison that the member wishes to use, is that in Ste. Rose it's easy to move or reduce the amount of diking in order to conform with your formula, but it's very difficult to move a ditch - a ditch is a ditch - and that's what's going to be built in Carman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, if we'd apply that same kind of rationale then - and the reason I use Carman versus Ste. Rose is because both communities I think warrant it. In my opinion, I certainly wouldn't put one over the other and I'm not trying to use that. I'm just saying that if this government has decided under the formula, the way they've worked it out with the Federal Government, that one qualifies and one does not, what I'd like to ask the Minister if there was a change in the project to some degree, which has happened in Ste. Rose, obviously there's been a change in plan . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** There's been a reduction in diking.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** . . . a reduction in diking. If there was a change in the proposal for . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** You can't reduce a ditch.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Now, now, the Minister is just saying that. I have some difficulty. There could probably be some adjustments made there. If that came into the same category, or if the Federal Government is prepared to forward monies on a cost-sharing basis with the Town of Carman, is the Minister prepared to proceed with that project as well?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that we presented an argument for higher benefits for Carman, but those arguments were rejected by the Government of Canada.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Can the Minister indicate when these arguments were put forward?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Two years ago, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Then I want to suggest to the Minister that possibly because there's been conversations with the federal member for the area, Jack Murta, who has indicated I believe that the Federal Government would probably be receptive to a cost-sharing arrangement to proceed with this project as well, will this Minister then be prepared to undertake — (Interjection) — I certainly believe it.

Might I suggest to this Minister, or I'd like to ask him, if this kind of arrangement can be worked out with the Federal Government for the Town of Carman, whether he would then be prepared to proceed to try and negotiate that aspect of it and then proceed with the project as well?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the member that we're a way ahead of him on this issue. We have pleaded with the Government of Canada to modify their stance so that we could include towns like Carman. I have a letter dated some months back just on that very point, suggesting that we take a look at formula, so that we could include other towns and villages throughout the province. We have yet to get a response to that plea.

I anticipated the member's question, that's why I had done so, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes you did, of course. Of course, Sam. Oh boy, you're smooth.

Might I suggest then to the Minister that if you sent a letter to the Federal Government, to the Federal Minister responsible I suppose, whether he would consider sending a carbon copy to the member for the area, the Honourable Jack Murta?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I wrote.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** You wrote to Mr. Murta?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** And there's been no response to date? — (Interjection) — I promised him a bridge out there in the Carrot River, what have you done? You've built him half a bridge. Wait, we'll build them a total bridge, not half a bridge.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, if I may, I believe that the Government of Canada . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do the members want to maintain their conversations?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, and we were having such a peaceful committee here. I wonder if those

members are going to disrupt it that have just arrived, maybe? — (Interjection) — No, no I think the motivation comes from somewhere else. I think the Minister was going to make a statement and I'm waiting for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister is making a statement but he cannot be heard.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I was going to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Canada is having as much difficulty putting together dollars for a project like this as is the Province of Manitoba, and that's not a reflection on the Government of Canada; it's a reality of our economic times, therefore, I can understand the delay in the response to my letter. I'm not at all surprised that they are not able to respond very quickly.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'll accept that, Mr. Chairman. I just want to - on behalf of the Minister concerned, I just wanted to dispel any possibility that there could have been a political decision in this aspect and that's why I figure that we should get to the root of the problem. If the occasion arises that the information is not quite accurate, then we will pursue this further.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, let me put something on the record for the member's benefit. I would like to see a Carman project, along with a number of other ones.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Have there been any new initiatives under this program, or are they all carryovers from initiatives started in the previous administration?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there is no change in the program at all, but the program is flexible, so that if there are new needs identified then we are able to address them.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The only ones I'd suggest are the ones I talked about earlier, in the constituency which I represent as far as flood is concerned, and I wonder what element of water conservation has been injected. Is it a one-sided objective, is water or flood damage reduction by water removal, rather than upstream conservation and ponding?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Just to clarify a point, Mr. Chairman, the federal-provincial agreement does not provide for flood protection on farm land, so all that we're involved with, with the national government, is the towns and villages community protection, but not farm land flood protection. For those projects we have to have reservoirs or whatever, floodways or whatever and we may want federal participation to do them but the present agreement does not provide for it.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Does the federal agreement not provide for the diking of individual farmsteads?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that program was terminated, some time ago.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** But it is correct that there was federal-provincial flood damage reduction monies available for individual farmstead diking in the Red River Valley. Is that not correct?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, that was under the Flood Assistance Board, and that program ended some time ago.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I just have one question relating to the Cowan District and the North Duck River. I believe the department is undertaking some study in that area to try and reduce the flooding to the agricultural community and I wonder if the Minister could bring me up to date on what's happened there.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised that there is effort under way to promote the development of a conservation district approach up there for the purpose of storage of water and related projects. That's under the Agri-Food Agreement, by the way, so there is effort under way to deal with the problem but we haven't defined just what it is we are going to be proposing.

The discussions are taking place with local people to develop a program, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Can the Minister indicate what will happen there this coming year?

**HON. S. USKIW:** In terms of development?

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Yes.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised that the groups have not yet come up with project proposals to date.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** So it'll be an ongoing consultation to try and arrive at what approach will be taken.

**HON. S. USKIW:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman. There's another four years to go on that project.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(g)(1)—pass; 4.(g)(2)—pass.

4.(h)(1) Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement: Salaries; 4.(h)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just a matter of clarification, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Under this agreement, is this the last year of that agreement that was undertaken by the Federal-Provincial Government, in terms of some of these drainage projects on the Marsh River and the Cook's Creek projects? Is this related to that?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, this agreement expires in September of 1985.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Under that agreement, there were certain monies designated for, as I indicated, the Marsh River area and the Cook's Creek thing. In that agreement there was a maximum of monies that were going to be expended under that program.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Originally we had earmarked \$500,000 for the Marsh River and that's been increased to \$850,000.00.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** By the time these projects are completed, which are part of the Capital that we're looking at, will all the maximum monies have been expended under this program that could be expended?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the situation is that we must cash flow all of the money by September of this year because if we don't we then simply lose the dollar allocations. We cannot carry it over.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I understand that. Mr. Chairman, what bothers me a little bit is that under the initial agreement - I think it was a five-year agreement, if I'm correct - that certain drainage projects were undertaken and I understand that in the Marsh River area, for example, the total project will not be completed because of lack of funds. Would that be correct?

There is one drain that I understand in the R.M. of De Salaberry or the R.M. of Franklin that is not going to be completed because they have run out of funds. Would the Minister confirm this aspect of it?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the staff advises me that it's possible that we may get into that one as well depending on whether or not we have good tenders coming in on the other projects which may result in some additional capital being made available, depending on how the bid process comes through. There may be money is available.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, you know that sounds encouraging. My concern would be, because a big portion of the final monies are not being spent in the Cook's project, that all the monies that are cost-shared, that we use it to the maximum, that we do not leave any money on the table.

What happened, and it's happened before under the Flood Protection Program that we had in the Red River Valley that we left certain monies on the table that were not cost-shared and I'd be very perturbed — (Interjection) — I just want to indicate to the Minister, I'd be very perturbed that since we're right down to the end of it, because I feel that possibly the project should have taken off a little sooner. The sooner that it could have been initiated, the cost of doing these things would have been less because each year the cost of doing these things are a little higher. As a result — (Interjection) — shut up, Scott.

What has happened now is that we've dragged it right to the tail end and, as a result, — (Interjection) — we're not going to be able to complete the total project maybe because of lack of funding. I just want to indicate to the Minister that we'll be watching this very closely that if the monies are all drawn down on a cost-sharing basis, fine. Then, I'll accept the fact that maybe this one project cannot be completed or undertaken.

If there's going to be money left on the table, then I'll, rightfully so, be very perturbed somewhere along the line because I feel, and I'm not reflecting this on any individual government, I'm reflecting this maybe

on the staff to some degree that we were slow and dragging our feet in starting this. This was a five-year program. It got initiated and it got hung up in, I don't know where, for almost two-and-a-half years. I know that our staff are very capable of having a project worked out a lot faster than that. We were slow in moving on that for a long time.

First, was the initial signing and the agreement. Everybody was excited and then for a long period of time nothing happened. Now, at the tail end — (Interjection) — well, if I'm going to talk into a vacuum, I'll do that. I want to have the attention of the Minister. It's important to me.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm hearing.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I think we did not move in time on this thing and as a result, we're not making maximum utilization out of these joint agreements. That is why we're going to be very careful as to what happens.

If the Minister tells me that if the bids come in at such a rate that some of the project can be undertaken and this one that's going to be left, fine. If it's going to be a dragging factor again and if we're not going to be able to complete certain projects and leave money on the table, then this issue will rise again, I can guarantee him that.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to be arguing for the member to live up to that commitment. Let me tell him that our expectation is that we will cash flow every dollar by August. We're giving ourselves a little bit of flexibility in the event that something gets in the way of completion where we can't cash flow all the money. We have more projects than we have money for. So, it's our intent to cash flow all of the cost-shared dollars.

With respect to being slow on getting off the mark, I'm advised that one of the major problems, with regard to that, has to do with getting concurrence from local governments, that there's been a tremendous amount of delay with regard to that aspect. As the member knows, if you're working with local government, you want to have agreement. It sometimes takes a little while to arrive at that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That's fine.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate to the Minister then, I will take that message back to the municipalities and tell them that they dragged their feet and because the projects aren't completed, it is their fault.

**HON. S. USKIW:** They'll be completed.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** No, they won't all be completed because one drain will not be done.

**HON. S. USKIW:** We won't have the money.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, this comes back to the argument that I raised before if the movement had been a little faster beforehand, and if it is the municipalities' fault, then they shall accept that responsibility that they were slow. I think that the municipalities can correspond with the Minister in that

aspect of it. I think I would beg to differ on that aspect of it. The intention and desire was there all the time and the responsibility lay with the government, not with the municipalities.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't fault the member for wanting to differ with me on that being the municipalities are his constituents. I recognize the value of his response.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Don't try and put it that way, Sam. This issue is not closed necessarily after the statements you've made.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, is there any intention by the government to renegotiate the similar kind of an agreement?

Mr. Chairman, we're on Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production are we not? The question is is there any intention to renegotiate or negotiate another agreement?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Agri-Food Agreement replaces this one.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well yes, Mr. Chairman, that's a different name but is there any intention to renegotiate or to recommend any more programs, whether it be in drainage or whether it be in water ponding or conservation programs I've heard a lot of political statements in the last year about this program, but I haven't heard any or seen any water development projects. Are there any water development projects that are proposed?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, in the Agri-Food Agreement, it's a \$25 million package over five years and in Soil and Water Conservation.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** There's some in Water Conservation, Mr. Chairman.

Will we have the opportunity to see or to debate some of the projects that will be looked at or what is the intention of the Minister and the government to look at them? Some time ago, in these Estimates, a few minutes ago, he kept telling us there weren't any funds available. That's the reason why some of the projects in the southwest area couldn't be developed, why my colleague, the Member for Emerson, couldn't see any development because of a shortage of funds. We now know that there are \$25 million available.

I know, for example, the cost of the Cromer Dam is something like \$4.5 million. If I were asked, I could certainly recommend a few other projects. So, there is money, there is an agreement. What is he going to do with it?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, at the present time the consultative process is under way with respect to the \$25 million and its various agricultural groups and rural agencies that are submitting proposals, or will be submitting proposals, as to which projects should be undertaken, where and the scope of them. When we

have the collection of all of that, we will then be able to start our decision-making process at the central level.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister — (Interjection) —

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister is not finished.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, yes, there are over 220 proposals to date which have to be sorted out.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister refers to 220 proposals. I would like to know who those proposals have come from. I am not aware of any public announcement that they were inviting proposals to come forward to use this \$25 million. How would any constituent or any MLA have know that this kind of proposal or opportunity to make a proposal was available? Maybe I missed someplace.

Was it advertised in the Manitoba Co-operator or in the Free Press or in any of the weekly newspapers, rural newspapers? He refers to 220 projects. Did that come from his staff or engineering department? He indicated that he was in the consultative process. Well, with 220 projects, has he received the propositions and is going back to consult with them or is he just trying to get through this? I am anxious to know how some of the people, who I know want work done, how can they get their project on a priority list? I think it's extremely important that we delve into this in a fairly major way.

The Minister, for so long tonight and this afternoon, has kept saying there isn't any money available. Now all at once we find \$25 million under the Agri-Food Agreement. Well, how do we go about getting our constituents involved in this consultative process and how is it advertised? Could we have the list of priorities presented to the Legislature before they're proceeded with? What's the whole process, Mr. Chairman? I'd like the Minister to explain the process.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the problem that the member perhaps fails to recognize is that this whole program is managed by the Department of Agriculture, not our department. We are merely respondents to requests from Agriculture to implement their decisions. The consultative process involves soil conservation districts and departments; water conservation districts; R.M.s; agricultural associations, and the extension service of the Department of Agriculture. That's where all of the input is coming from with respect to projects that should be proposed, considered, launched, etc.

So we are merely a respondent to that process. We deliver the technical service, if you like. We are not the decision makers with respect to where, how much, and when.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat confused. I think if the Minister had taken some time before the Estimates and talked to his staff, he might have found most interesting what's going on in the department. I'm now finding that the Minister said 5 or 10 minutes ago, that there was consultation taking place as to what projects and programs were going to be looked at. Now we find out that his department has

nothing with that, but it's the Department of Agriculture that is responsible for it, and all they do is take the orders from the Department of Agriculture.

I agree that the conservation district should be a part of the discussions. I would like the Minister, or have the Minister of Agriculture to table or provide us with letters that have gone out to the conservation districts, asking them for recommendations on projects within their districts.

Again, a direct question and I'm not expecting the Minister to table that kind of correspondence tonight, but I would expect that kind of backup documentation to be available to us because, after all, he's making certain statements and I would hope that we'd be able to look at the kind of documentation.

I think it's a good opportunity, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister being new in the department should take the opportunity to personally look at it and review. Yes, I have a lot of respect for the Department of Agriculture and their staff, but I think it's incumbent upon this Minister to sit down and say, as a Minister, these are the priority projects that we want to look at, that the conservation districts have got some good recommendations and that he is prepared to table them before this committee or a committee of the Legislature or in the Assembly, so that we, the opposition, can put forward constructive criticism of those projects.

If we don't, Mr. Chairman, we're right back where we started from, as I said at 4:30 this afternoon or prior to 4:30, it is not the elected people that are deciding what projects or how our provincial and federal money is being spent and that's what's wrong. Too many times, the people who are hired by the people of Manitoba, the bureaucracy, are making the decisions that aren't always, in my estimation, in the best interests of those people who are paying the taxes. And there are numerous, numerous projects which I would like to have the opportunity to look at and to debate on the \$25 million or whatever the amount of money is. And it's his government.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to look for and can't find - or maybe he could tell me where in the Estimates of the Department of Water Resources the \$25 million shows up as a capital item or an expendable item, to do the work that he suggested is there. I realize that it takes time and planning and all that type of thing, but he's indicated there is \$25 million amount of money available. He takes the instructions from the Department of Agriculture, which is in reverse of what he said 10 minutes ago, that he is now in the consultative process with those people.

I am not precisely clear. If I were to put a legislative report out, how could I tell the constituents of Arthur how they can apply for or be involved in the \$25 million program that's under the Agri-Food strategy of the Provincial and Federal Government?

There are water projects that we in the southwest want to see carried out. My colleague, the critic from Emerson, I'm sure has projects he wants to see carried out; as well, Gladstone, Swan River, all those areas that have got water projects and a need for water projects, how do we get a piece of the public money? How do we be a part of the decision which we're elected to be? How do we become a part of the debate as to where the money is spent? Do we have that opportunity or do we not? Are we expected to vote the monies

that are in this appropriation which will pass and we forget about any further agreement?

If I'm debating it in the wrong place, then I'm prepared to yield to directions from the Minister as to where we can do it. But all we want to know is what the projects are and how our constituents can have the opportunity to provide some recommendations as to projects, its use of capital money. I don't particularly want the engineers of the Department of Water Resources making the decision. I want the people who are elected by the people to make those decisions.

That's what I want, even though it is he that makes a decision and may make the wrong one, as far as I'm concerned, at least I have the chance to make that known. I want to be satisfied that he's making the decision as to which projects are being carried out in a priority basis, rather than the staff. I want the Minister to tell me the process and the procedure. If I'm out of order by debating it under the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production, where can I debate the monies that he talked about? He said there's \$25 million. We want to use some of it in all of the province at our decision making process.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I know that probably we're not all listening as intently as we ought to be, and that's because we are also consulting at the same time. I did mention that this program was delivered by the Department of Agriculture, not by this department; that the management of the program is in Agriculture. We are response department to the decisions already having been made by the other department. So we're technical in the sense that we deliver the project, as engineers if you like, but we don't make the decisions with respect to the projects. That item can be debated under the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture on Page 14, under 7.(b), when we get to the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman.

The Department of Agriculture is doing the consultative work with respect to the proposals that are being brought in, and this department is not doing that; so I know what the member wishes to know, but we are not in a position to respond to him because this is not the operative department, it is merely the technical services department to the program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(h)(1)—pass; 4.(h)(2) . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I should clarify something else, if I may. The \$25 million program that we're talking about is not totally in the area of Water Resources. I think there's about \$6 million in water resource projects out of the \$25 million. There are soil projects and there are farm management and crop projects and it's a five-year spread; so we're looking at \$5 million a year on average, over five years, over three or four different programs.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** It's not quite as much as we were led to believe a while ago.

**HON. S. USKIW:** If I left that impression, I simply want to correct it now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(h)(2)—pass.



Resolution 121: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,098,500 for Natural Resources - Water Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Before we rise, I just want to indicate to the Minister that next time when the committee meets, we'll be dealing with Parks and I just want to indicate to him so that he can get the information that I'd be very interested in getting information as to what has happened in terms of the tendering of the parks and roadside parks, so I'll be pursuing that in the opening portion of the Parks Branch so that he can prepare himself along that line.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Did you submit a bid?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'm just forewarning the Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Did you submit a bid?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I move committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.

### SUPPLY - HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health. Item 3.(c) Brandon Mental Health Centre - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there were roughly 20 vacancies between the two homes, right? - 20.5, thank you. Now the Minister obviously had no intention - or I'll ask him - the guideline that was set down on the 7 percent vacancy, January 1st, obviously wasn't able to be met or even come close to in the mental hospitals because they - is it fair to say that they had no staffing surplus?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The mental hospitals were excluded of this, and as I say, we had that yesterday, there was a guideline and there was a committee that heard the appeals, a sub-committee of Cabinet that could . . . and in Health we made that our first priority, all the way. We got the money from tourists . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Speak into the mike please.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The Minister almost confirmed what I was saying last night that the Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centres were exempted from this 7 percent freeze. I don't know what the . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Excuse me, just the nurses, not the administration.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** There are, out of about 1,100 employees, there were 20 vacancies, and if my numbers are correct from last night we had - not that I want to

get into last night again - but out of the 571, I think there was a higher percentage of vacancies there than the Minister indicates were the vacancies in the Mental Health Centres at Brandon and Selkirk.

So it would seem to indicate that the Minister achieved some savings in Regional Services because he obviously didn't have the same kind of staff reduction in the health centres because there was no freeze on them. — (Interjection) — Well, that's not tricky, I mean that's just straight fact. The numbers prove it.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You're trying to set me up to say that we didn't have enough staff . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** No, all I'm saying to you is that last night when the 7 percent guidelines were in place on Regional Services, there was a substantially higher vacancy than there was in the Brandon-Selkirk Mental Homes where there was no freeze. — (Interjection) — That's right, exactly.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

Could the members address their comments to the Chair rather than to each other.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** There's always someone trying to spoil our fun isn't there? — (Interjection) — That's right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister - basically, the Minister has indicated that Brandon and Selkirk were exempted from the — (Interjection) — The deliverers of care, whether they be nurses, orderlies, etc., were exempted in Brandon and Selkirk of the 7 percent guidelines on vacancies. You just can't spare any staff there. You've got to replace staff as and when because Brandon and Selkirk, they don't have a surplus of staff.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I think that's a fair comment.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, just another question on a little bit different subject.

When the two 100 bed psycho-geriatric facilities are completed at both Brandon and Selkirk - the Minister's already indicated that basically you've got enough patients within the facilities to probably fill both of those - does this represent an opening of the 100 bed psycho-geriatric, basically, personal care home facility and a closing of 100 beds in each of the facilities?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, yes, at least 100 beds. If we could, at that time - there'll be a selection, of course, those that would fit in the best in the psycho-geriatric hospital. You'll see gradual - maybe I should tell you that. It's been gradually reducing the population of both these establishments. That was started in the former . . .

I'll give you Brandon to start with, the numbers. I'll start by '79-84; 574, 555, 559, 519, 492 and 451. We would take 100 anyway from the best and we would keep on while we can, reducing the population. Mind you, it might even be reduced more depending, but we have to remember there might be people in the community now, but when we open these community

residences also, so that might reduce further. That's the intention and that is the people in this field. The same as mental retardation. I think I didn't hear the statement that apparently was on the news media, but I think that's what we would like to see eventually reduced. It's obvious they can't reduce 500 like that. Eventually you would have a reduced population.

I believe that there'll always be necessity, certainly in my lifetime anyway, for - it doesn't mean that I want to be one of those patients - some kind of an institution maybe with a much reduced population but we'll need it.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I appreciate that's a long-term goal. Let's just pick a date out of the air and let's say that you've got your 100 bed psycho-geriatric ward ready two years from now and a couple to three months to transfer patients and get them settled in; does that, at that point in time, close a 100-bed wing over at each of the facilities? That's really what I'm looking for.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Right. That's correct, Mr. Chairman. They're replacement beds, they're not new beds.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I presume that the contract that the government just signed covering the MGEA applies to both Brandon and Selkirk, in that they are MGEA employees, and in this fiscal year we'll be getting an extra week's holiday rather than an increment. Now can the Minister say whether 49 weeks is an average work time per employee now, given that most people are probably at the three-week holiday level, or should it be something higher?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I understand that the hospitals have the approval in principle to go back to the Treasury Board, if need be, because of that week that we're going to lose to provide the replacement to keep the standard of care.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, then is it fair to assume that the Minister, in anticipating this and having Treasury Board approval, to hire, if necessary, staff - I believe quite frankly that's going to be necessary in discussions

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I beg your pardon? You believe what?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I believe that hiring of additional staff is going to be necessary from discussions I've had with some of the people at both Brandon and Selkirk, that they are running their operations at what they consider to be minimal staffing levels and to allow the staff the one week additional holiday in lieu of a pay increase. In some words there's eight months of holiday time that they believe have to be replaced with hiring.

Now I just did a quick calculation, on the basis of a 49-work-week year - if I'm going at this right - 49 work-week year, 1,100 employees roughly, and if you have to give each and every one of the 1,100 employees an extra week of holiday pay, then you're going to have to make up roughly 23 staff positions if you're going to maintain the same staffing levels.

Does the Minister anticipate that No. 1, has he got enough Treasury Board authority to supplement the 1,100 staff complement with an additional 23 individuals to make up for any perceived staff shortages? Has he got that Treasury Board authority?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't made this calculation and I'm not going to get involved in numbers and so on, but in the principle, I believe that I have, but I want to say that I intend to be very careful because we are going in a bit of a different direction or at least faster than we have been going before, and it might be people that when we move to the community, we don't want to be in a position that we'll have to let personnel go and maybe to hire a different kind of personnel; so we'll have to be careful that somebody that probably could be involved in the community because . . .

Don't forget that once we open these, the more services that we give in the community which is certainly lacking - I think we all agree with that - or it's there, but there's certainly not enough, we'll have to improve that. As we reduce the population of these institutions to go in the community resources, we will need more staff there also so it will have to be done in an orderly fashion. But, yes, I think the point has been accepted by Cabinet to give us the authority to go to Treasury Board, that we don't want the standard and the service to suffer.

Of course in certain areas, especially with some professionals, it has been very difficult to recruit and I think my honourable friend knows that, and that's not just these last four years. Ever since I've been in this House, it's always been the same thing.

Now we have different programs, as I say, to encourage and to train GPs that could do some of this work and the line that we have between Brandon - that should help quite a bit. But in the answer to the principle, will we have the authority to fill these positions needed because of this agreement with MGEA? I would say yes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Does the Minister have a target authority that he can go up to? Do you have an authority that you can go up to, in terms of replacement hiring?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Chairman. It's obvious; I think my honourable friend knows how Treasury Board works. I'll have to make my arguments and I'll have to convince them of the need. I'll have to have good arguments to be able to prove that I need these people.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I'm pleased to hear that - and I realize that one is treading on thin ice when you take the global salary package for Brandon and Selkirk and you add the two together and you divide by the 1,100 staff, you come up with \$26,500 roughly, as an average wage.

Assuming the Minister has to undertake replacement hiring, because there is no salary increase and that the one week of holiday pay can't simply be given like, quite frankly, in the Minister's office and in various other branches. They probably can get away with their people being away for an extra week, which brings into question whether we need that number of extra people in the Civil Service, but that's another debate entirely.

But I believe, given the Minister's numbers on the vacancies in Brandon and Selkirk and the fact that, although with Regional Services, he may not have followed or accomplished the 7 percent guideline, he did nevertheless follow the suggested guideline on vacancies in Regional Services. But specifically Brandon and Selkirk were exempt, which to me would indicate that the staffing levels at both Brandon and Selkirk were run thin, that there was no surplus staff there that you could allow the vacancy policy to be put in force there to increase vacancies by even .5 percent; which would follow naturally that, given the fact that each and every one of those 1,100 staff at Brandon and Selkirk are going to be enjoying another week of holiday in lieu of a pay increase, that the Minister is probably going to have to replace - if not all of them or all of the vacancy basis that one week of extra holiday - at least a portion of it and probably a high portion of it. If that is the case, and using roughly a \$23,500 figure as an average salary, and he may be able to hire a replacement on a part-time basis for less, that's a half-million dollar implication on the budget this year.

What I'm pointing out to the Minister is the kind of problem that this perceived victory by the government in terms of negotiating with the MGEA has zero percent increase in year one with a one-week holiday in lieu of a pay increase, the impact is fairly obvious on Brandon and Selkirk. The Minister had them exempted from his vacancy guidelines, but that impact is applying to them because they're a hospital, basically a hospital. That same impact is following through on all of the hospitals and personal care homes that are funded through the Health Services Commission. They don't have room to give their staff an extra week. In reality, this zero percent pay increase, although it may have been a moral victory for the government, something they can hold up as being a great negotiating victory and accomplishment for the government, in this one section alone, may cost us a half-million dollars in Treasury Board special warrants. This is but one small part of the institutional health care delivery system throughout the province.

The "theoretical victory" gained in the contract settlement with the MGEA with no wage increase and the extra week holiday will cost these two institutions and will, indeed, have an impact, and a severe impact that the Minister's probably already aware of, on the acute care institutions and the personal care homes that are outside funded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's not general for the government because the MGEA, of course, there's a lot of employees. I don't think if I had negotiated for the hospital, that is the direction that I necessarily would have gone. So, therefore, it is a victory in itself. That is why we have been exempt on this because it's not the best way to go with direct services like in the hospital. I guess that's not the way we're going, so far anyway, in that general direction in the hospitals through the Commission. That's not MGEA employees in the hospital, just in those two because they're government efforts.

I think it is a victory, not just because whoever negotiated that - I have no credit for that. Of course,

the employees that are working in these institutions are MGEA and they are part of the contract - it wasn't the negotiations.

I think it is a victory, a good victory, because you're not reducing jobs. I think you had a situation, if anything, you're increasing jobs. You might not be saving money on the long run, but you're employing more people and I think that's important.

I've always felt that it's difficult - we have to be careful in the job. For instance, we've had the same staff years and that's why you have vacancies also, from 574 to 451 in about five years. That's 100 less people, pretty well with the same staff; there hasn't been a reduction. So I'm sure that we're not going to have to have exactly the same number and we'll be very careful. But the member is absolutely right, it's not the best way to go for the work that we have to do, in other words, for the direct service, but we certainly could live with it with that understanding. That was our main concern. That's why I say that we already have the principle, the understanding that we will go through to Treasury Board, but I want to say that we'll be very, very careful because we will need more staff pretty soon, not at the hospitals so much but in the community.

Eventually, if maybe Doctor Toews, if he's looking at me, and Don might have an idea, maybe we could reduce another hundred or so from that eventually, gradually, but you will have replacements. That was a big mistake we did in Tulchinsky's days. The movement was, close these institutions. In fact, some people thought we could close everything; and there's no way that we're going to close this to have somebody drugged all the time in bed or tied in bed or something. I don't think that's good.

First of all, the community wasn't ready to accept these people in the community. I don't know if my honourable friend was in the House when, in Education also, that we said some of these people have to go back and some people that are retarded and so on and even the teachers wanted no part of it. The parents were saying, what's going to happen to my kids if these kids are beside them, and there was a fear. There was this prejudice and I remember we passed an act but didn't proclaim it - and that was understood. That's what we were going to do, to educate the public.

Now it's quite a bit different. There's been an awful lot of change and we did not have the trained people to accept these people in the community, nor the facilities. So what happened? You had the case - I'm not going to name anybody - but this person who has not been in the hospital since we took over but was talked about years ago and all the facilities that talked about changes, well that was one of those things. People had nowhere to go, so what did they do? They either roamed the street, and that is not the best thing to do. I'm not saying there was nothing at all and you can see that all over - you can see that away more in large cities in the States than you see it here, it's awful there - or when it was real bad, they were admitted to acute hospitals in psychiatry.

It's the same thing as now, the problem we have with people that have been panelled for personal care homes who are in acute beds. So again, those acute beds actually were beds that we were closing in institutions. They ended up in acute beds and therefore we had no acute beds for the people that just need

some kind of treatment and help for a few days or weeks and then that could go back in society. So now we're in a better position, but we're going to be careful. We've learned our lesson. We're not going to go as fast and we'll be ready for these people. We're not going to start closing these places with nowhere to go.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I accept what the Minister is saying. When I point out the victory in the negotiating process, I'm saying that I'm giving whoever negotiated it a reasonable amount of credit for establishing a zero percent mentality out there, that their wages are going up zero percent and using his calculations - I think the number has been touted that it's worth really only about .8 percent or something like that, to have that extra week of holidays. I don't how that's calculated but it appears . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Finance is following me, you can ask him when he comes back. He should have the information.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** We will ask him. But basically I believe - and I think it's proof positive in this particular line in the Estimates - that although the victory may have been achieved in the public perception that there's zero percent, and indeed throughout the administrative sections of your department until we got to these two sections, you will be able to live with that because in Regional Services you will simply have a circumstance where a public health nurse has an extra week of holidays and maybe something will get delayed for a few days, but that's all; in Continuing Care, maybe some service will get delayed a few days, a week at the maximum and that's all. And the level of service will be down, but it will be down marginally, so that there may well not be a recognition that it's down. In the Minister's own office, with three or four or so secretaries that he has in his office, maybe a letter won't get out five days after it's received or acknowledged, it might be six or seven. But I mean there isn't going to be any major change in the level of delivery of service within the line departments in the administrative sectors of the department.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Except direct service.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** But when you get into the hospital setting like we have here with Brandon and Selkirk, you indeed are, I believe in general, running these sectors at pretty well the limit of staffing. I don't think you can go down a great deal more.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Don't forget we've been steady for the last four or five years. We've cut down 100. I know that you don't just cut that much but we've got a bit of flexibility compared to what we had five years ago.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** But the Minister, in what he's saying, is confirming what I'm saying. In the last number of years the staff has been gradually pared down.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Increased? Is that what you're saying?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, it stayed the same, but the population has gone down.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, I follow what you're getting at there. But by the fact that - and I go back to your vacancy guidelines - you exempted both these institutions and the victory, as I say, in the negotiation is there in that you can tout the zero percent increase, but if you follow it here - well I don't think you're going to be able to follow it here, and I think the Minister is recognizing he's not going to be able to follow it here, because he's already got Treasury Board approval to come back if he needs some additional funding.

So in reality the zero percent perception victory applies only in the administrative sections of government. When you get down to the people who are delivering the institutional services, you're going to have to add more money, so it's not a zero percent increase. If I can be so presumptuous as to make a prediction or a guesstimation, I think that's why you were able to arrive at a settlement with the nurses, for instance, because you recognized the case they were putting forward that a zero percent wage increase is a guideline because everybody else was getting an extra week holiday just didn't apply to their case.

So the zero percent was good perception politics, but in institutional care, not applicable. You're probably going to have somewhere in the neighbourhood of up to a 2 percent wage increase that you're going to have to deliver either by additional hiring, or in the case of the outside institutions funded by the Health Services Commission, you're probably going to have to put those wages in place, rather than simply in these institutions allowing an extra week of holiday and then hiring replacement staff.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's right, but I have two observations to make. To add weight to what has been said, it is true, I should admit that although we are keeping approximately the same staff and the population is going down, as the population goes down you're going to keep the heavy care though. You know what I mean by that, so we can't say you divide by 100, how many employees you have. You can't do that.

But on the other thing I would say that I think that in itself what the member said is important - if you could have the mentality there, hey, you know money doesn't grow on trees, we can't just keep on and so on. There is no doubt, that even others that we settled, they see what's going on and it's an example and it's something that we all accept. I would hope that it helps to bring sanity.

But it is a big victory in this sense that we're not getting rid of jobs. We're protecting jobs and that's important. You know if we were forced, let's say that we have to give 6 percent, 7 percent this year, you probably would have to reduce staff or it would be prohibitive. All salaries in hospitals and personal care homes - 1 percent is not very much, that's \$5 million. There's a lot of programs you can do with \$5 million, so I think that that is an important thing. You're not reducing jobs also.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to continue this discussion because I'm discussing it with

the wrong Minister. We could get into one heck of a discussion tonight as to why you didn't follow some of the guidelines that other institutions were following three years ago, when you had the backing of the municipalities and all of the R.M.s and the town councils wanted you follow 6-and-5 and you went off on a 27.5 percent salary increase on a 30-month contract then.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The MGEA?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes. So you know as I say this isn't the place and this isn't the Minister to be arguing that point with. But what I want to make with him is that - and I don't think we have any basic disagreement on the points I'm making - that as far as the administration of the department goes, a zero percent wage increase, quid pro quo, one week of holidays, is workable. And it allows you to say you've got the example but when you get into institutional care, it can't be done and moreover . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** But I don't think you'll have an argument with any Minister on this.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I know I'm not going to, but moreover - and this is once again not directed at this Minister specifically - but the example of the zero percent wage increase and an extra week of holidays can't be followed by the private sector and won't be followed by the private sector because . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It could in some instances.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . there is 2 percent there that most employees in the private sector are going to say, that's 2 percent, we want it. Although it is an apparent direction the government is taking, it's transparent, is what I'm saying. Once again, I'm not discussing this with the right Minister. We'll discuss this with the negotiating Minister when we get to that.

But I want to go to another series of questions and in this case I'll be dealing specifically with Brandon. Now it's my understanding that the medical director, who is the only accredited psychiatrist, is tentatively - whether she can be persuaded to reverse that decision or not I don't know - but she has tentatively tendered her resignation for, I believe, June some time.

Now I did not hear of this from the executive director herself. I heard of this from staff who are very concerned about the loss of her talent and her ability out there. In conversation with several of them, I think it's fair to say they almost revere her. She does incredibly good work and they are very concerned about the level of service, and maybe this is entirely a partisan statement that they're making, but they have great concerns about the loss of this individual as the medical director and the loss of her expertise as the only accredited psychiatrist at the facility.

Now, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether he has got a candidate in the wings that can almost immediately on resignation fill that void out there so that we don't run into a circumstance where patient care may decline as a result of the loss of a, according to staff and I have no reason to disbelieve them, very competent, very capable, and very efficient medical director out there and an accredited psychiatrist.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It seems to be the evening that we agree quite a bit. — (Interjection) — Yes, we'll have to stop that. We have no hesitation in saying that we're very sorry to see her go.

It is a situation, I think it's a person that's very dedicated and is putting everything in it. It's a difficult job. I would have to admit there's probably some frustration with the red tape and some of the things that we're trying to change. What can I say? She's going to be very, very hard to replace. We're always trying to recruit in that area. We hope that it might encourage some. Maybe these things came a little too late for that director, but the direction in which we're going and I think that finally after so many years I can understand why many of these people would be frustrated because we had - I say we - I mean government, the community, probably the medical profession and so on, I don't think we really knew where we were going. I think we do now. I think we accomplished a lot in the last few years.

It was the same thing three years ago with the provincial psychiatrist. There's a lot of work when you think that Dr. Prosen and others who helped us on that and we had a set-up, that with the university, his connection with both, it's working well. That is a step in the right direction. The director also that we talked about under Mental Health earlier and the general direction where we're going with these changes. It took a long time in coming. There was one person, again, that we saw some articles when they were talking about this that this person didn't like the treatment and so on, but what did we know? In those days, that was it. I mean shock treatment was the way to go and so on. That's why I say the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the professionals also.

I would echo what has been said today. We're losing a very capable, dedicated person that put everything that she had in it. We're sorry to see her go and it's going to be very, very difficult to replace.

**MADAM CHAIRMAN, M. Phillips:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Given that we agree on the individual, that doesn't resolve the problem, of course, that, in fact, she's leaving and that, in fact, a replacement is needed. The Minister mentioned one key word in his reply in terms of red tape. I have to indicate to him that this is what some of the staff are telling me and I don't know whether it's right or wrong. They indicate to me that the demands for paper work by the department now are increasing and they are finding that it takes more and more time which cuts into valuable time for the delivery of services to the patients. In this case, I have no knowledge as to whether that is right or wrong. It is only a reflection made by the staff but the Minister indicated red tape as being one of the problems.

Now, in terms of the changes that are being contemplated in the institutional hospitals, is there an ongoing or is there a current investigation into the amount of paper work that is required of the institutions of Brandon and Selkirk to determine whether you're demanding of those - I'm looking for the right word here - basically the senior personnel throughout there

in terms of reporting which, of course, filters down to the individual staff on the wards, is there any research or investigation going on to determine whether some of the paper work requirements, some of the red tape requirements are absolutely necessary and whether that process can be reduced and that alleged burden of paper work can be reduced so that you can free up the staff to do more care service rather than administrative service?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Chairperson, we don't want to exaggerate that either. I think the frustration is the red tape - some of it. There is an administrator that does that. Sure, there's certain things that would have to be done by the professionals. What I believe is the most frustrating thing is the difficulty to give her support, to recruit qualified people I think more than anything else. I think she feels that's why the pressure is so much.

There is a bit of a silver lining in there. That person is going in private practice and will stay in Brandon and health. It's not the same thing. We'll still be looking to replace her. At least, we'll have her services.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Can I correct you on an impression that you've got?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, pick me up.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Chairman.

That is not a complaint that was given to me by the executive director. She did not mention at all paper work. These are staff who are in the position, I guess - I don't know what the technical name is - but basically one of them, medical directors of a wing.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You're not relating that for her quitting because of that?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** No, I'm talking about what staff, not the executive director, but staff have indicated is an increasing load of paper work and red tape that is taking them and their staff - they indicate to me - away so that the have to spend more time in cranking out paper work for the department and, of course, that cuts into the amount of time they have for the care of their patients. That's not something that I even discussed with the executive director. This is from talking to individuals working on the wards, etc. That's why I asked the Minister if there's any investigation as to the necessity of some of this paper work. If there's one criticism that's often made of government, it's that we tend to shuffle paper so that we can employ people. In this particular case, if we're shuffling paper without a specific purpose or without a foreseeable value, then maybe that is one area of review in the administration of the mental health institutions that should be undertaken. If you could free up some of the time, and even if it's only 20 minutes a day out of an eight hour shift, that you could reduce the paper work load. That is - let me do a quick calculation, 4 percent increase in time and would make a significant saving in terms of staff time, patient care delivery and maybe even allow the Minister to operate his one-week holiday without needing Treasury Board authority for additional staff.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Chairperson, I certainly will look into it. I haven't had that many complaints. I want to give you what I think is one of the reasons and we're looking at that; there'll be some changes. But I'm asking staff today who heard that to pay specific attention to that and to see if the improvement can be done. I can say this, that I know that a lot of that red tape could disappear. I don't know if it's going to meet the concern that some of these people seem to have.

The situation is that, right now it's a government-run hospital and there's more red tape. There are certain forms for employment and all these things; we know that. It's not the same as in another area where you might not have all this. That we've recognized for a while. We're in the process now of looking at it very seriously and I would hope that next time we meet - I don't mean tomorrow, I mean next Session or before that if we make a statement - we will have independent boards and probably transfer the hospitals and go like any other hospital, have more of an independent board, get them away from the set up that we have, get them away from the department, as such, and they would get their financing directly from the Commission and we think that would curtail a lot of these things.

We've heard a few weeks ago - do you remember all the concerns that they have and there were supposed to be scandals and all that? The fact that you're dealing with the revision of the act also, I think these are the concerns, the protection of the people. There's probably more what we call red tape or more forms and more things to fill out and more records to keep - that's a guess, as far as I'm concerned - than there would be for a normal hospital. But we will look at this concern specifically and the staff will report to me and we certainly will continue to try to adopt a different system . . . We're looking at that very seriously, independent boards that will not report to an ADM and they would be the same as any other hospital, with their board and they would have to deal with the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the financing, for their budget.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister is indicating here. I'm not certain that the move to an independent board and divesting of the Department of Health and reporting directly to the Health Services Commission would necessarily remove some of the paper work load. I believe that is an independent phenomenon, if you will, which may in fact, as the Minister says, be created partially because of the nature of the patient you're treating. But I bring it up only because, in discussing with staff - and these aren't executive directors or anything, these are people that are working within the institution, the people that are handling the day-to-day activities - that is one of the areas that they are getting more and more concerned about, the complexity of the paper work, the volume of the paper work and the fact that it is cutting into the time that they have to spend with patients.

If we're looking at the purpose of an institution like this, the prime purpose, I assume, is to attempt to give the staff the ability to rehabilitate those patients that should be there only for a short period of time. Recognizing that no government, including us when we're government, is going to have the financial

resources to, instead of staffing those hospitals with 1,100 people but rather go up to 1,200 people, we recognize that, then it seems logical to me that if one of the staff concerns is the amount of commission and department demanded paper work, if you can reduce that load and make more efficient use of your existing staff, then you will deliver better rehabilitation services to your patients. You may well have those patients more quickly discharged from that institution and get back into the normal lifestyles that they enjoyed before being committed to the institution.

The paper work was an indication that came up on a regular basis and that's why I'm mentioning it; I'm not mentioning it as a basis of a criticism for this government and this Minister. But I think it is something that we have a tendency - and this will be a criticism - we have a tendency in the bureaucracy to justify the jobs by looking busy shuffling paper, and if some of that is causing a reduction in the level of service available to the patients in these institutions - and hospitals and personal care homes are the same - then I think it's incumbent upon any Minister in any government, regardless of political stripe, to attempt to remove as much of that paper work that isn't necessary because the objective will be what everyone is after: more efficient use of the staff, better patient care delivery and a saving in the long run in dollars, not only at the institution, but when you create paper work at Brandon or Selkirk Mental Centre, someone at the other end's got to process it. If it's unnecessary paper work, then it's unnecessary waste of manpower and time at both ends.

So I make that comment to the Minister and I'd appreciate his answer.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Chairperson, I certainly don't resent that all. In fact, I accept it the way it's given, I welcome it. But I do say that definitely this is something that we felt and I think we were pretty well sure that - maybe not as much as should be - but if the set up is changed, that will be a good step in that direction.

It's not going to be complete, but it will be a step in the direction, we're convinced of that. There's always more red tape in things run by the government like that than if you had a free-standing hospital board. There are a lot of things that they can do that we can't do. Just the fact that it would be transferred to the Commission, there's an awful lot less red tape. Some of that red tape, through government, any government, for instance, for what we have to go through to Treasury Board and all that, as you know, sometimes is frustrating for staff. We've had that in the department also and there's a little less of that in the Commission because the Commission has certain rights because of the act, that they don't have to do the same thing as the department. So we're convinced that this will help. I'm not saying it's going to do it all.

I want to say that might be helpful also. I was looking at that when my honourable friend was talking about the length of stay. Right now we have the people in two categories. Don't ask me how many in each. It might be roughly 50 percent or maybe a few more in a little shorter time, those that are in the hospital for more than a year and those that are less than a year;

and those that are more than a year, the averages seem to be going up. I guess maybe that's because some of them are leaving and we're keeping those that actually belong there the most, that this is still the best place for them.

I'll give you the four years 1980,'81,'82 and '83 and those, as I say, that were in the hospital for more than one year, the average was 9.4 years, 14 years, 12 years and 11.4 years; but those that are less, that seems to be going down, not too fast, but it's going down. It was less than a year; that was 74.9 days, 74.1, 71.5 and '83, 70.1.

But I think, with all this, with the act being looked at, I would hope the move that I mentioned and then the commitment that I have made and the instruction that I'm giving staff to take a particular look at it, and if need be to bring an expert to look at it, we'll certainly do that and I'll report back.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Once again, speaking briefly on the psycho-geriatric 100-bed facilities. Now in Brandon, that one is going to be located, as I understand it, off-premises basically.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The old jail.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, but it's not going to be essentially within the same administrative grounds or complex, it's going to be off-site. It is further my understanding that that is intended to be administered by the same administrative staff as is currently administrating the Brandon Mental Centre.

Now does the Minister envision that within a year or so of opening and filling that facility, that he will be establishing a free-standing board there as well, an independent board much similar to the board structure you've got in your personal care home boards throughout the province now?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The reason why it is not on the complex is to give that flexibility and the board, from the start, will be an independent board. Now there will be some civil servants on during the construction time, sort of like we've done in the adolescent centre, and so on, and that will be changed.

I'll be making an announcement fairly soon that one of those - yes at Deer Lodge I might as well tell you now - that at Deer Lodge we can go into it, that we start an independent board, the geriatric centre. We've had more civil servants and that's being changed. I'll make a change again soon. They will hire people that have been there but it's a different administration.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** When you are contemplating your staffing patterns for the psycho-geriatric home - bearing in mind the Pascoe Report suggestion that with 25 percent of the resident population in most of the personal care homes throughout the province being basically psycho-geriatric patients - and in this case, in Brandon and in Selkirk, you're going to end up with essentially a complete psycho-geriatric hospital, is the staffing pattern going to have to rely quite heavily on say registered psychiatric nurses?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, I think the report recommends, even in what is known as personal care



homes now and we'll move in that. That one will be specifically for psycho-geriatric patients. That's what I said when we were talking about the per diem rate. They'll have the same thing, plus some specialized help or staff to deal with the psychiatry part of the problem. Yes I would think that we will rely very much on psychiatric nurses.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I guess that brings me into the next - not line of questions - but more or less an observation to the Minister. That leads up to a question which I'll pose to the Minister after I establish my train of thought for him.

To establish staffing in these two 100-bed psycho-geriatric facilities which are going to be onstream, say in two-and-one-half years roughly or two years maybe; and given that there is a move into the staffing of any of our 10,000 beds of personal care home facilities throughout the province and using - where possible and maybe where budgets apply - some psychiatric nurses there in our regular personal care home program, the Minister is probably going to be faced in these two lines of Estimates with additional training costs.

Given the announcement recently by the Minister of Community Services that she's closing the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage, these two schools are going to be picking up basically the additional training capacity.

Now it would seem logical to me, and the Minister will correct me if I'm wrong, that with the intended direction of the government to proceed in two basic directions, both of which are discussed in the Pascoe Report; firstly, that there should be some effort to retain registered psychiatric nurses in our regular personal care homes and now the Minister, having coming onstream in two-year's time, 200 beds of psycho-geriatric which are going to be staffed definitely with some registered psychiatric nurses, it would seem to me that the training capacity is going to be used at least as much as it is now, possibly more. With the closing of the Portage School that's more pressure on both Brandon and Selkirk - and the Minister will pardon me because we've been dealing with both Brandon and Selkirk and this question applies specifically to Selkirk - can the Minister indicate to me whether the current Psychiatric Nurses Training School in Selkirk is able, in its present configuration, to train the additional load of nurses that it probably will be required to do, or in fact will the Minister have to be approving a move to - I believe it's called Plan B - out at Selkirk of new facilities for the training of psychiatric nurses in Selkirk?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Chairperson, let me try to shed a little bit of light on that, then I'll try to answer the question to the best of my ability. Right now in the first year in Portage there are 26 and they need 26 and 25 in the second year. Between Brandon and Selkirk, there's vacancy, 35 we could accommodate without any change at all - 35 more this year and 22 next year.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Both years?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes well for this year we'd have vacancies of 35 right now for the first year, and the

second year, 22. So we could take care of that without much change, but I might say that we're doing a little more than that. I mentioned the O'Sullivan Report, you'd asked before now, that I promised you a copy - if you don't get it before me, I'll give you a copy. If you get it before you give me one, okay?

The situation is that it will be passed onto us. I intend to meet with that board and they'll officially give us the report. Then we intend to enter into discussions with the RNs, the psychiatric nurses and LPNs. Then I'll report as we go. I can't say exactly how it will be handled but we want to talk to them privately, separately on this thing. I think that it is time that we will have to have an idea.

If we're going to use the people wisely - and we'll probably discuss this more when we get to the Commission - I think we'll pretty well have to define the role of the different nurses and so on and then say, well this is it. An RN, let's say should not displace an LPN, unless like in any other sector, if they apply they could maybe get it, knowing they're overtrained at the rate, acting as an LPN. That's a possibility. Then, of course, that will be studied with the medical profession also because that is far-reaching and we intend to look at the school once we have this report, once we know exactly what is needed to look at these schools very seriously and make any change that we need, if it has to be beefed up. I'm not going to get involved in which one should be closed and so on. There's no doubt in my mind that one of them should be closed, that we don't need three at this time. We can always reopen one. It might be a different education. It might be that there's something more for the community. Don't forget that we'll need someone in the community also.

Right now, we're not panicked at this time. We have to remember for the future. Most of the nurses now in two-and-a-half years will come from the now Brandon and Selkirk Mental Hospital, because the patients will be going. They'll come with their patients in other words.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can the Minister run by those numbers on students again. I didn't get those. What I would like is he indicated that there's spare capacity at Brandon and Selkirk. Can he possibly break that down as to where the spare capacity is between Brandon and Selkirk?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There's now, in my understanding, in Portage there's 26 in their first year and 25 in the second year. The vacancies that we could take in the first year are 35 - between the two, that's between Brandon and Selkirk - and 22 in the second year. That's without doing anything at all. Of course, the important thing is not just the facilities, the proper teaching and that'll be looked at to meet our needs.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister announced a couple of nights ago the establishment of an audio-visual link to Brandon from the University of Manitoba. Now, I believe I've got it here - \$136,200 is the cost and it's for four hours a day five days a week.

Now, a question to the Minister. Without knowing the benefit that he expects to gain from the audio-visual link, it would seem to me that with the loss of the executive director out there that quite possibly that \$136,200 might have been well spent assuring that there was another psychiatrist out there or maybe even two psychiatrists.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I was saying that it's not the question that we're trying something different instead of hiring. We're looking, we'll still hire. For years, I've gone through the same thing, tried everything. On two occasions, Mr. Sherman did the same thing. Well ever since I'm in the House, I think, that the Ministers of Health have not been successful. In the past, we've been able to get people that are figuring that they want to retire. It's a retirement or something. I don't want to criticize any members. It's changed somewhat, but that was the attitude then and it's very difficult to change.

We are recruiting. In fact, we have somebody coming or that's here from overseas that might need a bit of training. We've advertised and so on. We're still going to go ahead. It'll be added on. It'll help. I think you eventually will see that not only in mental health, but I imagine that you might see that in regional hospitals - let's say up North they will be able to communicate directly with the Health Sciences Centre one of these days, some way where the experts will be there. You see you haven't got the specialists in the North. I think that's a facility.

It is not that we say, okay, we're not going to hire anymore. We've got a bunch of people we could hire. We're doing this to save money or - it's not that. It's two and it'll give us a back-up and if we can hire people, so much the better. That is the main reason that Dr. Moggey, I think, is leaving because it's so difficult. That's the frustration. We'll hire these people, but then over and above that this thing will help. If we're not as successful or it takes a while, well that'll be there at least. It's not one because of the other. We're not replacing. It's not a different direction.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** If I left that suggestion with the Minister that wasn't my intention. The Minister's answer that they've been trying to hire and they can't hire, so the \$136,000, even if they made it available, wouldn't necessarily have brought them a psychiatrist to Brandon is what the Minister's basically saying.

Can I take a little different tack then? I think 1975, the Residency Program with the School of Psychiatry was discontinued in Brandon; I think it was '75. The year doesn't matter. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that - I forget; I had at one time the number of psychiatry students - I think it was in the high 30s. Those numbers aren't necessarily where I'm wanting to be: the numbers aren't important to the argument I'm making.

Basically, you've got now an audio-visual link out to Brandon, which is going to give you four hours, five days a week, of connection with the School of Psychiatry at the University of Manitoba, presumably at the Health Sciences Centre. Can the Minister see the potential and the value of discussion with the School of Psychiatry to re-establish the residency program at Brandon? That is the largest institution. We've got what - 500 and

some patients there compared to Selkirk? The point I'm making in suggesting this course of action is several-fold. I don't know whether this would fit with the goals and aspirations of the School of Psychiatry in the University of Manitoba, but Brandon, I'm sure, provides as balanced or as diverse an admittance pattern, it's more diverse admittance pattern than Selkirk because you've got your long-term care, you've got your short-term stay patient, you've got your acute admittance people.

It would seem to me that would be an ideal residency program out there and the disadvantage, probably up until this year, was the fact that it is 130 miles away from the university scene, but the Minister has made it no further away with this A-V link than the television set. I would ask the Minister if there is a possibility that a residency for the psychiatric doctors could be re-established out at Brandon, using your A-V link as a method of keeping in touch with the instructors, because you know instructors are a problem in a residency program if you don't have them at the school; that's your biggest problem. Basically, now that the A-V link is established, the instructor problem - it isn't the same, certainly I'll agree, as having the man or the woman sitting right next to you giving you your advice and bouncing the problems off them - but certainly it's coming a lot closer.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think that my honourable friend, when he expressed his concern also gave the answer, the situation why it could not, up to now. What has been done is we just didn't have the teachers in Brandon. There are three right now that are going through it at the Health Sciences Centre here at the university, and they are earmarked, they are committed to Brandon. There is no doubt that we would love to have the facilities there. I would think, without discussing it too much with the staff, that it might be a logical move and that would help also, but you can get in touch with people here and that will be looked at. Right now we haven't the teachers; we haven't been able to set it up in Brandon so that where it is at this time, because of the teachers, instructors.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I realize that's the current problem. Is it worth re-investigation, if you will, now that you've got your A-V link?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Let's work on it for a year or so, then we'll do it.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I realize you're not going to be able to do it this fall, but it would seem to me that could well be a vehicle to re-establish the residency program out there with the additional benefit that you've got.

The training on-site, to the benefit of the patient, and to the benefit of the psychiatrist as well who's in residency, because you've got in Brandon, as I understand it, the full range of psychiatric patient, from chronic long-term, psycho-geriatric to short-term acute admissions and it's a suggestion I make based on the fact that that facility, Brandon, now has the audio-visual link with Winnipeg.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, this is a suggestion that we have already made to the

professionals and they tell us that it can't be done at this time. They say the teaching has to be a year minimum. Dr. Toews teaches at the university, also in psychiatry. He's our Chief Provincial Psychiatrist and we've discussed this with Dr. Prosen also before, while we were working on the set up that brought us Dr. Toews. It is felt that we must have the teachers to start with now; and they are endeavouring and it's in the works, as soon as we can. That's what we want to do, set up that program, the residency in Brandon.

Now there is no doubt that this will be another hell, but on its own, we still have to have the teachers and then it probably will be of some use; but right now, to start without the proper teachers, we're told that's not feasible.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, my intention is just to discuss general issues and then we'll pass the Brandon, Selkirk together.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has alluded to some newspaper articles which indicated allegations by patients of bad treatment . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Former patients.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Former patients, right. Can I ask the Minister, when an allegation like that is made, what process is triggered within the Minister's office and within the institutions to investigate the authenticity of those allegations?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** If it's a medical issue - you're not talking about anything criminal now - like we would do with every hospital, we'd get in touch with the medical director of the hospital and ask for a full report. If there's any doubt, if we're not fully satisfied, we probably would get in touch with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and that's all we can do - or the university, whatever. In other words, we are not experts, when you're talking about treatments, and it's not the MMA or any group like that - it is the College; that's the role of the college. By legislation, they are the ones that look at standards and - what shall I say? - discipline and improvement, and that is what I was saying a while ago, that we're all in there and I guess everybody has been lacking clear directive. It's improving quite a bit more. It's a medical thing; it's strictly with the staff that we have there.

We also have recourse - we probably would go through our Provincial Psychiatrist, who is not at the hospital, who would discuss it with them. We've used Dr. Prosen a lot also as a consultant. As you know, he's at the university, so therefore the university, the College, our own Provincial Psychiatrist and the director of the institution in question. I also forgot the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman, at times, gets involved. The patient probably would go to the Ombudsman. The main thing is we try to get the report as soon as possible.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that the medical director - I choose Selkirk because that's been in the news - the medical director at Selkirk would be asked to investigate the allegations. Presumably the medical director would make a report based on his findings. If I'm using the right words -

does the person lodging the complaint have access to the medical director's report, which is going to say whether the complaint is legitimate or not?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, normally that could do more harm than good to the patient or the next of kin and these are internal reports.

Now if there's something - I don't know, we've never had to face this yet - if there's something criminal, if something was the court, I guess they could get the report, I don't know. But the medical report, that has always been touchy, not only with this hospital, but any medical report. You know they're talking about being able to get this information and I'm always concerned about that and the medical profession is very concerned because there is no doubt, if they know that this report is just going to go to anybody or go to the patient, that they'll be very careful. You'll start having a confidential letter or something with it because they could be sued, especially when you're talking about mental health; so they probably would not be - well, I hesitate, but I guess there's no other way - no honest report, no true report. Well, no, I don't think anybody will falsify anything but they would not be complete, the records. So normally they would not go. There might be some reason or something that we might consider; I can't think of any. Again, we're just talking about the medical report now, not the . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay then, let's assume that this complaint comes to the Minister's office and it's turned over to the medical director and he investigates and the patient complaining is not satisfied. Presumably, the Minister himself might make reference to the College of Physicians and Surgeons to see if proper medical standards were maintained. If it goes to the provincial psychiatrist and still the patient isn't satisfied and it ends up at the ombudsman, which theoretically is the impartial arbitrator of those sorts of circumstances, does the ombudsman have access to all the reports, medical director and on up, in terms of making his assessment of the patient's complaint?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes the ombudsman has. If there was something that was brought to my attention, I would let the Deputy Minister know of course because he's in charge of the administration. He probably would get in touch or I would get in touch with the provincial psychiatrist, who would then get involved as much as he has to get involved with the medical director of the establishment. That would be the first thing.

Now if they're still not satisfied or if there's something that is not clear, I probably would involve the College and the liaison usually has been Dr. George Johnson. So that would be between our deputy minister, myself and the medical director of the establishment, Dr. Toews, maybe Dr. Johnson in certain cases, and the college and the ombudsman - I can't see anything else we could do - and the university, maybe Dr. Prosen from the university also. I'm not saying we'd always follow all these steps, but these are people that we could get involved.

If it goes to the board, if there's something, the court might order the report, as you know, but we're talking about investigations of medical reports, that's all.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So far we've been talking about basically, if you will, the in-house investigation.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Medical treatment.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now the Minister - I'll just fire this one over to him because he's seen it, just so we know who we're talking about.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I kind of suspect what . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, I think you know. Now here's the problem. I can appreciate what the Minister is saying in terms about the medical director and committing a complete report to paper.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** What?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I can appreciate what you are saying about the medical director upon investigating a complaint, committing a complete investigation to paper. I can appreciate further some of the problems in terms of having the person complaining with access to that.

But I think the problem comes in - and it's a problem for me as a person wanting to help an individual on the outside, the Minister as well - that unless he sees - like he gets a letter from the Minister saying, well we've had the complaint investigated and he can't substantiate the allegations. It's only natural that the person would say, well you know, quite frankly, I don't buy that. It's natural for the individual to say that.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Especially in those settings more than other hospitals.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's right. And he's going to want to say, well I want to see the report and therein we start on the problem. Now this individual saw me recently and it was his intention - and I don't think quite frankly that he's got the financial capacity to go and pursue the route that he indicates he's going to pursue. He's going to contact two or three lawyers, apparently today, and see if one of them would give him a guesstimate of how much it would cost to pursue this through the courts because he's that convinced that his allegations are correct.

Now I suggested to him that before he makes that final decision, he should involve the ombudsman, because he's basically not connected to the department, hence can't be accused by someone from the outside of having a vested interest of protecting the people inside the establishment which, right or wrong, is a logical sort of a complaint that's going to come to surface when you have a person who alleges a problem. Now I don't know what this individual is going to do.

But this is why two nights ago I was asking the Minister - and I tell him with all frankness - that I don't have a complete understanding of the problems in the mental health institutions. But sometimes as a layman, just looking at sort of the fringe problems, you maybe can see an obvious problem that needs solution. That's why I was asking the Minister two nights ago, about whether in the review of The Mental Health Act there is this patient advocate, if you will, someone who is

entirely independent from the institution other than the ombudsman, who can provide the kind of impartial advice, because you, as Minister, and if I was the Minister, if the Member for Fort Garry were the Minister, if we tell this individual that our staff has investigated and if he's so bent in his mind that there is a problem, he's going to believe that we're basically covering up for our staff and he's not going to be satisfied.

In this individual's case, he is so - at least I believe he's so fixed in his course that he's going to spend money he can ill-afford to spend to pursue it through the courts. Doggone it, I guess I've got some real concerns about that. No. 1, the courts have got enough stuff to do; No. 2, he's got better places to put his money. And it just seems to be sort of a frightening growth in government where we have these suspicions that if we don't get the answer we want that somebody is covering up and our only recourse, of course, is to go to the courts. And I'm not alleging any wrongdoing; I'm not alleging any cover-up; I'm just stating what I believe is sort of a growing sense of frustration with the bureaucracy out here and this man, quite frankly, is completely frustrating. He's just as tight as a fiddle string when he discusses this issue.

If he contacts me again, I'm going to again recommend that he take this to the ombudsman, rather than — (Interjection) — Yes fair enough, I'll let the Minister . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I believe that my honourable friend gave him the only advice that he could. The situation was very thoroughly investigated. There is no way that anybody in the world can say for sure what happened.

Now the situation is that a person, all the patients have different medical examination, determined at certain time. The last one that that particular person and the other, also for reasons that I'll mention, nothing sinister, but the reason why that there was this medical checkup and so on was to determine if there was anything - now I'm thinking from memory I might be a little wrong - I think it's just a couple of weeks or three weeks at the most. That person also had passes for weekends and there are certain things that I don't want to mention here that I'll mention to my honourable friend directly - remind me. That was done now. All the indication that we have - and we can't prove - not more than we can prove that that was contacted in the institution would seem to indicate that it wasn't. But after having said that, I don't know what the report can do. Again, it's a touchy thing to discuss with those people who know pretty well who we're talking about because it was in the news.

The situation is that we had instructed already the director that he could and should give the report to the ombudsman upon request. Now, I don't if the ombudsman has requested it. I can check and we'll know by tomorrow or Monday anyway?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I don't think the gentleman's gone there yet.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Oh, he has the report. The ombudsman has the report.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I don't think the fellow's gone there.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** So, maybe the ombudsman is doing it on his own or maybe staff - I don't know. Maybe staff just had given it to the ombudsman. I guess we can go to the ombudsman too if we want to initiate the thing. We'd have no hesitation at all. I'll discuss the situation privately with my honourable friend.

Now, as a patient advocate, the principle is right. I'm not saying it shouldn't be done or couldn't be done. Maybe we should have one for all mental illness, not just the institution or something. I don't know. Actually, staff - it's false to think that there could be let's say with anything, you make a mistake, you might want to cover up. Our provincial psychiatrist is not in the Institution and so on, so he certainly would be independent and that's our role. I believe like any doctors. I can understand that, fine. I think my honourable friend recognizes that. He's not mistrusting anybody, but the person himself might think I don't want these people or something.

If you have a kind of an advocate, I think we should have one. We've talked about that. We're looking at the wife battering and the abuse for the seniors. My responsibility is the seniors also and that is a concern that we have, and also for the children that can't speak for themselves even in divorce and all that. There's a slew of different ideas like that.

Now, some people feel that maybe it should be done, that you take one or two. I guess I could be convinced - I haven't discussed that with the experts - but my preference would be to build up, if need be, the office of the ombudsman, that he might have specialists. I think they would be more independent and better equipped to do that. If you have somebody like that stationed in a hospital, they can get friendly, and they'd say, oh yes, he could be accused. That is the situation.

Up to now, the ombudsman has dealt with us quite a bit. On this one, no; we just give him the report and that's it. I don't think that their advice would be given. You can go to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, but he might not want that. He might feel that, there again, it's all the medical profession protecting themselves with the government. That might be a possibility.

We will do everything we can within reason. It's something that because of the passes and because of the time, you're not examining people two minutes before they leave and walk with them to the door and then go and meet them at the door and come in. That wasn't done. It's a possibility, but all the precautions were taken and we certainly, for a different reason that I'll mention also, but I think that was the best advice.

Now, I guess we can also by stretching things, it could happen also, we could include somebody else. Maybe not on that particular case, but there's also the Human Rights group that might look in an incident such as that also. Maybe not that particular one, but I mean in some instances anyway.

I'll send this back and I'd like to have a private conversation with my honourable friend just a minute or before . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I don't disagree with what the Minister is saying here. It's a two-way street, because the allegations are made and I guess news might be short the odd day and so it becomes something that's

talked about. The ability to resolve the problem in what appears to be an impartial manner for both the complainant and the department serves both of them very well. I'm sure that Selkirk staff, the department, the patients, the families of patients don't need some of the things that have been laid out in the press of over-sedating, not seeing a psychiatrist for six months, and lack of rehabilitation programs, and those kinds of problems. All that does is cause a great deal of concern for everybody involved. The staff have to answer probably when they go out on a social evening whether it's right or not and constantly operate under an aura of suspicion, if you will. The families who have loved ones in those institutions, of course, are naturally concerned. Quite frankly, I haven't thought about it enough to know whether a patient advocate is the way to go, because even that can be considered to be not completely impartial.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Don, the review of the act will address that directly.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's right. The Minister indicates that the review of the act will address that kind of problem and that's why we were discussing it with him a couple of nights ago when we were talking on another session.

I definitely think that it is something that the Minister cannot take lightly and isn't taking lightly. It may prior to the revisions of The Mental Health Act, it may necessitate the Minister saying to the ombudsman or to some other independent individual, I want it investigated independently so that these allegations can be resolved and a public report can be made from an impartial person that there is either some substance or no substance or basically a lot of substance, and if there is a lot of substance, we're going to clean it up. I know that would happen if there was any substance to those kinds of allegations.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We'd have no hesitation for that.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** If these sorts of things keep coming up. I know the Member for Wolseley has been involved with an individual apparently that's been communicating with her on problems there.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** This person?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** No, a different person. So, it's not only just this one individual that we've been talking about tonight; it's other people.

I've had a stack of correspondence from an individual - not in my constituency but he's from south central Manitoba - and he indicates that he had problems in Brandon. I can't tell whether he's had problems or not. It is a very difficult area. It serves no one any good to have those kinds of innuendo and allegations outstanding. I think the Minister can understand it that a person with concern for a loved one making some of the allegations is not going to be particularly trustful of the in-house investigation. Right or wrong, he's not going to be. — (Interjection) — That's just human nature.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's why she'd go to the ombudsman.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's why, yes, either the ombudsman, or even failing that because the Ombudsman, of course, is attached to government too, and sometimes, although I don't think that's - to the layman the ombudsman may be.

All I'm suggesting to the Minister is that if suggestions like those that have appeared lately keep on appearing, that he may have to just simply order an outside investigation and get it cleared up once and for all. We may be a year or a year-and-a-half away from changes to The Mental Health Act which might accommodate . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I've had no hesitation on that if I thought an I could find out more.

If you say all right, an Ombudsman could not be much more independent than they are now, the government can't fire them and so on unless you have a majority in the House, I think or something to that effect. If you had an advocate for these people, it would be the same thing if you . . .

You know, everything that was said is true. Then we have to look at all the cases and look at all the difficulties in this hospital. It's surprising that there's not more complaints. We hear about the cases that are complaining, two or three, but what goes through and so on, it's surprising that there's not more. I think everybody would welcome - our staff also - if there was something to put it to rest by getting somebody outside of the hospital and so on to do an investigation. We wouldn't hesitate at all, but I think the best now would be to the Ombudsman who would have access to everything that was done.

It's after the fact also now, they'd have to rely an awful lot on what was found and maybe question some of our employees, we'd have no problem with that at all.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In terms of dealing with specific medical problems, can the Minister indicate whether on admission, do patients get a complete physical, blood test, that sort of thing?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Do they what?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Do patients on admittance get a complete physical, including blood tests and does the similar process occur when they're discharged? Is there also a complete physical, etc. etc. on discharge?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes. Every patient that is admitted and then another time during that, and I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, that was that kind of medical that this person received, was given about three weeks before so it was complete. My understanding on that is that it is correct, but I'll check on that to see if it's complete or what kind of a test there is.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And does the patient undergo a physical examination upon discharge as well?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, normally I'm told, to my surprise to be honest with you, there's normally no

tests upon discharge, but in this case, because of the situation and so on, there were. I don't know exactly what kind of tests, but tests to determine if that disease was present.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I can appreciate - I doubt if that would be something you would do as a matter of routine. A person's ill, you don't necessarily want it, but . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It is routine when they're admitted.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Upon admission, but not necessarily on discharge and I can see the logic behind that.

Mr. Chairman, I think, unless some of my colleagues have got any questions on Brandon-Selkirk, I believe we could probably move these sections through.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass; 3.(d)(1)—pass; 3.(d)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 85: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$54,567,000 for Health, Community Health Operations for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 10:00 o'clock and Committee rise having been moved, Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain Resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Some day the House Leader will advise me precisely technically how the other committee can keep on operating while we formally adjourn here. Other than that, I have no objection to the House adjourning.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. I appreciate the point raised by the honourable member because of the difficulty we had last Friday morning. During normal House sitting hours when the Speaker returns to the Chair, a committee cannot be sitting when the Speaker has returned to the Chair.

Under our Rule 65(13), the authority is provided for the discretion of the committee to be used after normal

sitting hours and we are now, according to our declaration that it was 10:00 o'clock three minutes ago, somewhat after 10:00 p.m. and that discretion is afforded to the other committee, as it was the other day, I believe it was Wednesday, yesterday, that we called it 5:30 while we were in committee and continued to sit through till 5:30. I believe that's the distinction the honourable member is looking for - 65(13).

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** This House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).