

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 26 April, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce today a \$37 million thrust in school construction and renovations for 1985. This is more than double the \$17 million spent on new school construction, additions and renovations last year.

Mr. Speaker, after a number of years of declining enrolment, our school population is stabilizing. In response to this fact and the fact that there has been population growth and infilling of houses in certain areas of Winnipeg and Brandon, we will be increasing our regular school building program for 1985 to \$22 million.

Of that amount, \$18 million will be spent on new schools, compared to \$11 million last year. Mr. Speaker, one of our goals in education is to provide equality of opportunity for students no matter where they live in the province, and this includes equality of school facilities.

As a result of the first province-wide assessment of school conditions completed last year, the Public Schools Finance Board has determined that an accelerated program of renovations, upgrading and remodelling of older school buildings, this year will enable us to get many more years of useful service from some of our fine, older school buildings.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will expend an additional \$15 million for an accelerated program of school upgrading and renovations this year. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will be enhancing the quality of education for students in older schools, by such improvements as better lighting, heating and ventilation, improved library and science space and improved access for handicapped students. Our older schools will then be able to provide the same level of service as newer schools.

In the last two years, we have shifted our building policy away from building new schools to renovation of existing schools to enhance the capacity of these older schools to provide modern educational programs. The shift was necessary, Mr. Speaker, because in the last 17 years roughly \$300 million has been spent on new schools and additions, but only \$15 million has been devoted to bringing older schools to today's standards for educational programs.

The impact of this size of school building program will be substantial. About 800 person years of construction will be provided. Work will be provided

to material suppliers and handlers and Manitoba's construction industry will receive a substantial boost.

Because of our ability to move quickly in co-operation with school divisions, many of these projects will be providing jobs during winter months at a time when unemployment traditionally runs highest in the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, we will be asking school divisions in the future to identify their building needs for a five-year period and to submit their requests for support in a systematic fashion every year. Such requests will then be prioritized on a province-wide basis to form part of the yearly construction program of the Public Schools Finance Board.

This year, major renovations and upgrading of older schools is our top priority, under the accelerated program. For years the trend was just to keep building new schools in suburban areas, while established schools in older neighbourhoods became outdated, sometimes to the point where it became difficult to deliver effective educational programs. As a result, older neighbourhoods became less attractive to young families with children.

Many new schools being built today are being designed with community use in mind. The same is not true for older facilities, so one of our considerations in approving upgrading plans for older schools will be community use.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our purpose in undertaking this significant program is to provide equality of opportunity to all students throughout the province, no matter the location or the age of school they attend.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this will be the largest single year expenditure on new and older schools to be made in the last eight years. It responds to needs which have existed for some time to upgrade older school buildings and begins a long-term program of revitalization of schools throughout the province.

The initiatives in the program I have just announced present a significant long-term investment in our young people and their future. I am pleased and proud that this government is continuing to recognize the important contributions made by our public school system to the well-being of all Manitobans by making this investment in our schools, in our growing communities and in our province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Minister for the announcement she has made today. There seems to be one note ringing throughout this particular speech and the Minister has indicated, on at least two occasions, that there seems to be a need for the enhancing of quality of education through our public school system.

By this announcement, the Minister seems to suggest that by providing bricks and mortar, we'll be able to improve the quality of education throughout this

province. Mr. Speaker, of course, most sane thinking Manitobans will realize that that isn't particularly or totally the case.

Specific to the announcement, Mr. Speaker, we support the major renovations of our older, but very sound schools. Unquestionably, they have a use that will continue for many years with some upgrading, probably major in some cases and more minor in other areas. These buildings do have a long-run commitment that they can be made to the community as a whole and we support the government's thrust in giving them a life beyond the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, we'll look forward to the Estimates process, at which time we'll be able to determine specifically what schools have been earmarked for receiving the major portion of upgrading and which other schools are to be considered in the new building program. We'll be interested to know whether the Winnipeg South Technical Vocation School will be receiving some additional funds to help complete its building program.

Of course, we'll be interested to know whether any political influence has been used to determine the location of these schools. Just having read the other day in an article from Thompson written by the Member for Thompson, where he indicated he had great influence in helping decide that the Parker Collegiate there was to receive a vocational additional, that he almost singlehandedly helped bring forward that type of decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, we support the announcement. We'll be looking forward to finding out specifically what schools are to be helped and still, though, I conclude by saying quality is the No. 1 consideration, but buildings in themselves do not provide for that.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the West St. Paul Junior High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Bobychuk and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Manfor - terms of contract of President

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. I'm wondering whether or not he has had an opportunity to find out information on questions that he took as notice yesterday. The first one being: who on behalf of the Government of Manitoba approved the exceptionally generous contract to the CEO of Manfor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of Manfor approved the contract. I'm pleased to note in today's press that the Honourable Member for Swan River has indicated that he does not consider that the amounts paid in this particular instance were excessive but, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I do not like the payment of salaries of this nature.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the article. I can send a photocopy over to you. I do not like these type of salaries. I think, in fact, that we're forced into a situation of the world of reality insofar as the pulp and paper industry is concerned, and competitive salaries in other companies, whether they be private or whether they be public, Mr. Speaker. It's only for that reason that the board of directors had no alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I think some of the excessive salaries that are paid in this country can only be remedied by way of appropriate tax reform so that there is a fair distribution of wealth across this country.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the contract calls for the CEO to be given \$1,000 after taxes, no amount of tax reform is going to change the amount of money this individual's getting.

In view of the fact that the Premier says he doesn't approve of this sort of high salary, then who approved of it on behalf of the Government of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had listened to my comments carefully, he would have noted that I did not like this kind of salary being paid.

We are forced into the world of reality; it is my understanding . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Swan River . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for bringing some sort of civility into the House.

We are forced into the world of market reality. Mr. Speaker, as the CEO himself has indicated, he would have received \$50,000-\$100,000 more in the type of operations that he was in fact managing previous to his work in The Pas - I don't know, the honourable member can deny all he wishes, but I do note that the Honourable Member for Swan River has indicated he doesn't mind the president being paid that kind of money.

I do mind that kind of money; I wish it wasn't necessary, but if we're going to run Crown corporations efficiently, on a competitive basis, and it has been an uphill battle ever since a former Conservative

Friday, 26 April, 1985

Government in this country, under a former Premier, got us into the CFI situation; it has been an uphill battle under three administrations to try to bring about cost efficiency.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier is admitting that he and his government don't operate in a world of reality, but are merely being forced there by circumstances around them, I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether he or any member of his Cabinet approved of this contract that was offered and has been accepted by this CEO, this very generous provision for salary perks, benefits and so on, to the CEO of Manfor. Did he or anyone approve it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Dealing with the premise of the Leader of the Opposition's question, he might be interested in knowing that the Province of Newfoundland paid this particular individual, Mr. Sweeney, \$192,000 in 1976 - 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, \$192,000 in 1976.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
I'm having some difficulty in hearing the answer.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the general parameters were approved, in respect to this contract by the previous Minister responsible for Manfor, on the basis of recommendations from consultants, of recommendations as to what prevailing rates of pay were in respect to other operations, and in respect to what this particular individual had received by way of compensation in previous positions that he had held.

Mr. Speaker, what is fundamental is that the job of ensuring that Manfor is placed on an efficient basis is continuing. We're far from satisfied - After now some 16, 17 years of the operation of Manfor - that it is yet operating on an efficient basis. But, Mr. Speaker, what is required is that we ensure proper management, proper skills, in order to ensure that this - what was not a very good economic operation that the previous administration committed themselves to in excess of \$100 million - is put on an operation that can indeed, Sir, serve the Manitoba economy under the circumstances of the origins of the Manfor operation.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the Premier indicate that it's the Minister of Energy and Mines who approved of this and was responsible for these negotiations.

Now that we have that information on the table, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could indicate - in view of the fact that the Chairman of Manfor, a Mr. Harvey of The Pas, is quoted as saying that one of reasons why this document was kept secret from the public was because it was detrimental to the public - why was this agreement entered into?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Clearly, the particular contract is one that involves commercial transactions, a

commercial enterprise that is in a competitive field. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether any other private corporation - I would have to bow to the wisdom of my colleagues - is released for public review. The competitors of Manfor, are their contracts released?

A MEMBER: Yes, yes.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, I think the answer is no, Mr. Speaker. I think the answer is no.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that remuneration packages and levels of officers in private corporations are required to be revealed, would this Minister undertake . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: . . . to the shareholders, of course they do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Even in private corporations, remuneration packages are known of senior officers, so that the shareholders can know what they're paying their people. The people of Manitoba are the shareholders of this corporation, and I ask the Premier whether or not he would be willing to undertake to ensure that in future the salary levels of the chief executive officers are known of all of our Crown corporations?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be looking at what the private sector does to ensure what is done in the commercial world of enterprise insofar as Crown corporations of competition.

MR. G. FILMON: What about the public, do they have a right to know?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Leader of the Opposition keeps speaking from his seat, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he, like his federal leader, would move to close down Manfor like his federal leader did in Schefferville throwing hundreds of workers out of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to make that operation viable. We will continue to do everything we can to ensure that Manfor is made viable.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we don't need the scare tactics of the Premier to try and take the attention off his inadequacies. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier, this Premier who is dedicated to freedom of information, will he tell the public in future what the senior officers of Crown corporations are being paid?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that information is made known. I will check that out, Mr. Speaker, and as for scare tactics, it was the Leader of the Opposition himself in Calgary that first raised the prospect of the closure of Manfor. That's true, that's true.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Manfor - contract of General Manager

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Flyer Industries. On Wednesday, I asked him whether or not he could confirm whether the Chief Executive Officer of Flyer was making roughly about \$140,000 a year, which included some bonuses. I wonder if the Minister would inform the House whether or not he is prepared to table that contract in the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do have the information for the member. The question as to whether or not there was a five-year contract in place at \$140,000 per annum is incorrect. There is a three-year contract that expires in October of 1986 with the Chief Executive Officer of Flyer at a rate of \$104,000 per year. The first year of that contract provided an incentive bonus of \$36,400, which was paid in the first year of the contract.

I was also asked as to whether or not the CEO had been demoted. That is not true. What has taken place is that by agreement between the board and the CEO, the CEO is spending full time dealing with the very difficult and costly problem of warranty claims and the board had asked for the secondment of an additional person to work as Vice-President of Operations for Flyer.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the CEO of Flyer did receive \$140,000 last year, I wonder if the Minister would answer the second part of my question and that is whether or not he will table the contract in the Legislature.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I will take the question as notice to see if there are any prohibitions to the tabling of that contract in terms of the details and terms of conditions of that contract and reply back to him.

Manfor - visit to Montreal by CEO

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister responsible to this Legislature for reporting on the affairs of Manfor.

Can he indicate whether the Chief Executive Officer, who apparently currently is in Montreal, is there

pursuing other business as allowed for in the contract or merely enjoying part of his 9-week holiday as also allowed as part of the contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member will appreciate that I have a number of other questions that I will answer in conjunction with his questions that I took as notice yesterday. Mr. Speaker, while the Premier mentioned that we were forced into the world of reality, members opposite continue to deny that such reality exists and that's a very unfortunate thing.

Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: They don't know what reality is.

Manfor - hiring of consultant

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I took as notice a question yesterday, I indicated yesterday that we had an executive search consultant working with us to find quality candidates for this position, and just for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, we were originally looking for a candidate who would be willing to assume those responsibilities for in the range of \$100,000.00. We were informed by the consultant, after an extensive search, that it would not be possible to attract the kind of candidate that was required for that kind of money.

Manfor - terms of contract of CEO

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, one of the members asked yesterday whether I had signed the contract. The Premier has indicated today that the authority for signing the contract rests with the board, the Chairman of Manfor, and the Minister was informed of the details of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, we were concerned; we were concerned that this contract was going to be let for beyond the original \$100,000 we believed would be necessary. We were told that the candidates who would be acceptable, who could do the job, would not be willing to relocate to The Pas, to assume the kinds of responsibilities that existed. Mr. Speaker, we were going into a very exciting phase in Manfor. We had undertaken a major upgrading; there was a commitment; there was an expectation that there was a lot of work to do.

Mr. Speaker, Woods Gordon, whom the members opposite used many times in their tenure, were the individuals who were doing the work for us, indicated that for a candidate the calibre of the chief executive officer, would cost in the range of \$200,000.00.

I want to indicate that with respect to the specific questions asked by members opposite yesterday, yes, Mr. Speaker, the chief executive officer is entitled to a housing allowance. The house that is available to the chief executive officer is a very modest home in The

Pas. That is no different from what is provided in other chief executives' salary and benefits package.

Mr. Speaker, the . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: You asked the questions yesterday. Why don't you listen to the answers?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, there was a question yesterday with respect to the car allowance. The chief executive officer's car allowance is no different from the other senior officers. If it was his intention to upgrade, it would be at his expense. The disturbance allowance of \$1,000 a month was negotiated in lieu of the costs of the moving expenses, the real estate fees that would have been necessary in the event that the chief executive officer sold his house and so forth and acquired one in The Pas.

The analysis that was done by staff at that time was to the effect that this \$1,000 would be less expensive than the alternatives.

There is a provision for vacation. Those provisions include a requirement that vacations be in fairly short blocks of time and that they be with the approval of the board of directors. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate as well that, while members opposite seem to take some delight in suggesting that these terms and conditions are out of line with what is standard in the industry, they know very well that is not the case.

I have some background information on a number of other contracts, including one that was signed by a member opposite on behalf of the government, which includes such things as car allowance, memberships in business and clubs, interest free loans to purchase a house. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, signed those kinds of contracts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize that the Honourable Minister took several questions as notice and he is prepared to give the answers but that should not form the basis for a speech which would constitute an improper use of question period.

Manfor - visit to Montreal by CEO

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and ask him that simple question again. The Minister himself alluded to the fact that we Manitobans, shareholders of Manfor, are spending millions of dollars, to use the Minister's terms, of super, exciting expansion, expansion that has resulted in the laying off of a workforce of 65-70 people in the lumber division. My simple question is, where is our super executive officer? Is he pursuing other business in Montreal, as called for under his contract, or is he on holidays? That was my question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The chief executive officer is on holidays. The chief executive officer is entitled to holidays and he is due holidays.

Mr. Speaker, the member referenced the fact that there were layoffs occurring at Manfor. The chief executive officer, the board of directors and the government undertook to turn Manfor around. We have a commitment to Manfor; we did that, and I mentioned in committee more than a year ago, in the attendance of the chief executive officer and the chairman, that there were three major components to this exciting development.

No. 1 was the retrofitting. There is more to creating a corporate atmosphere that is conducive to success than simply providing the tools for a successful corporation. Mr. Speaker, we undertook a major retrofitting and upgrading; we undertook a major refinancing and, finally, we undertook some reorganization. The chief executive officer is a very important cog in the reorganization that is occurring at this time in Manfor.

We have a commitment, a long-term commitment, something the members opposite have never had and appear not to have to this day.

Salary ceiling - Senior Officer 7

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Oral Questions.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

Last year this government established a new and highest level of compensation to civil servants, Senior Officer 7. Could the Minister advise what the current upper ceiling of salary is for Senior Officer 7?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister, when taking that question as notice and bringing that information back to the House, advise the House whether any member of the Civil Service has been appointed to that classification of Senior Officer 7 or whether the government has decided that this would be such a controversial decision that any action to appoint anybody to that classification will be deferred until after the next election?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to provide further information, as I indicated to the honourable member; but I do want to put on record the fact that we have, as a government, been obliged to look at comparative salaries elsewhere in the Civil Service in other sister and brother jurisdictions - if I can use that term - other provinces on either side, and we've also had to look, in respect to the recruitment of people, some of whom are in private industry, and we find that, by and large, salaries in Manitoba, both for the upper levels of the Civil Service, and the upper levels in salaries, generally, is much lower. And we have to face the economic factors of recruitment, and while salaries may seem fairly significant to some of us, they are very very important in recruitment of qualified people.

**Interest Rate Relief Program -
Billing and collecting repayable portion**

**Manitoba 23 -
provincial funding**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On April 23rd, I had taken a question as notice from the Member for Pembina regarding how many notices of collection of interest payments that have been sent out under the Interest Rate Relief Program since the Manitoba Development Corporation took over the administration of that loan program.

I am informed that since the Development Corporation has taken over the collection on those loans, 16 demand notices have been issued of the business involved, seven of which have made arrangements for payment and another nine which are still outstanding. That's out of a total of 416 loans that were transferred to the Manitoba Development Corporation. I am also informed that less than 5 percent of them are in arrears at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Following the answer from the Minister, did I hear the Minister correctly, in that he indicated the MDC is pursuing the collection of 460 loans? No.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I indicated, and I'll repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there are 16 notices issued for payment of loans that were in default. Seven of those 16 have already made arrangements. There are still nine of the original notices that have not been responded to. That's out of a total of 416 loans that the Manitoba Development Corporation is presently responsible for under the Interest Rate Relief Program. All of the others are not in arrears.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Do I assume, following that answer, that the Manitoba Development Corporation is handling all three categories for collection; namely, the Interest Rate Relief loans to farmers, to small business, and to homeowners; or do other departments pursue the collection for any one of those three categories?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'll have to take that question as notice, but I believe it's only the business portion that's presently with the Development Corporation, but I will get a more complete answer as to where the other two components are being administered.

**Morgentaler Clinic -
Request re publicly funded clinics**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister, in relation to Dr. Morgentaler's request to set up publicly-funded abortion clinics in three provinces in Canada, and the fact that he got a strong "no" from Saskatchewan and New Brunswick; will the Premier make a clear and forceful statement on this question now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think he's already received a very clear message from Manitoba.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Member for St. Norbert asked some questions of the First Minister about the funding of Manitoba 23, and the Premier referred to his meeting with Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and his stern statement to him, to back off.

Now bearing in mind that there are women and children present, can the Premier repeat what the Prime Minister said to him in return?

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping we'd get a historical comment.

The other question I would ask the First Minister is, bearing in mind the fact that he claims to have stood up to Prime Minister Trudeau, will he also be making a similar strong stand with the present Prime Minister when he calls a provincial election on June 25th?

**Sugar beet industry -
assistance to**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister tell me if he has met with the Honourable Charlie Mayer, the Minister responsible for the sugar industry recently, in order to discuss the sugar industry in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I found it difficult to hear, for chatter across the way. Would the honourable member repeat his question?

MR. A. BROWN: My question to the First Minister was, has he met with the Honourable Charlie Mayer, the Minister responsible for the sugar industry recently, regarding that industry?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, I have attempted to communicate with the Prime Minister and am waiting a response from the Prime Minister of Canada in respect to the need for urgent action on the part of the Federal Government to live up to their obligations in respect to the sugar industry in Canada, including the Province of Manitoba.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm that the Federal Government has made a commitment of up to \$8 million to save this industry and that all that is required now from the Provincial Government is not more political posturing, but a commitment of \$3.5 million to save a \$90 million industry in Manitoba?

The onus, Mr. Speaker, is on this government to provide assistance at the provincial level at the present time. Are they going to be willing to sacrifice this industry and all those people that are employed by it?

Friday, 26 April, 1985

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member that question period is for the seeking of information and not for making speeches?
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know. Is this government prepared to do something in order to save that industry? The Federal Government have made their commitment. We are now awaiting a commitment from the Provincial Government. Is this government going to give us that commitment?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder, indeed, where honourable members sometimes are, in respect to representing the interests of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has surely seen the telex that we forwarded to the Prime Minister. The honourable member surely recognizes the fact that we have put money on the table, subject to the Federal Government abiding by its commitment to the sugar industry in Canada, Mr. Speaker. We have put \$2 million on the table.

I would ask the honourable member to please get his facts straight, because if he can't get his facts straight in here, in what way is he misrepresenting the position of the Province of Manitoba to his constituents?

A MEMBER: Let's build a statue on the front lawn.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister tell us when he is going to quit using 450 full-time employees and hundreds and hundreds of part-time employees as political pawns in his political posturing against the Federal Government in order to try to score a few Brownie points and make that commitment which is required of him? Because the commitment in the telex had all kinds of strings attached to it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. A. BROWN: When will the Minister make the commitment that is required?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member is making an argument, not asking a question.
Oral Questions.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would be pleased to answer that question, even if it was somewhat out of order. I would like to deal with that question posed to me by the honourable member, since it's on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let us be very very clear, that insofar as our call for the Federal Government to live up to its obligations, we're expecting the same treatment by the Federal Government in respect to the sugar beet farmers in Manitoba, as they have rendered on behalf of the tobacco and grape farmers in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we all, in this House, stand up in support of the interests of Manitoba, including the Manitoba sugar beet farmers, rather than bending, as honourable members are doing across the way, to partisan interests in supporting the government at Ottawa rather than standing up on behalf of the interests of Manitobans.

MR. A. BROWN: A final question, Mr. Speaker.
Are we then to understand that there will be no commitment coming forward by this weekend in order to try and save this industry?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to this House if, in fact, the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . we did not distribute a copy of the telex. There appears to be some ignorance of the fact that the telex was forwarded to Ottawa and the contents of the telex. I don't know, it appears the Honourable Member for Rhineland has either not received that telex or has chosen not to read that telex, Mr. Speaker.

What we asked and what we implore again of the Federal Government, and I would ask if the Honourable Member for Rhineland has some influence with some of the Manitoba Members of Parliament that he make this statement as well to them. "Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Minister responsible for the Wheat Board in Ottawa, would you kindly do the same for the Manitoba sugar farmers as you have done in Ontario for the grape farmers and the tobacco farmers? Surely, that is fairness, surely, that is equity to treat the farmers in the Province of Manitoba in the same way that you have treated the tobacco farmers and the grape farmers in the Province of Ontario, with nothing less."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier is in view of the fact that other provinces have made their commitments without strings attached and without conditions attached, and in view of the fact that there is a great . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is a great deal of urgency on this, will he allow

Friday, 26 April, 1985

the matter to be discussed in good faith without putting strings and conditions, and put forward the commitment of this government to support the sugar beet industry in Manitoba, so we don't lose the 450 jobs, so we don't lose the \$31 million annual economic benefit to this province, and so they can continue this year and then negotiate in good faith after, will he do that now in the interests of the producers and the interests of the workers?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I trust the honourable member's nose is not growing, Mr. Speaker, because I was not aware there were 450 workers at the Fort Garry sugar plant. I met with the Fort Garry sugar plant owners only yesterday, Mr. Speaker. There are 100 permanent employees plus 150 part-time employees.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what is important is that provincial governments manage the affairs of a province in a way by which they ensure that the senior level of government assumes their responsibility.

The honourable members referred to other provinces. The only province that I know that has made a proposal is the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker. I wish we did have a Heritage Fund of some \$11-12 billion in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Maybe under the stewardship of the Minister of Energy and Mines and the direction in which he is proceeding by way of energy development in the Province of Manitoba, that may in some distant future occur.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Leader of the Opposition to assume a Manitoba responsibility and speak up to the Prime Minister. Ask the Prime Minister to telex back from my telex of last Friday, ask the Prime Minister to respond to my telephone call. Ask him to take a little time out of campaigning in the Province of Ontario to attend to the affairs of the sugar beet farmers in the Province of Manitoba.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier is unaware that farmers are workers and people who work on farms are workers and truckers are workers. The combination of those people, added to the Fort Garry people, amounts to 450 jobs in the sugar industry, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that there are 450 jobs at stake, and in view of the fact that Heritage Funds aside this Premier has indicated that the money is available - he has said it's available - will he take the strings and conditions off to assure the industry that it can survive this year and then go to the bargaining table in good faith with the Government of Canada?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, indeed, that the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

May I remind honourable members that Oral Question period is not a time for shouting at each other across the aisle, it is a time for posing questions.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed not this government, but the Federal Government that has attached conditions, which permit it to abdicate its historic responsibility to the sugar beet farmers in Alberta, in Manitoba, and in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, all that we ask of the Federal Government is that they do at least as much as a government that was not known to be very friendly to the Western farmers, the previous Liberal Government that honourable members would be the first to jump up in their places to denounce as being unfriendly to Western farmers. All we ask, Mr. Speaker, that this present government in Ottawa do at least as much as the Trudeau Government did in 1982, do at least that much and we've got then \$2 million on the table from the Province of Manitoba for the sugar beet farmers of this province.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition to ask the Prime Minister at least equal the performance of the former Prime Minister of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I have an announcement with respect to committee meetings.

The Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources reported yesterday it had completed consideration of the Report of MPIC. I'm calling it to meet next Tuesday morning and, if necessary, next Thursday morning, both mornings at the normal time of 10:00 a.m. to consider and report on the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the bills standing as adjourned debates on second reading in the order in which they appear, please.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 2, the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. H. ENNS: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 21, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. H. ENNS: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, A. Adam: We will call the committee to order. We are dealing with Resolution 9.(a)(1) Salaries; (2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, you've been in the committee and what we've basically been doing is covering everything under the waterfront and then moving along.

I'd like to now touch on game farms and specifically I'd like to know from the Minister - after the unfortunate incident we had with the elk that were brought into the province and 32 of them having to be disposed of - what is the position that this Minister is going to be taking in terms of importing elk or wildlife into the province? Does he plan to allow elk to be caught in Manitoba for the purpose of wildlife farms? I wonder if he could maybe give us an indication in which direction he plans to go with that aspect of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Mr. Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there's more than that issue involved. There is the question of how extensively we get into game farming and the use of our own wildlife species for that purpose, that has yet to be addressed more fully. I think we permitted it but I don't think there's a blanket approval sort of philosophy for anyone that wants to set up a game farm.

I'm not sure that there are any particular reasons to object to their being set up - or with the use of local

game - at least I've not been impressed with arguments that say that shouldn't be done. Perhaps that is the answer to the question of imported species.

The inclination would be that we might not want to approve further imports, however that does not impact on interprovincial movement of species, so that there could be interprovincial movement even if we ban or restrict the international movement.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Minister is receiving both sides of the argument in terms of game farms versus not game farms, and to what extent we want to go with them. Obviously, in some European countries it's working quite successfully.

The concern that some of our game operators have, I suppose, is the fact that individuals have been allowed to trap some of our wild game for use in game farms, and some concern has been expressed about the fact that they're allowed to raise elk, for example, in captivity and then export them. It seems to be a good market out there. My understanding is that the ones that went to New Zealand, the individual was getting up to \$4,500 an animal. There is some concern among the wildlife or the game operators whether that is the route that is being promoted, whether we should allow that or not.

The other aspect is that in a year like we had this year, we probably would have been better off to allow maybe some game to be taken instead of having them starve to death.

The other question then arises, anybody who has a game farm, would he be allowed to apply for a permit to trap some animals? We have people throughout the province and this question was raised to me by a well-run game farm in the Grunthal area. Nick Janz raised the question if he would be allowed to maybe get animals as well. I fully realize it's not that cut-and-dried an issue that can be just answered by yes or no. What I'm hoping is that the Minister can give a bit of an insight as to how our Game Branch views this matter and the direction that they'd like to go with it.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there are arguments on both sides of that and the department has permitted the one in question, the game farm, that has imported American elk into the area; but from my own point of view I'm not sure that I would have any strong views opposing setting up of game farms within the province of our own species, rather than relying on the imports. If that were the case, logic flows that one would have to allow the entrapment of these species right here and for their introduction to the game farm, breeding stock. That's a process that's somewhat slower than just pulling in a whole herd of animals on a purchase basis, as has been the case. I guess one has to recognize that there is a viewpoint, certainly on the part of the wildlife associations, who are not very much in favour of game farming, period.

I'm not sure if it's valid. It's an area we're going to be looking at. However, my information would be that I would want to be as least restrictive without causing damage to our environment, ecology or whatever.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Would the Minister be inclined to allow those, let's say, that qualify as a properly

Friday, 26 April, 1985

constituted game farm. to trap elk, for example, or certain other wild game to build up their game farms?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that's what I was just alluding to. I'm not impressed by arguments that say that it shouldn't be done. If it's going to be allowed - and we have to make that decision - then we obviously will have to follow with the other decision and that is to allow the entrapment of big game for that purpose.

If I were to guess, I would guess that we probably will be allowing, but I have to say that there's a bit more research that I must do on that question, being newly introduced to the subject. If there are no biological problems that arise, problems of confinement that then create other problems, with respect to disease and so on. If the technical people can assure me that there is not a serious problem in allowing that to take place, then I have no personal hang-up about it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I thank the Minister for his views. My next question is, if somebody wants to export game from a game farm out of province or out of country even, as has happened, is a permit required by the Department of Natural Resources?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, the department does have a permit system for that purpose.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Is it the intention to continue issuing permits to allow the movement of game out of the country, as has happened, for example, to New Zealand?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, there's no desire to change that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'll leave that area then. There are a few other areas I just want to touch on. One has to do with hunting seasons.

I don't know to what extent the Minister has been in touch with the lodge operators who raised concern with the change in some of the hunting regulations, especially with the Americans, for example, where they had bookings and then the seasons changed, and as a result they felt they lost a fair amount of money.

The suggestion that the lodge operators have made is that the seasons be announced further in advance, so that proper planning can take place in terms of their bookings and the planning of the individuals who will be coming from out of province to hunt and fish here. Last year, it is my understanding that late changes in the goose hunting, for example, created many problems.

I would like to ask the Minister whether it is possible - realizing that you can't always predict the population trends I suppose of wildlife - if we could have the seasons announced on an earlier basis, so that people who make their livelihood from it could have a chance to do better planning.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the point is valid. We have already announced policy with respect to next fall's hunting, so that there is ample notification given to whoever is interested, with respect to wildlife and big game and waterfowl. That's been known now for some months, I believe - January of this year.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A question that I was asked to raise on behalf of the Member for Turtle Mountain, will the Charter of Rights affect the Sunday hunting ban? Now that Sunday supposedly has been struck down, what will that do to individuals that would want to request hunting on Sunday?

HON. S. USKIW: My only comment that I would make about that is that the Charter is certainly a very interesting document and will spring a lot of surprises for many of us over the years ahead. I'm not prepared to predict what the end result will be or whether or not it will impact on this particular question.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: There were some areas of consideration last year in the Northern parts of the province that under certain circumstances, hunting was allowed on Sunday. There was talk of it at least. I don't know whether consideration was given that way. I wonder if the Minister could clarify whether there were provisions for certain areas where there was hunting allowed on Sunday and whether the Minister is considering moving in that direction, just for example, we go past whichever peril there is up there, where it's a major undertaking to get there for hunting on a weekend and have a day where they sit around - now whether they do hunt or not, I don't know. But the request has been from many lodge operators that hunting should be allowed on Sunday. Is the Minister going to be considering that kind of activity?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the wisdom of that from the perspective of a lodge operator who has gone to a tremendous amount of expense in soliciting clientele from far and wide and beyond the country, to want to maximize the benefit of that trip for his client.

I think that makes a lot of business sense. I believe the only hang-up to date has been on perhaps, religious, ethical, moral or whatever grounds with respect to Sunday, although I don't share all of that either because Sunday is not something that all of society sets aside as the Sabbath Day, if you like, depending on one's own religious beliefs and convictions; so I have not any particular concern about Sunday as being a day that must be set aside, personally. But I know there is a fair amount of public opinion that would argue the other way. A fair amount of public opinion might argue that Saturday would be a better day to set aside, so it's really pointless in getting into that kind of thing. I think it's worthwhile looking at, from the point of view of the viability and competitiveness of the tourist-hunter operators, if you like, because they are there for business purposes.

We don't shut the hotels down on Sunday because we've accepted the fact that people have to sleep somewhere, even if it's Sunday. You know, there are some logical, common-sense business practices that have to be employed because the public demands the service and if you were going to offer a tourist service to the public then you must be there 24 hours around the clock and seven days a week. You have to include leap year, the extra day there too. All the dairymen know about that.

So it's not very logical to think in terms of applying a very strong restriction based only on some people's

Friday, 26 April, 1985

religious beliefs, but rather one has to look at each situation on its own merits, if you like. I think I'm prepared to do that with respect to this one.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: What the Minister is saying is that if requests are going to come in from a body, let's say, like the lodges and outfitters, for allowing hunting, especially further up North, that there is a definite maybe that they will get consideration.

HON. S. USKIW: I think it's probably more than a maybe. I have obviously not independent authority on that, but from my own personal perspective I couldn't imagine why I would want to discourage or disallow that practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting the comments that the Minister just made in regard to possibly allowing hunting wildlife on Sunday. I would suggest to the Minister that should he move on this, he would, in my opinion, be allowing himself to be wide open for a large protest on the actions that the Minister is considering.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think the member misread or misinterpreted my remarks. We were talking about specifically those remote locations where the people are set up for that particular business. We're not talking about allowing everyone in Manitoba to hunt on Sunday, which would mean you would hear gunfire next door to the church that you are attending on Sunday, sort of thing. That's not what we're proposing.

What we're saying is that we would give reasonable consideration to propositions on the part of lodge operators who provide guides for hunters in remote areas of Manitoba; wherein they would not be in conflict with other things that are occurring on a Sunday, other than perhaps another trapper or another hunter, but certainly not the mainstream of society. So I see no particular problem with respect to that component of our hunting area.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I understood what you said the first time and I still say that I question you whether - where could you draw the line? That's the point.

HON. S. USKIW: Remote lodges.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, where is the remote lodge . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Isolation.

MR. L. HYDE: I agree with that, but I still say, Mr. Minister that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This exchange is being recorded, please. The operator will have a hard deciphering who is talking.

The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I still say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister certainly will be opening up, as I said earlier, a can of worms that he will have great difficulty in defending.

HON. S. USKIW: I can assure the Member for Portage that we likely will not include the delta.

MR. L. HYDE: I would hope so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a couple of very small questions to the Minister concerning some of the endangered species in the Province of Manitoba, and particularly the skinks that are on the protected list. Can the Minister advise how their being on the protected list has affected their numbers and whether their numbers have been increased in the last little while?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we'd have to get the data on that. We don't have it readily available but we'll provide it for the member.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well I knew that the data would be quite interesting and of great importance. I think that I would be quite happy if the Minister would advise, after he gets the data, as to the number of skinks, possibly even for the last couple of years and how they have increased in numbers or even decreased in numbers.

HON. S. USKIW: That's acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. H. HARPER: Yes, I was very interested in the comments of Emerson regarding the Sunday hunting. I believe many of the trappers that are way out in a remote area, sometimes there's a need to check on your traps - as a matter of fact, trapping is defined as hunting in The Wildlife Act. I was just wondering how would that affect the trappers. You can't penalize them for checking their traps.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that's the very point that I guess I was alluding to. We set down laws and then we immediately violate them, because the laws we set down are not practical in their application many times. We, as a department, have been turning a blind eye to those violations, simply because the law is an ass. It's very simple. The law is not practical in its application in those situations. So administratively, the enforcement people look the other way when the law is being challenged. Rather than allow that to continue, I think we would be better to put the issue on the table and to allow for certain things to occur, within reasonable parameters, that perhaps we are not willing to officially okay by statute law today. Practical application is really what we're talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any more general questions, because we have agreed to pass all these items unless there are questions?

HON. S. USKIW: No, there's no agreement.

Friday, 26 April, 1985

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that's what I understood. It's all open.

HON. S. USKIW: No agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, we've tried to cover sort of the major points and now we'll move along relatively fast but there might be the odd question that we want to raise here, so it's not dramatic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to be clear.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: We'll move along relatively fast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall I call the items now? Until I hear someone, I will assume it will be passed.

HON. S. USKIW: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(a)(1) to 9.(e)(2) were each read and passed.

9.(f)(1) - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, we talked about the Northern Development Agreement and this is again just the provincial portion of that five-year program that we just touched on briefly the other day. I wonder if he could just explain a little about what that agreement involves in terms of the wildlife aspect of it. It says here Management.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, the three principal areas are Wildlife Management, Polar Bear Management and Caribou Management - and input into the Northern Flood Agreement.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister just maybe give us a little update as to how the caribou aspect is faring? I recall being up North and at that time meeting with various reserves to discuss the possibility of working out a joint type of committee to, I suppose, look after the welfare of the caribou herds, basically the Kaminuriak and Beverly herds. I think there was a joint committee set up in conjunction with the Northwest Territories, as well as the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Manitoba and, I believe, the Native people. Am I correct on that? Do you know about that, with this group that was set up to deal with the caribou herds?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there is an authority set up for the caribou species, for the development and management of the caribou program. A management program is being developed and we're not yet in a position to indicate its content.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Approximately what is the time frame we're looking at, a completed program maybe that would be coming forward, because I believe it's been worked at now for a number of years? Are we looking at it within the next six months or something like that?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, we're anticipating a management proposal or report by about October of this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(f)(1) Northern Development Agreement: Salaries—pass; 9.(f)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.
9.(g)(1) Wild Fur Management: Salaries - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions here. I want to make the comment that, in looking at the report, I believe that trapper education and humane trapping program activities continued to increase substantially. There seems to be always a certain amount of public pressure on the trapping aspect of it and I think is an industry that I believe pumps millions of dollars into the province's coffers and is a means of substantial income for many people up North, especially.

I sometimes have concern about the activities of our Greenpeace Movement, if we might call it that, in terms of trying to banish these kind of things and I think possibly an enhanced program of maybe promotion and awareness to people generally would maybe take that edge off a bit because there's always a certain group that seems to be promoting the idea that this is a terrible thing that's happening, the trapping of fur-bearing animals and I think, in my mind, a very common way of life that has been there for a long time; and with the improved methods that are being used I think maybe there should be more onus put on the promotion so that people understand what it's all about and maybe so that they have an idea of the impact, financially and otherwise, that it has on province and this country.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we always have to expect that there will always be balancing acts that we must do between various interest groups in society and the member is quite right. I guess his concern is that he would hope that the anti-fur movement group doesn't predominate or take over the policy making positions in government.

I just want to advise him that Manitoba is the leader in the Fur Institute of Canada and our friend here to my left, Mr. Golden, is the chairman of that group, so I think we have a fairly healthy input into the protection of our fur industry. It does generate about \$5 million of raw fur value to the trappers of Manitoba so that is important to a fairly significant number of people. So I think we have more than our share of input, given our particular role in the institute.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The reason I raise that is just so that we have that awareness in the back of our minds that there are groups that are promoting against this kind of thing and I think the same kind of effort should be used in the other direction because we've seen what happened to the sealing industry in Newfoundland and I certainly would hope that we would not get to that point where we'd have even any impact really on the trapping industry in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another couple of questions and possibly in a little bit more

Friday, 26 April, 1985

serious note than the last group that I asked, Mr. Minister. But as you know, I have a small piece of property out in the southeast corner of the province and there are some wild animals on the property. I enjoy the wild animals and I know there's a chap that does some trapping on my property and it's with my permission.

I'm not against hunting; I just like to see that these animals keep up in fair numbers. I would like to encourage the development of these animals on my property particularly. There's been some lynx caught out there, some mink and things of that nature and I would like to encourage the propagation of these animals and I would like to protect them somewhat, on my particular property. Do I require a permit to . . . I'm not talking about putting them into a confined area, but I would like to protect them while they are on my property, maybe even wild turkeys and things of that nature. Am I restricted in any way in the development of these animals and protecting them on my own property?

HON. S. USKIW: I just want to remind the Member for Niakwa that the law as it now stands requires that people that want to trap or hunt on private property must have permission of the owner; so that, in essence, there is a sanctuary there now unless the member permits that activity. It's really in his own hands, whether it happens or doesn't happen.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's not really what I was asking, Mr. Minister. What I'm really asking, do I require a special permit for the special breeding of these animals to encourage the breeding of these animals, because I know that if I'm going to raise buffalo or things of that nature, bison, I do require a special permit. Now does it matter on the size of the animal? That's really what I'm enquiring.

HON. S. USKIW: The member's obviously referring to fur bearing animals.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, I'm talking about fur bearing animals.

HON. S. USKIW: Fur farming comes under the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman. I don't imagine that the member is trying to set up a fur farm per se.

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, not as such. I'm just trying to set up a sanctuary so that when I get up on Sunday morning and go for a walk I can see wild foxes running across the property - which I have done, Mr. Minister - and I enjoy it very much and I have no intention of curtailing the activities of these wild animals; but it was just going through my mind whether I required a special permit if I was going to do anything to encourage them. I'm not talking about setting up a fur farm; I'm just talking about a sanctuary more than anything else.

HON. S. USKIW: I guess the key question to that is whether the member intends to establish them in captivity, as opposed to letting them be free and wild. If the person wants to captivate those animals, then he would have to have a permit.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I see, even if I was going to, we'll say, breed them under captivity and then release them on my own property, I would require a permit in that regard?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Excuse me for my ignorance, I have a lot of questions and sometimes I don't understand what the purpose of the government is.

HON. S. USKIW: They're all the same.

MR. E. HARPER: What is the purpose of the royalties?

HON. S. USKIW: Royalties? That's revenue. That's our share of the resource. That's what helps to pay for your hospital bill.

MR. E. HARPER: The reason why I say that, there are different amounts of royalty attached to each species, like a badger is only 1 cent; whereas, an otter is \$1.25 and a muskrat is five cents. In the North, where there are remote trappers, their activities are getting more expensive - like you're paying for a gallon of gas maybe \$3.50, and these kinds of things, you know. Who is taking the share from them? And every little bit helps, that's the reason why I question it. In terms of royalties, I don't know whether it's doing anything for the trappers.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, I guess we have to admit that our royalty structure is outdated. The level of fees that we have now dates back to the Forties, so we do have to revise them in order to better reflect their economic rent to the Province of Manitoba - I guess that's the way to put it.

MR. E. HARPER: I think we'll have a discussion on that because through licence fees and everything else, the trappers are paying enough already as it is, so you and I will have a discussion later.

HON. S. USKIW: 1945 is a long time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(g)(1) Wild Fur Management, Salaries—pass; 9.(g)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 9.(g)(3) Grant Assistance—pass.

9.(h) Canada-Manitoba Waterfowl Damage Prevention Agreement - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 126: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$3,874,500 for Natural Resources, Wildlife, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 10.(a)(1) Surveys and Mapping, Administration, Salaries; 10.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes. We don't have very much under this section, Mr. Chairman, but I want to raise - and I don't know whether it's necessarily related in

this area, maybe I should have brought it up under a different area. But reading at the top heading here, I want to make reference to the fact where it indicates geographic mapping, and also in my report here, it indicates that this area covers part of The Mining Act and it makes reference to that, Mr. Chairman.

I want to draw one particular problem to the Minister's attention. Maybe if it isn't in the right area I would like him to give consideration to what I'm saying, is that the Well Drillers Association of Manitoba have had an individual from the Department of Natural Resources working with them on various aspects of assessments, etc., etc. The individual's name is Lewis Hopper. Apparently this position has been in the department for about 20 years and I believe Mr. Hopper has filled that position for about 10 years now.

It is my understanding that that position is becoming redundant and consideration is being given to transfer Mr. Hopper to the Agricultural Branch. I would ask the Minister to maybe look into that matter and possibly reconsider that position.

It appears that this individual has been of tremendous help to the people in the province and they have very high regard for him and they feel that the position should not be redundant. My understanding is that he would still maybe cover part of it. There is concern, certainly by the people involved in this that have been working with him, that if possible, that position should be retained, as this individual has been of tremendous help and I think has worked out a very good liaison situation between government and the problems that they've run into.

Like I indicated, maybe this isn't the right section, but I wanted to raise it with the Minister and ask whether he will review that situation and get feedback from all the people involved, and maybe change his mind on that aspect of it.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that item was debated under Water Resources a few days ago and I did deal with that question. We have taken ourselves out of that area of responsibility entirely, on the premise that the industry is mature enough to look after its own particular needs.

On the other hand, the other services have been transferred over to the Department of Agriculture, including this staff person, I believe is being transferred to Agriculture.

So in this appropriation we don't have either the money or the staff years. All of that has already been taken out in the end of the previous fiscal year. A decision was made some time ago, and really I have no role to play in it at this point in time. It's a decision having been made . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, under Mapping, I just was enquiring about maps on the different hunting areas. With the requirement now of obtaining permission to hunt, many hunters are finding it quite difficult to locate the actual landowner. Now some municipalities, I understand, have gone as far as naming their landowner on the map, so that it's maybe a little easier to contact the gentleman and get permission to hunt on certain

areas. I just wonder how widespread the distribution of maps like this is. Is there a fairly large demand for them?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the only maps that we do have for that purpose are on Crown lands. We do not designate private lands. We are not in a position to give that information.

MR. D. BLAKE: I realize that. These maps are available from the municipalities for the various areas. On the Crown lands, is there an increased demand for those now?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the member is alluding to maps that are being distributed through the municipal system and that is something that we are not providing.

MR. D. BLAKE: They don't come out of this system originally? Okay.

HON. S. USKIW: We do provide Crown lands mapping for purposes of hunting.

MR. D. BLAKE: That designate all Crown lands?

HON. S. USKIW: That is through our own system.

MR. D. BLAKE: I see. There's a Dauphin office and I imagine that's a private enterprise where you can buy maps from them that designate all the landholders. I'd imagine that's something that's been undertaken by some individuals that have been doing it on their own.

I just wondered with some curtailment in hunting or permission required, now if that had increased the demand for Crown land maps to any degree.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, there's always an increasing demand for mapping from Crown lands. There are private operators that provide the other service, Mr. Chairman. Apparently it's available.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(a)(1) Surveys and Mapping, Administration: Salaries—pass; 10.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 10.(b)(1) Salaries—pass.

10.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I just wanted to raise the question. There's always, especially in the areas of the LGDs, local government districts, a concern and a pressure for legal surveys. That is in this area, would it not be, Mr. Minister?

HON. S. USKIW: I thought I answered that. I said, yes, that's this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(b)(2) - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I just want to follow that a little bit. The Minister indicated there was an increase for maps. Is there also an increased demand for these

Friday, 26 April, 1985

surveys that small little communities and local government districts - specifically why I referred to that because I have areas where there's grave concern because in a transaction if somebody buys or sells property now there has to be a legal survey accompanying the transaction. It's creating a lot of financial stress on certain individuals. I raised this last year where an individual was selling a small piece of property and a legal survey was required and he sold the property for \$500 and by the time the legal survey was done it cost approximately \$6,000 to bring it in from heaven knows where. This is the kind of problem and I don't know how to really address it in any other way. It does create problems in that respect and I don't know whether the Minister has any way of changing these things or making it a little bit more easy.

I know of cases, Mr. Chairman, where sales have been aborted for the simple reason that the cost of providing a legal survey was so high that there was just no percentage in doing it. I wonder if maybe this department could play an influential role in making some kind of provision from time to time so that these transactions could still proceed.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what the member is alluding to is a long-standing problem. We have not, obviously, maintained the survey system or the township survey system for over 100 years and that has created a very expensive problem for us if we were wanting to update it to this point in time. The estimated cost of doing that through the old system is \$36 million to do 800 townships, and I think that's just in southern Manitoba is it?

A MEMBER: Yes.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes. So it's a tremendously high cost item.

We're trying to deal with specific cases on an ad hoc basis. Our response mechanism is designed to do that rather than attempting to update the whole area. What we are doing is waiting for the results of the pilot project that's already under way and which we hope to initiate some time in '86-87, or '87-88. That's in the Souris area where we have a trial project involving four townships. That has to do with the satellite and photogrammetric positioning technology that is being applied and the cost savings are in the order of 5-1 versus our conventional survey system. If that is the way to go, we'll be able to move in this area at a much lower cost.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I appreciate that there is some movement in that direction. I appreciate the economics of it when we look at \$36 million. My next question was going to be, and I guess the Minister answered that, whether there's any plan developing in terms of gradually overcoming this, because somewhere along the time it'll have to be dealt with and if this is the way to go then we'll look forward to that with interest to see how it works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(b)(2)—pass; 10.(c)(1) Control Surveys and Mapping: Salaries—pass; 10.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

10.(d)(1) Geographic Mapping: Salaries - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Over the years, many of our trappers in the Northern area have been involved to some degree and I think got paid to some degree for doing certain slashing lines and stuff of that nature. I have been in contact with some of the trappers and I don't know they've been running the lines or slashing certain lines up in the Northern isolated areas. I was just wondering is there a program in place that deals with something like that, or do we do any kind of specific mapping in the Northern parts of the province.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, I'm advised we have a mapping program in remote communities, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Can the Minister just roughly indicate how that works just to have an idea?

HON. S. USKIW: I'm advised that we have topographical base mapping which provides for 20 miles of mapping around each community on a scale of 1 to 20,000. The national government is doing a similar program, or a mapping program, for the entire North and of course that's separate from our operations here.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Does the federal program and the provincial program work hand-in-hand to some degree or are they both independent of each other?

HON. S. USKIW: No, there's a co-ordinating and liaising effort there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(d) Geographic Mapping: Salaries—pass; 10.(d)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 10.(e)(1) Map Distribution and Remote Sensing: Salaries—pass; 10.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass. 10.(e)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: This Item (3) Recoverable from Other Appropriations, can the Minister indicate . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, that's a recovery through the sale of maps to other departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass.

Resolution 127: Resolved that there be granted to her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,951,000 for Natural Resources, Surveys and Mapping, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

11.(a)(1) Resource Support Programs, Manitoba Water Commission: Salaries; 11.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I wonder if we could use the same format here and maybe deal with some of the concerns and then we could proceed with that.

Before we adjourned last night, I indicated to the Minister whether he could give us an indication of the Garrison Diversion, where it's at, what's happening and what he anticipates will happen?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think I should put into the record a statement on that.

Friday, 26 April, 1985

"The Garrison Diversion unit, commissioned in December, 1984, recommended to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior a revised plan for the Garrison Diversion project in North Dakota. This revised plan provides for the irrigation of 130,000 acres of land, all drainage from the irrigation area being to the Missouri Basin. The plan does provide for the transfer of Missouri River water into the Hudson Bay Basin for municipal and industrial purposes provided that water is properly treated on the Missouri side of the Divide to ensure the removal of all biota prior to its release into the Hudson Bay Basin.

"The Government of Canada, by means of a diplomatic note, forwarded on March 26, 1985, advised as follows: 'The Government of Canada considers that the Commission plan as a package does not pose threats to Canadian waters, and once approved by Congress should resolve a long-standing problem on the Canada-United States agenda.' The diplomatic note was sent by Canada after consultation with Manitoba, and we did not disagree with its contents. We, however, have not endorsed the Commission plan, because the plan maintains the possibility that Lonetree Reservoir may eventually be built. The Commission plan requires that Sykson (phonetic) Canal be built as a substitute for Lonetree and that Lonetree should be proceeded with only after determination by the Secretary of the Interior consisting of a demonstration of need and satisfactory conclusion on consultations with Canada.

"We would have preferred to see the authorization of Lonetree Reservoir cancelled. However, adherent to the Commission plan will ensure the construction of the reservoir is not proceeded with unless its need has been justified, and consultations with Manitoba and Canada have reached a satisfactory conclusion. Manitoba is prepared to participate fully with Canada in the consultations with the United States recommended by the Commission.

"Canada advised in the diplomatic note that they assume that the consultations envisioned and the Commission's plan will not be sought before the plan receives formal congressional approval. The process for congressional approval is now proceeding and it is expected that a revised draft of the proposed legislation will be reported out of committee in the near future. We will be watching these developments with interest and maintaining our vigilance to ensure that Manitoba's interests are protected.

"In recent discussions with North Dakota's legislators, we have maintained a position of willingness to talk about many cross-boundary concerns with them, including Garrison, but we have given them no reason to believe there is any change in our resolution to protect our fishing and farming industries by accepting Missouri water into the Hudson Bay Basin for irrigation purposes."

That's a pretty comprehensive update as to where we are on Garrison at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I appreciate the Minister putting the statement in the record. I just want to ask this Minister, at the present time is there any intention to continue talks, let's say, a province-to-state basis, specifically with North Dakota?

I had the occasion to be down there not that long ago and I suppose part of the problem has been to

some degree, maybe communication. I think most of the people from the State of North Dakota, to some degree, have had the wrong impression about the position that we have taken from time to time, and I think I would recommend very strongly to this Minister that we develop a communication system and a liaison with them, not necessarily promoting the idea of changing our position but just to maybe continue discussions with them so that they may better understand.

When we attended some of the Province of Manitoba's - along with some other people, myself included - hearings at Bismarck. It's all on a very official basis and even then emotions run relatively high between the for-and-against components in the Garrison thing. But I feel that we have a responsibility to still get in touch with our neighbours from the south, especially North Dakota, because at the local level there has developed an almost anti-Manitoba feeling to some degree. I would suggest, in my mind at least, that this could be overcome by just having some dialogue with our legislators from North Dakota, if for no other reason than to just to build up the good will because we need these people for trade purposes, we need them for tourism and I think we don't want to leave the impression that maybe is out there right now that we are opposed to many of the things. I think they could accept the fact that we have strong feelings about Garrison. But it's more than just Garrison, we have other projects that are interrelated and I would strongly urge the Minister that we try and maybe get together with them. I know that some of the legislators from the State of North Dakota plan to be coming to this province in either May or June sometime just on a bit of a goodwill tour and I hope that maybe we could arrange something similar.

The other thing that I'd like to suggest to this Minister is that possibly that we, as legislators, in Manitoba have a better understanding of exactly what the project is all about. They have a standing-open invitation to come and just have a look at exactly what they've been trying to do. We look on the maps and we go through just literally tons of paper and the pros and cons about the project itself, but very often having a first-hand view of the matter I think would probably enable us to understand the situation a little better. I know that prior to my time in government that - it's been a number of years ago - my colleague from Minnedosa was one of those that were down there initially when they started with that, and I think that many faces have changed here in the Legislature and I think it would probably be beneficial.

I'm sure that it would be keen interest from the American side to show us what they are doing and planning to do. I'd certainly be interested, if we can't do it through the government here, that we set up maybe a tour of a nature. I certainly intend to pursue it myself, if I can, but I thought I would suggest to the Minister that it might be beneficial for many members. Maybe the Minister has been there. He's been here for a long time; maybe he was on one of those tours, but I know that many members here would find it very enlightening maybe to see exactly the scope of what is really happening other than looking at it on a map and saying, well, this is what's happening. I think just doing that kind of thing would probably help alleviate some of the

Friday, 26 April, 1985

tense feelings that we have with our neighbours there to some degree.

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate, I am not promoting any change of position that we have taken with Garrison, but I think it still leaves the door open for us to communicate with them, and I understand what they are trying to do. I think it would help us when we have projects which are going to be related to them.

I indicated in my opening statements the concerns I had about the Souris River development, and although it's not related to this, it's under the Resource aspect of it. These are the kind of things where we also, as a result, do not have communication with them now, and I'm just using that as an example where we have to get back on track, I believe, with our neighbours from North Dakota.

So I would hope that the Minister would again use his phrase, "use common sense," and maybe see whether we could try and resolve some of the concerns that are there, that are definitely there.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we've been very fortunate in that we have been able to use the services of a very able person, in the person of our Consul General in Minneapolis, to bring elected members of North Dakota together with our people here from the government. Those meetings have been very beneficial to bridge those particular misunderstandings that have occurred as a result of Garrison. The last meeting we had was a superb exercise in that respect.

While we didn't agree to review, any further, the Garrison question, and stuck to the position that we had held for some time, we did agree at that particular meeting that there would be a mechanism established for the purpose of cross-referencing issues between the State of North Dakota and Manitoba. Tentatively, we had agreed that there would be a meeting in Manitoba in April of North Dakota legislators with government representatives here. That has not been set up. I know at the official's level we are trying to set it up, establish an agenda of items, things of that nature. It has to do with a broad range of subjects. It has to do with water, to do with tourism, highway linkages, signage, all sorts of things that we ought to be talking to each other about in any event. We found that to be a very warm experience, notwithstanding the acrimony of Garrison to that date to that point in time. We think that we are now heading for the high road in respect to our relationship with North Dakota legislators and vice versa. We look forward to the interchange and dialogue that's going to take place.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I'd like to partly endorse that type of action. I feel that's a much needed positive step forward.

I would ask the Minister that if this kind of meeting will take place between the legislators of North Dakota and government officials here, whether there is a possibility of having members from the opposition attend and be involved in the meetings to have an understanding of what's going on? The reason why I ask that is because in the event, as we anticipate possibly changing government in the near future, so that we're on the right track and running with the proper people.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the member knows that the Chair doesn't allow anticipatory type of questions, propositions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hypothetical.

HON. S. USKIW: That's right, very hypothetical.

There may be an opportunity for that, but again we are not the sole decision-makers on that. Our officials will be trying to put together an agenda for such an event to take place. If it's convenient, I see nothing wrong with having an opportunity for elected people from both sides to have lunch together or whatever in a sort of informal basis after the formal part of our discussions is over. I say "convenience" in the sense that if the House is sitting and we're here, then I think that's a good idea. If members are scattered all over the province, then I'm not sure how practical that would be. But in any event, we'll take that under advisement. I see nothing wrong with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, as my colleague has mentioned in 1972, six or seven of us toured that project and I was amazed at the massiveness of it. It's just a giant undertaking, and I think the involvement of the discussions and the tack that's been taken has been probably the right one. There's no question, it's an extremely important development to the people of North Dakota, and I said at that time, when there was strong opposition from some people down there, that this project is so far along the road. They have spent so many millions of dollars on it up till then, with the Snake River Pumping Station and the various other canals, that they probably were not going to be able to stop it. But I think the tack that was taken that let's modify it in such a way that it's not going to be harmful to our water system and we can both live with it, I think that's been an excellent position that's been taken and it seems to have worked out fairly satisfactory to all concerned.

I would like to ask the Minister: are we still maintaining a presence in Washington in connection with the Garrison?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, I think that will be there ongoing for a while yet, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: By a law firm.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, it's by a legal firm that we have retained over there. I don't think there is a great deal of activity at the moment, but I think we have to have some presence until the decisions are made at that end.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Minister might tell us what the cost involved is in maintaining this presence there, and what it's costing to operate the office here.

HON. S. USKIW: I'm told we're paying the legal fee on an hourly basis, so it's probably less expensive that way than on a retainer.

MR. D. BLAKE: What is the position of our office in the building here? Are we still staffing that fully or is it kind of part-time now?

Friday, 26 April, 1985

HON. S. USKIW: We modified our costs here by consolidating with other activities.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, I'm glad to see the Minister's enlightened approach to our good neighbours to the south, Mr. Chairman, that in time we can put the flag burning behind us and go on and treat them as good neighbours as we know they are.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, just so there's no misinterpretation of those comments, I really don't want to be associated with flag-burning incidents personally.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wasn't . . . the Minister of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'd like to maybe touch on the next item which is the Conservation Districts Commission. The Minister, when we dealt with Water Resources, indicated that there was going to be a promotional program coming forward or to promote the establishment of conservation districts. I understand - correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman - this is water conservation that we're talking about here, am I correct?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I notice that if the Minister is following through on his idea of expanding or trying to expand the water conservation districts, we have quite a reduction there. It looks like staff has been cut in that respect. Can the Minister maybe indicate whether his statements about trying to do more of a promotion job on that end of it in terms of establishing districts, how he plans to do that when he's cutting back in this area?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the logic is of the cutback. It's a very marginal cutback. Let's see. Here we are.

Yes, there is a reduction due to salary adjustments and I would have to suspect that means that higher paid people have moved elsewhere, and people came in at a lower classification which is often the case when you recruit new people. That's a guess on my part. I'm told that's correct.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It is still the intention, as the Minister indicated though, to try and expand and form more water conservation districts?

HON. S. USKIW: Just to enlighten the committee on that, the mandate for the operation is a commitment which is threefold, one of which is to develop a five-year scheme, annual programs and individual project initiatives to provide order, direction and priorities for an integrated approach to land use management for individual conservation districts.

The second point is to encourage and promote the establishment of conservation districts in Manitoba as a preferred system for enhanced soil and water management.

The third point is to co-ordinate the efforts of the department, commission and the conservation districts

in the development and approval process required for five-year plans or schemes and, of course, the annual programs and projects as well. That's the mandate to our staff at the moment.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That five-year program that the Minister is alluding to would not include just the conservation districts. It would also include the province as a whole. Am I correct in that assumption?

HON. S. USKIW: The department, the commission and the districts are going to be part of that process, right.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: So areas that have not formed a conservation district at this stage of the game would still be included in the five-year program, or is that five-year program only going to be set up for the water conservation districts?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, these five-year plans are for the districts already established. We still have to have a dual program, because we have many areas that don't have conservation districts so we will be encouraging the development of additional districts. But we have to have a two-tiered program in order to respond to both the districts and the non-districts, if you like.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: So in that dual program, there would also be a five-year program.

HON. S. USKIW: No.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: There would not be a five-year program for those that are not within the district. That will still continue to be done on an ad hoc basis.

HON. S. USKIW: Essentially our hope is that we get the whole province into conservation districts ultimately. There is no point in setting up long-term plans, while at the same time you're trying to co-ordinate your planning with a multiple discipline idea. In other words, if you launch a five-year plan outside of the jurisdiction of a district and then you bring in a district that may develop a different five-year plan, you're actually wasting your time and capital. So it wouldn't be productive in the long run to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I just want to make one or two remarks, Mr. Chairman, and this looks as good a spot as any. I know many of the water control facilities that have been set up have been set up for that purpose, of water control. With those facilities there develops a fairly substantial recreation area, and I know over a period of years people forget the original intent of the dams and recreation takes over.

Rivers, the area that I mentioned to the Minister the other night, is probably a good example. I've just talked to some people from there in the past 24 hours and this year I think, Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing an extremely odd year. I was born and raised in that area and with the snowfall that we had this year, I felt there was going to be lots of water around. I have seen

the dam at Minnedosa taken out with high water. I've seen the dam at Rapid City taken out.

This year, they tell me at Rapid City - I've talked to the mayor - when they lifted a couple of logs there to try and get some water down into Lake Wahtopanah at Rivers Lake, he said there was just a terrible odour. It just felt that that body of water in the Rapid City area had been stagnant all winter. I know there is not enough water coming down to run over the Minnedosa dam.

So it's just amazing where that water has gone this year. There hasn't been a runoff. It seems to have soaked in. I know six or eight inches of rain up in the mountains are going to change that situation somewhat, and maybe we can get those lakes flushed out at Minnedosa and Rapid City and Rivers.

But in the Rivers area, there's a tremendous problem with algae there. Even though the fishermen fish, and many times your line is just green with algae. But there's a beautiful little park area there, and the people are very concerned about what may happen. The Minister advised me the other night that they're opening cottage lots up there, and I think there are 14 out of 20 is all that's been taken up. People are a little reluctant to come in there. Those that used to come are not coming, and the local people are getting a bit concerned.

The swimming there is virtually eliminated even as early as June, because the algae's so thick. The biologists or the people that study that tell us that the algae is so thick now without the runoff from the fields or whatever that it will feed on itself and will perpetuate itself. It's getting that bad.

HON. S. USKIW: It's a bog.

MR. D. BLAKE: Right. They're proposing taking an area and with volunteer work or whatever they can acquire, sandbagging an area, even a paddling area for the children in the beach area with an outlet and an inlet and then bluestoning and trying to preserve it in that way. So it is presenting quite a problem there to try and maintain that recreation area.

They've also mentioned that the Grand Valley was closing, and they're not hiring any local staff at Rivers. They're going to move the three from Grand Valley up. Now if the waterslide goes into Grand Valley, they're going to need staff there. So their concerns there may be a little premature, but I don't know whether the Minister has been made aware of whether staff are being moved in from the Grand Valley area and they're not hiring locally or what the situation is. He could maybe look into that and maybe let me know in the next few days, let me know what the situation is there.

I just wanted to mention that, Mr. Chairman, that it's an extremely odd year in the rural areas where, even though we had a fairly heavy snowfall, a runoff just hasn't occurred. It's very unusual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'd like to, before we finish off this section here, just touch on the Habitat Enhancement Fund. There is \$250,000 in there, and I would like the Minister to maybe explain exactly what's happening with that, whether we have a program that is moving

forward in terms of promoting the retention of habitat.

I think over a period of years, we've had some discussion about how to do it, whether there's a feasible way of undertaking projects of this nature. Possibly, just as a suggestion, maybe through our wildlife licensing, there should be a certain portion, I think - just a thought. If, for example, whatever hunting licence an individual buys, maybe there should be an extra \$5 tab which would be specifically indicated as for wildlife habitat retention, or something like that, so that we could then maybe work out a promotional program, together with the municipalities and individuals, where we would maybe set aside certain lands.

The Minister indicated that we are losing 4 percent of our habitat per year and, obviously, unless we start some kind of a program to change that direction, it will continue to do so. I think, in my mind, at least, that there would be a receptive attitude by most people that they would contribute, through licensing or whatever the case may be, that we establish a fund.

Now I don't know whether this \$250,000 is just set aside by the government as an enhancement fund. How is it being utilized? Is there an intention to expand on this, for an expanded program on this?

I would certainly encourage maybe a planned program for the future where we would take and maybe make provisions for farmers, municipalities where you have marginal land, swampland, stuff of this nature, where the farmers - and you can't blame them - have a tendency to try and drain and utilize every acre of land that they have because of the cost squeeze, price squeeze structure of things, tax wise, etc. Maybe there should be a program worked out where municipalities could have worked out, I suppose, maybe a forgiveness for taxes on some of these properties that really do not have good agricultural value, and still the farmers pay taxes on it and, as a result, then maybe try and utilize some of this. It maybe isn't economically feasible, but if a system was worked out whereby municipalities could take in maybe a reduction in taxes, maybe alleviation of total taxes on some of these properties so that they would stay in a form so that it would enhance habitat.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, yes, the member is quite on target. We have had a good number of discussions with various groups on that very item. There is a lot of support within the users of wildlife, water fowl, habitat, generally speaking, for a concept that would greater fund these initiatives. I have been led to believe that they would support an increase in the fee system if they knew the money was dedicated for that purpose. I think that's fair comment; I think that's a responsible approach on their part.

We are indeed looking at that and maybe coming up fairly soon with a proposal to enhance the financing of these projects. We have to yet sort out the mechanism, but we are well on the way in those discussions and I would hope that we have something this year on that issue.

Apart from that, this is the second year of our own initiative of \$250,000 toward the program. It may be, if we end up with a broader program, we just may make a contribution to the broader program, rather than just doing our own thing, so to speak, here; but that's part of the discussion.

Friday, 26 April, 1985

MR. A. DRIEDGER: How is this \$250,000 that is designated here used at the present time?

HON. S. USKIW: Essentially, there are a number of areas that we intend to use the money for: development of nesting islands; spawning beds; plantings, trees or whatever; water control measures; a whole combination of things that we do with that money, usually small projects, because that's not a big pot of money, but spread out throughout the province.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I would certainly encourage a broadening of a program in this direction. As I indicated before, the awareness is there by, I think, most people, and the need is definitely there and I think it's maybe just a matter of working it out. If the Minister is indicating that they are moving in that direction, I certainly want to encourage that aspect of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Just to follow along what the Minister has said, I am sure that those in the wildlife associations, and those that are avid hunters would endorse an extra fee on the licence as long as they could be assured that it was going toward the enhancement of the habitats.

I was happy to hear the Minister's announcement earlier of the negotiations and the agreements with Ducks Unlimited. I have been involved with them for some time, and we had our fourth annual banquet at Minnedosa, banquet and auction, in which we raised roughly \$12,000, \$13,000 at each one for Ducks Unlimited.

I am attending one at Gladstone on Saturday night. They are just getting going and they raise substantial money. There is a large number of these banquets now around Manitoba that are fairly new and are raising substantial funds.

In our particular area - mind you, the Minnedosa area was once known as the pothole capital of the country in mallards - the mallard population is extremely down with nesting islands and that in our particular area, where it's natural for the breeding ground. They have got some tremendously worthwhile projects in there and the support they are getting is quite significant. I am happy to see that the government is co-operating in joining with them because they are doing very very worthwhile work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11.(a)(1) to 11.(e) were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 128: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$758,600 for Natural Resources, Resource Support Programs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

We are now starting on Item No. 12.(a)(1).

12.(a) Expenditures Related to Capital, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets: Northern Development Agreement - Provincial; 12.(b) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets: Other Capital Projects, 12.(c); Capital Grants . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I thought we were going to call it a day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I would just like to indicate that we would like to deal with the Capital aspect of it maybe Monday. There is a possibility, depending on how many of my colleagues want to get involved, that we can maybe finish that and the Minister's Salary maybe Monday afternoon, at the latest, Monday evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30, what is the pleasure of the committee?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 7, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Line 1, Administration.

Is the critic coming? Item 7, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Line 1, Administration - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yesterday the Minister was interrupting his answer to — (Interjection) — yes, sounds good - and he was about to indicate whether, in fact, he would be able to write a letter to the various groups that had received his January 7th letter and a follow-up letter of April 22nd, and explain to them the financial situation. I don't think the Minister had an opportunity yesterday to answer that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thought I had answered it. I wasn't quite finished but, unless there is a wish to keep on discussing the letter which I'm certainly ready to do, the statement that I made is that the letter I wrote I stood behind it 100 percent. I admitted that the information I got, and I don't see anything unusual about that, that I relied on the Department of Finance, the same as if they want to know the number of personal care beds and so on they'll rely on me.

The situation is, I refute very strongly that my intention - and now I'm not talking about anybody but myself, I signed the letter - was to mislead the people of Manitoba or the administration and so on. We've had these discussions with them for going on two or three years now. I think that I made it quite clear that at the time we could not afford it. I kept talking about how much this would cost in 10 years. That has nothing to do with the feds at all.

I also admitted that there was pressure in that letter, that it was meant as part of the pressure on the feds and I think it worked. I think that the members of the opposition agreed with that, because they accompanied the Minister of Finance to Ottawa to try to put pressure on the Federal Government, especially after the memo from somebody in Wilson's staff seemed to indicate - not seemed - did indicate that they weren't about to do anything which certainly was the recommendation.

I say that letter was correct 100 percent. So the members of the opposition or all the members of this

committee certainly have the right to disagree with me. I certainly accept that or say that my information was not correct or say that I erred in judgment. That's fair enough. But as I say, I resent the accusation that I was misleading the public. I think that all my actions around here are not of someone that is trying to hoodwink the people before an election.

The other letter we admit, as I explained the situation, it was prepared quite a while ago by the Commission. They checked with the Department of Finance four weeks after. It was still correct, but then it was delayed again, and they admit, I admit and I take the responsibility for that, we should have checked. We were wrong. As of today, it's wrong. It was right when it was prepared. It was wrong. It wasn't a motive that they wanted to mislead the people. It was an error on our part. I admit that.

The Minister of Finance admitted that. It's in Hansard. If there is anybody in the media that cares to repeat it, fine. I think that is sufficient. Next time or any time that we have an occasion to discuss with the administration, we will certainly discuss that with them. But I certainly have no intention of going over to the staff of the Commission, and writing a letter and saying that they were wrong under the circumstances.

I think the members are trying to make a big thing out of this letter. I was ready to let it go, but apparently the wish is to keep on discussing this letter.

Now the point is, I am so - and I don't know if the word is surprised - but when I hear different things about how people are not consistent in this House on these things that we're told on one hand that we have to be careful on the Budget, the deficit and the Budget, we're told how great the policy of Reagan is in the United States. We're told that we can't run a peanut stand. We were told that we were throwing money at problems. We were told that not too long ago, that the NDP threw money at problems, and that might have been true at one time in certain areas.

Now we're trying to act responsibly in a very very difficult time. We're going through uncertain times, and we're trying to get the co-operation of the people and get them to understand. I think that has been quite clear. We're resisting, we're taking certain steps that I think were undreamed of that a year before an election we would do the things that we're doing in this department. I think we have also asked for the co-operation of other people and, fine. I certainly don't agree with that but we could. It's conceivable that we would have ulterior motives, that we wanted people to maybe take it easy on us. That's something they have to decide for themselves.

I guess with the little time that I have left in politics, I guess maybe I feel different if I had just started politics, I don't know. But I see the problem that we will face and the problem that the people will face if something isn't done, if we don't get together and try to endure.

For instance, there is no understanding at all. I think a member from the media yesterday asked me the question, and he could not accept that I wasn't ready to say, yes, we'll build a bed for every single person on the waiting list, for every single person that's there, in other words, his advice to me was that we should have 1,800 new personal care beds and that should be an emergency. Now with this kind of understanding and this kind of reporting, it makes it that much more difficult.

The situation on this is that argument or that discussion started to show that we were not spending money in Health, and I refute that very strongly. I refute that, and then there were comparisons made with the previous government.

Now at no time in opposition or in government did we not recognize that this was block funding, global funding. It went to the Consolidated Fund. It has nothing to do with my department at all. I have to go and get my funds like anybody else from the Treasury. It has to be approved by Cabinet. This is where they're complaining. Nothing is earmarked for Health.

Now I also recognize that some of these payments were made to Health, because of these universal programs that were started by the Federal Government. We have always said that we were ready to go and cost-share. With cost-sharing, we would have to pay our share. We're ready to do that, but it's obvious that the Federal Government of either colour, because the present government is going to do the same thing - can I have some water? Mr. Chairman, the situation is that the government is doing the same thing. They want to put a cap on it, they want to cap their spending in Health because it is scary and then the provincial governments are left with the responsibility.

Expectancy has been created. There has been, I think, some wrong direction from the Federal Government at the time - I'm not blaming the present government. I guess you learn by your mistakes. I'm not saying that it was done purposely, but these programs, they were financing one thing; in the hospitals, they were financing acute beds. So, therefore, everybody rushed to have acute beds and then we've had this pattern now that we're using so many acute beds. We're using more acute beds than any country in the world, and we're told that the bottom is falling out, that the health care is not taken care of with that kind of thing. So, we're saying, we've got to look at this, and we've got to be careful and plan for the future.

Now, I think, just before I stop the discussion on this to present my five-year program - I haven't got those figures in front of me - I'll give you the statement of what it would be in the last two years if we paid money that came from Canada. But let me give you an example of what has been done.

Now, in opposition, and this is the statement that I made then. I took the years 1976-77, '77-78, '78-79 and '79-80, and I added the total cost of the hospitals and the total cost of medical together, and then another addition, I added to that personal care homes. I calculated the money that came from the feds under the cost-shared formula, to start with, and then the first year in the block funding; then I deducted what was left and that would be - if we were going to measure the way it was measured in this letter - that would be the share of the Provincial Government.

In 1976-77, the Conservative Government of the Day, after the 1977 election, inherited our program.

In 1977-78, it was their program. They actually got an increase from the Federal Government for the total program of over \$17 million. They increased the whole thing, their share, by less than \$6 million.

Now, the following year - let's listen to this before we're lectured on not spending enough money - in 1978-79, there was actually a reduction of what the Provincial Government's share was. They spent - and when I say

Friday, 26 April, 1985

they spent, they spent of course money from the feds, but I'm not counting the money from the feds, and I'm not saying that this is legally wrong, but let's see what they are accusing us of doing this year. Their share of the Manitoba Government in the 1977-78 year for hospitals, Medicare and personal care homes was \$196.629 million, and the following year, 180.230, in other words, \$16.5 million less than the year before - less.

Now, we're saying that we're only increasing by so much, there was less. You look at the program operating in capital costs from the year 1970 to '85-86 and you'll see, the first year that they were responsible after the election, responsible for the budget. In 1978-79, the year-to-year increase was 4.7; then it went to 10.7; then it went to 16.2 and 22.2, and that's when the panic set in and just before the election everything was thrown in then. It is exactly the way usual government have been doing - less the first year and going all out the last year. Money certainly was no object. What have we done? Could we be accused of doing that? We started the other way, we started, even after the 22, we spent the 22 and then 17.1, then 10.9 and 7.9, and this year we're talking about 4.9.

I will tell you right away that there is no way that we're going to be restricted to that; there's no way in the world that is possible. You might say then, "Well, why aren't you giving us the right figure?" I've mentioned to you that what we did on that, we looked at no growth in Salary, except we put in the base, whatever agreement had been ratified and so on, the second year agreement, that was put in the base with the understanding that we would come back and go to Special Warrant if we had to.

That hasn't been done exactly like that in the past. In the past there has been some money put in, but certainly not the full money. This year, because of the uncertainty of it all, and it was a difficult year, you don't know how many hours we put around that Cabinet table to try to decide on the Budget, and we weren't getting any answers from Ottawa. The Commission was after me every day to give some directive because they, in turn, were being asked by the different hospitals: "What are we doing?" So I wrote the first letter early to try to get the people to advise them it would be a very difficult year, that's what I wanted to do.

Secondly, to have them help us in putting pressure on the Federal Government - and I don't hide that, that was the strategy of the Minister of Finance and I think it paid off to a certain point, we have to put pressure on the Federal Government to get some funds - and also to help them, to give them a direction what to expect.

The letter was: "In so doing it is necessary for us to approach each of the facilities that are funded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission and pose the following two questions." This was not finalized. Then it was very late. Most of the work was done on the Budget, we still hadn't heard from Ottawa, so we made the decision, rightly or wrongly; we couldn't see anything else, we said all right. We hope, and we feel that Ottawa, when they look at everything they will get some indication that we were starting to get . . . I was told by the Minister of Health, yes, that they were looking at Quebec and Ottawa. He didn't make any commitments what to give us, but that was being

reviewed. He admitted also, to me, in front of all the Ministers of Health that, yes, that wouldn't do, it wasn't quite fair, and that would be reviewed. That was very good, and they did. In the meantime, we included the money as if we were going to get it. We weren't getting any answers, so either we did, or we didn't. We gambled; we said, okay, we're going to get this money.

Therefore, we were hoping to have this money and, when we gave a directive, we said we'll give it like that and, if we don't get the money, then we'll have to find a way, either cut programs more in all the different departments or increase the taxes. That was the decision that was made.

Of course, to make it as low as possible, because certainly we had to finance the hospitals and so on, we did not include the increases in salary. That was the directive that we had, but I think that we knew that in days of collective bargaining it wasn't a policy or a decision of government to say all across the board there won't be any increase at all; that was the directive, that was a guideline and so on.

I will be going back. There is no doubt that it's going to cost more money than that. I don't want to mislead anybody. I will have to go out, for instance, in the nurses' agreement, that could cost about \$8 million.

Another area that we maybe weren't quite as realistic on, but that is always an estimated guess, is on increase in volume, that we don't know; but in normal years, we might have probably have it a bit more and have a surplus. Now we won't have that. So there will be more money spent than that. I don't say that we're going to throw it around, but I made the statement, why should I be different when I'm sitting on this side of the House than on the other when Mr. Sherman was bringing in his Budget, and he was talking about, I think it was a 2 percent or a 1.8 percent, that was for all the hospitals and everything. I said you can't, it's impossible. I was ready to bet anything and I was proven right.

So I would like to go with this; I think we've had a good airing of this letter. I would accept that some members of this committee might think that it was poor judgment. If that's what they think, fine. I would accept that they might think the figures I received from Finance were not correct. Everything indicates that they were and everything indicates that this letter was right. But as I say, I strongly resent the fact - and I don't think my actions bear this out at all - that I went out to mislead people. I resent that and I don't accept that.

Now it was a letter trying, in a very difficult time, to indicate to the people what to expect, and I think it worked. So as far as I am concerned, I certainly think we've had a good airing of something that should be discussed in the Department of Finance if we are talking about the policy and so on. I certainly would like to get back to discussing the health matters.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we will get back to discussing health matters, and that is a challenge the Minister put out. The first time I heard it was back in late November at the UMM Convention, where the Minister of Health was the keynote speaker, in which he told the audience the changes were coming, that the changes would only be made on the basis of consultation with all the affected groups, and that we

Friday, 26 April, 1985

had to approach this with an open mind and full knowledge of the facts, etc., etc.

That, Sir, is why I have asked him, and I accept the answer that he is not going to send out a letter to correct the April 22nd information which is not correct in terms of the budget that the Minister has to work with and the government has to work with. I accept that he is not going to do that. He considers this correction he is making on Hansard and discussions that he is going to have with . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's not my letter to start with.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, "It's not my letter, to start with." But the letter quotes the Minister of Health.

If the Minister of Health wants to go on being misquoted by his own departmental staff, then I suggest that he is not fostering the kind of co-operation and full information that he so desired back in November of 1984 in order that Manitobans might be able to approach the health field and the resolution of the problems that are there and that are growing with an open mind and with full information.

Mr. Chairman, I simply cannot accept the Minister saying that it is not his letter on April 22nd because it is a letter from his department; it carries the full force and authority of his department; it quotes the Minister directly as outlining certain things.

I know the Minister gets upset when members in opposition and members of the public may question motivation behind certain actions of himself and other members of his government. I regret that it happens. I regret it happens from time to time when members on my side of the House, when we were in government as well as being in opposition, have had their motives questioned.

But, Sir, the reason I have - we have spent probably entirely too much time on this letter - but the reason I bring it up is that the Minister is quoted as recently as April 22nd in a letter to all health institutions, and it is quoting him incorrectly. It's not proper information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am saying it might look like just a nuance. This is what it says: "On January 7, 1985, a letter from Honourable L.L. Desjardins." I quote that letter. They did not quote me as making the statement on April 22nd. They quoted a letter and fine, that quote was right at the time but it was no longer right on the 22nd, and that was the mistake they have made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is just exactly the mistake that I think the Minister, if he wanted to foster the kind of co-operation in the health care facilities and communities, could correct.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It will be straightened out but not in the way you want it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister says it will be straightened out, but it won't be straightened out by

another letter from the Minister saying that this is the new information. Mr. Chairman, the Minister may get excited from time to time about us attaching political motives to his government and to his actions, but this is the most important department. It is the most important department which touches probably all Manitobans in some way, shape or form every year.

I guess I consider it reasonably important that the Minister of Health is viewed as providing correct information, and that is why we would like to have the Minister correct it. He has chosen and said that no, he is not going to correct it by letter to those same institutions, and that is his perfect right as Minister responsible. If he wishes to not do that, we can't force him to, can't make him do it, but in the future when organizations come in and ask the Minister for certain information and a letter comes out a month later, the Minister is probably going to have those letters checked. That won't be our problem; that will be his problem.

Mr. Chairman, to get on with the discussions of Administration in the MHSC, could the department indicate out of the Other Expenditures, whether they are embarking upon any new computer programming for information collection for assembly and collation of departmental information? If there are no programs which are proposed and new in this fiscal year '85-86, could the Minister indicate the level of computer investment, if you will, or computer spending on programming, etc., that has occurred over the previous year that just came out, to give me an idea of the importance the MHSC attaches to the use of computers in compilation of information and, as well, the direction they believe they should be going in to gather and make information available on the operations of MHSC and their funded organizations?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I will give the increase for rental of office equipment and computers, mostly computers.

The voted 1984-85 was \$1.6 million; in fact, \$1.601 million in '84-85; in '85-86 it would be \$1.717 million, or an increase of 1.16. Now the Manitoba Data Centre, it was \$1.419 million and now the charge is \$1.440 million, or an increase of \$21,000; the CRT is the same, \$96,000; Data Entry, 46 - that's the large increase from 46 to 96 for an increase of \$50,000; the OCR, though, is discontinued. It was 25 and that is discontinued; so there is a saving of \$25,000 there. The data entry would replace that, I would assume. There is also a remote job processor, an extra \$60,000 that wasn't there last year. There is an increase in education supplies, miscellaneous and so on from \$15,000 to \$25,000; an increase of \$10,000 and that makes the total.

Now this is due mainly for replacement of the obsolete remote job processor that they had, and that's an obsolete data entry system of \$50,000.00. That's the \$50,000 and the \$60,000.00. Those are the big ones.

The increase also in the education supplies and so on, it is anticipated education resulting from introduction of admission discharge transfer system in urban facilities for provision of supplies in the event of medical claims being submitted by a floppy disk.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I presume the remote job processor has nothing to do with hiring, but rather refers to data entry and is a new piece of equipment

Friday, 26 April, 1985

to theoretically speed the facilitation of data processing within MHSC.

Mr. Chairman, when we were in the Brandon-Selkirk Mental Health Centres lines in the Estimates, I mentioned to the Minister that in talking to staff that one of their concerns was an increased burden of paperwork as requested by the department to comply with — (Interjection) — that was in Selkirk and Brandon, when we discussed the Selkirk and Brandon mental homes. The Minister indicated that he would take that under advisement and provide me with what information he could.

I once again indicate that in talking to nursing personnel, etc., and particularly I have to say some of the major hospitals because in the rural hospital settings there generally - I'm making a generalization here - is more time and less patient load often so that the amount of paperwork for the generation of information for MHSC is not as high a burden to the nursing personnel in a smaller, rural hospital. But it is pointed out to me, rightfully or wrongfully, but it is pointed out to me by nursing personnel that I've had discussions with in the Health Sciences Centre in particular that the amount of time required for paperwork does, from time to time, cut into their availability of time for patient care.

Now you know we can get into, I suppose, a two-sided argument on this thing, that ideally if there was no paperwork to do, every moment of the shift would be spent in patient care and that would benefit the patient. But presumably, the Commission would be less some valuable information that they may need to make future plans, to plot staffing requirements, etc., etc., for the next several fiscal years. So it's a classic dilemma if you will in the generation of paperwork.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the caution that I am putting to the Minister today is the classic one that all governments are accused of from time to time, that we get overzealous with the requirements of information from those we serve. In this instance, as I say, the people on the wards, the nurses are indicating that there is, seemingly to them, a growing increase of paperwork burden and from time to time the paperwork may appear, rightfully or wrongfully, to take precedent over patient care.

I would lay that situation out for the Minister and invite his comment. I would certainly think that's an area when we're looking at cost control that, with the computer revolution, there is no question that a middle management or management personnel at HSC can do many many more and miraculous things in terms of data processing to come at it from several different angles to come up with 13 different conclusions. There is no question that the temptation, I think, for middle management would be great to develop the necessity for more information so that they can justify more and more computer utilization and study of data and you can do that ad infinitum.

It's like the Minister saying yesterday, you can build 1,800 personal care home beds tomorrow and a year from now, you'd still have a shortage. Well, the same principle, I believe, can apply today with the computer revolution to the demand for information from the people delivering the service. You could end up with people in middle management developing all sorts of new program studies that appear to be justifiable, but caution has to exist in that you are going to be taking

information from somewhere and generating a series of statistics.

Generally the data you're requiring is going to have to be created at some point in time by the floor worker, the ward worker in the hospitals. If that information isn't extremely valuable or useful in the future, then you may be in a situation which is counter-productive in that you remove those people from the primary responsibility of providing health care to becoming providers of paper to be processed and shuffled.

So I would make that comment to the Minister, and I'll listen with intent to his response.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would recognize the validity of the statement made by the honourable member. I think that it's a known fact, no matter what, you can look at computers, and that's probably one of the fields where it would be more obvious. As I said yesterday, in hospitals it's the same thing with CAT scan when you have something everybody wants.

All I can say is that we've gone to the tape exchange at the Commission - I'm talking about the records of the Commission, tape exchange - and that's cut down on paperwork an awful lot. It will be sending the tape directly to the hospitals, to even doctors and so on. So that will do away with way less. That is one of the things that they're doing at the Commission.

But I'm told that problems were recognized at the Health Sciences Centre, and they are developing a new computer to enable time to cut down on paperwork and for staff who could do exactly what has been mentioned, more patient care and so on.

Now I guess the last thing is that, as my honourable friend stated, there has to be balance and we have to be careful that you don't go overboard on that. How you do that, I guess, is just being careful and get the experts to talk to you, but we recognize that will always be a danger and you have to be very careful.

That is why I compare that, because I think it is a valid comparison up to a certain point, the CAT scan. It's not to keep records or anything, it's something else. But I mean it is something that, when you started it at first, it was only a few patients. Now everybody wants it, every hospital and they have the ridiculous situation in the United States where a hospital with 55 beds insisted on a CAT scan. That is ridiculous. They wanted it - they're a private hospital as you know - because the doctors wouldn't know if they didn't have a CAT scan. So you had ridiculous situations like that. So in that instance for CAT scan, we have a committee that would look at the need and so on, and determine when the next one is, and do it with some kind of a program in planning, not just say everybody wants one.

I guess we would have to do the same thing here also to make sure that there's a balance and that we don't go overboard in computers. But I'm told that the tape exchange has improved it and does away with a lot less paperwork and it can be exchanged with the doctors, the hospital and so on. As far as the Health Sciences Centre, I think that is recognized that they have to computerize, to go to computer more, and that is being developed now. Of course, it would have to be approved by the Commission, but it's in the process of being developed now.

Friday, 26 April, 1985

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Minister, I don't have any basic disagreement with what you're saying. I guess it's in the degree of control because you, as Minister - I say this without any impunity as to your ability, because I don't know computers, and I don't suspect the Minister doesn't. A computer expert, from what I have run into in my limited time in government, have almost an unlimited horizon of demand. When you put a computer person in front of you he can justify almost any level of expenditure, and the caution I'm offering, and no doubt we'll have to follow when we're government, is to make sure that we don't run into the situation where we are developing workloads because of the computer and not saving workloads because of the computer. You know, I make that observation and I think the Minister probably doesn't have a great deal of problem with that.

Mr. Chairman, in the correspondence of January 7th, that the Minister sent out to all the administrators, etc., etc., he did pose the two questions in terms of, I can't lay my hands on the letter, but basically the two questions were, how do you handle zero percent increase in supplies and how you handle a zero percent increase in salary negotiations. Could the Minister indicate to me whether he obtained some useful replies which were able to be fitted into policy development from the various institutions, and I'd like to have a brief discussion of some of those at this stage of the game.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on that famous January 7th letter, I wrote and requested the consultation assistance and support to have the government meet the challenge facing them, and I asked for recommendations from facilities, and I am pleased to report that a very large number of facilities responded with many recommendations that they have, and will be given serious consideration by government.

Commission staff were asked to categorize recommendations as follows: (1) Not possible, or impractical and give the reasons why; (2) Refer to other appropriate department; (3) Requiring further review, discussion, or consultation for possible implementation in the future; (4) For immediate consideration and possible implementation. It was interesting to note that eight facilities recommended program reduction in larger hospitals, and two facilities recommended elimination of active treatment beds in rural areas.

Not possible or impractical - some of the examples which were considered appropriate were the introduction of hospital user charge, which would be unacceptable under the Canada Health Act; the removal of sales tax and elimination of the payroll tax, while reducing health costs, would reduce revenue to the province as a whole; the introduction of an insurance premium would be considered unacceptable to the present administration. Refer to other appropriate departments - most of the recommendations falling under this category will be referred to the Finance Department, they include examples, such as, reducing or abolishing the property tax rebate; increasing tax on upper income earners and special local health tax. Requiring further review - discussion or consultation for possible implementation in the future.

We received a number of interesting recommendations which will require further review by

Commission staff, consultation with the providers of service, and discuss with government prior to being considered for implementation. This category includes the following: institute a program similar to the Bond Program in Ontario; public education; some set laws on health programs; reducing number of physicians practising in Manitoba; making physicians more accountable for use of hospital services; close hospital beds for summer months; energy audit on all health facilities; regionalization. Immediate consideration and possible implementation - increasing personal care and authorized charge, facilities have been notified of the increases that have been approved for the fiscal year 1985-86; encourage production and manufacturing of health care supplies in Canada, and especially in Manitoba. Many of you have been invited to attend a meeting which has been scheduled for this Friday which will cover some of the items which have been recommended under this heading.

We did get some information. I think that some of them obviously felt that there's no way that they could live with that, it would be very difficult. Then we had all kinds of recommendations as for charging per diem, utilization fees, or removing taxes and different things.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that the facilities did have a number of suggestions. Some of them politically unacceptable, but nevertheless they offered a broad range of options to the government. I'd just like the Minister if, as a result of any of the - and I didn't have my earphone on for the start of this presentation and maybe missed a couple of the recommendations - but about a month ago, the Minister introduced basically an extension of the per diem to non-panelled patients in hospitals at doctor's recommendations; and secondly, to long-care residents of our mental health institutions, was that a recommendation that either came up this year or has been recommended in years past?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The mental institution is something that was a ruling we had before, you would not get that from those institutions anyway. They would not be concerned with mental health as much as those that we're talking about now, but for the chronic patient, yes, that was a recommendation. They felt that it was the same as people that were panelled for personal care.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought that recommendation might have come in that manner and the Minister has indicated that is a charge that he can justify basically anywhere under any set of circumstances and that it is a legitimate reflection of what the taxpayer is doing in terms of providing service to these individuals.

Another argument that the Minister made in terms of the general philosophy of the per diem charge to personal care home residents, and the inclusion of a new group of individuals and, incidentally, the Minister may not have the numbers now but, at some point in time, before we finish MHSC I'd like to get an indication of what the department estimated the revenue impact would be on the inclusion of per diems on non-panelled chronic care at doctor's recommendation. So, if the

Minister could take that question as notice, I'd appreciate having that indication of dollar revenue.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, and indeed our government prior to his, used a per diem charge to our panelled patients and our residents of personal care homes on the basis that in the case where they were pensioners that anything above \$150 a month, roughly, is surplus to their needs and often ends up in a bank account which is distributed at the time that the citizen is no longer with us, or else serves as additional revenue to the family; and the argument that was put forward, when we were government and that the Minister is using, is that when the taxpayers are providing the meals, the room, the board, the shelter, the medication, all needs with the exception of certain sundry needs, cigarettes maybe or other personal amenities, are being taken care of by government funding and taxpayer dollars, it makes reasonable good sense to have a per diem charge.

Following on that same sort of philosophy, one suggestion that I know came from at least one organization, namely, the Nursing Home Association of Manitoba. They view in similar philosophical terms, I would guess, the annual property tax refund, and in their letter in reply to the Minister's January 7th request for suggestions, I think it might bear reading into the record, Mr. Chairman. They deal with the topic of the annual property tax refund in this manner. They indicate that about \$700 per resident - \$4.2 million in total - . . . "is distributed annually to residents whose children and relatives often appear to take possession of these funds. In many cases this results in a gratuitous gift by the government, not to the intended person, the resident, but rather indirectly in the result to the resident's children.

"While a take away is politically sensitive, nonetheless the funds should be retained in the MHSC's possession, possibly credited to the resident and used where required for residential maintenance. This would ensure that the funds are used for maintenance where necessary and retained to defray MHSC general expenses if not needed for a specific resident."

It was followed with a note: "It was noted in the discussion that over age 65 residents in Brandon Mental Health Centre pay no maintenance," but, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's new policy announcement has cleared up the last statement they made on their presentation to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, basically I think the argument made here on property tax refund is very similar to the one made in terms of the per diem application for leaving the resident with some \$1,800 or \$150 a month to provide for sundry needs, and the balance of that is a contribution towards the roughly \$100 a day that we're paying as taxpayers to provide them with their complete living needs.

So I would ask the Minister of Health if this might not be in a time of fiscal restraint where we haven't got dollars that are surplus, if this might not be a legitimate area following on the philosophy that's already in place on per diems, to allow a saving of some money to the Department of Finance and possibly have that money even channelled back into the provision of additional health care services in the property tax refund credit system?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the revenue from the chronic is \$1.7 million and from the

mental \$1.8, and the member is absolutely right, I think it is bringing more revenue, but I think the policy is absolutely right.

Now, for awhile the chronic - this is something that I felt that should be done for a long time but we could have charged - there would be no cost-sharing with the Federal Government at all. This year, under the old format, when they were paying 50-50, they would not have shared. We could have charged; we would have lost. We just charged our taxpayers, and we would have lost that. So that wasn't done.

Now under this new bill, I checked this and the staff have checked that with the Minister we started with, the previous Minister, and with Mr. Epp, although this has been finalized with staff, but he told me in a meeting that we had that he couldn't see anything wrong with us charging that at all as far as not saying he's responsible for our policy, that's not what I'm saying. But as far as all that, he didn't think there was anything wrong, but it's being checked further.

As far as what my honourable friend said about the tax rebate, I couldn't agree more. It's exactly the same and I'm pleased to hear him say that. I want to add my voice to what he said. I think in the way that these were charged during your regime, in the personal care homes, and you made that point, I'm just agreeing with this. It took a while in changing some of my colleagues, but I think that they appreciate it now. That's one of the ideas that, without the experience of really realizing what was going on, it is difficult to accept because you think automatically you're trying to work against sick people or old people, but that is the case. They're giving up a pension and all that, it's to keep body and soul together, to help pay their board and room and whatever; and if the public is paying that just to give that to whoever they want, I don't think is quite right.

It would be terrific if we could afford it, but we can't do that, and to make it fair to the taxpayers, well then, when you're paying all the shot and you're paying an awful lot because that's a drop in the bucket, the per diem rate that they pay, compared to what it costs in the construction and everything of all these facilities. Then especially when you're moving away, to a point you're changing the system on mental health that you're going on psychogeriatric facilities, the same people, the same age, the same pension. They got exactly the same thing plus maybe a disease that is considered for mental illness. So there is no problem with me on that. I could defend that 100 percent.

Now, this other thing, that is one where I read where you would refer that to another department, you wouldn't see any money coming in my department, nevertheless, we're all taxpayers and we're all in the same department, so that was made to Finance because it would go in the Consolidated Fund. The Cabinet had approved it in principle, then we were told that the laws had to be changed. You have to talk to Ottawa because they're collecting the money and it takes at least a year or so. That is in the hands of Finance now, but my honourable friend is absolutely right. Why would you pay rebate on a tax to somebody that's not paying a thing. So it makes a lot of sense.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated, initially when he said that they were checking

Friday, 26 April, 1985

with the Minister of Health federally for compliance with the Canada Health Act.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that's for chronic care.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. That was for the chronic care that you newly included at the mental institutions and at doctors' recommendations.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Federal Government has been trying, the former Minister has been trying to talk about mental health and I went right through the roof when they started talking about mental health, because there was never one penny that came from the Federal Government. That's one of the reasons why we're in this state at this difficult time. So they kind of broke away from that a bit, but it's mostly the chronic. It'll be the same thing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, that was my understanding of what he was saying, so I'm clear that under the Canada Health Act, they do not consider that to be a form of extra billing for which the province would be penalized, I take it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. The point that we made, and they seemed to accept, is the point that I made in this House also. The difference, when you're talking about deterrent and so on, you're talking about somebody leaving their home, locking up, or somebody there keeping that home going, heating it in the winter and so on and going for a few days, in other words, those added expenses. Now we're talking about somebody that's been away for a year - there's no other home waiting for them - in a mental institution or somebody that's been a couple of months, and say, fine, they'll never get back home. So for all intents and purposes, that institution becomes their home. So that is one of the reasons. But you're right, that's the way the Federal Government looks at it. They don't look at that as extra billing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And then, presumably, they would not consider a move to not refund property tax credit, as we were discussing the \$700 or approximately \$700. Okay, let me start from scratch.

Right now the situation is that residents in personal care homes, as an example, receive the property tax credit of \$700, and if I understand what the Minister was saying, that if you could have cleared the legislative hoops with Ottawa that might have been even in this year's Budget.

Now my question is, that is not considered as well to be a user charge or an extra billing in terms of the Canada Health Act, so that there is no problem if you undertake that move with the proper legislative change between yourselves and Ottawa, it's the same sort of a situation as the per diems where the Canada Health Act doesn't even get concerned about them.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It has no relationship with the per diem or extra billing at all. This is a program; it's not everybody that has the program. You're saying here we are paying so much. No, it's not that at all.

I would appreciate and suggest that could be discussed probably with better answers as far as

relationship with Ottawa with the Department of Finance. We just turn that over to them, but my understanding is it's because of the collecting that they do and something has to be changed. But I'm sure that Finance could give the details. We just turned it over and recommended it to Cabinet. It was accepted at first without directing, but then Finance came back and said they would need some changes and so on. That's being looked at at this time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That was my understanding what the Minister's answer was. My only question was that that did not in any way infringe with compliance with the Canada Health Act. The Minister indicates that's indeed the case.

Mr. Chairman, under Administration, could we discuss the MHSC's policy, the current policy? I don't know whether there has been a change in terms of the recent article in the Free Press as of March 30th in terms of the tighter controls on people going out-of-province or out-of-country for medical services.

What I would like to get from the Minister this morning is the current policy under which Manitoba MHSC reimburses Manitobans who have to leave the province. I don't mean people who are outside of the province and need emergency health treatment, but rather Manitobans who are resident and leave for Ontario or for Minnesota for medical treatment or to Saskatchewan for medical treatment. What sort of a policy is in place to, No. 1, allow that process to happen; and No. 2, to enable the Manitoba resident to recoup any or all of the costs that are incurred in obtaining out-of-province medical services?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I guess we can stretch things again and discuss it here, but I would much sooner take it with leisure, like in the past. Any policy on doctors or medical treatment and so on would be there. Administration here is less policies than stamps and equipment and that kind of stuff to make the staff go. So we could talk about it at this time, but I think it would be more appropriate that we could cover all medical services and so on under Medicare, all hospitals under Hospitals. If for some reason, my honourable friend would sooner do it here, but where do we stop?

Because you can cover everything under Administration. You can cover the policy, why you're building personal care homes, why you aren't, if we stretch things. So I'm just suggesting that it would be easier. I would ask for co-operation, but I'm ready to discuss it now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the only reason I ask now is it's a policy decision. I thought that would be more appropriate under Administration. I don't intend to carry the debate on again when we get to the medicals; like there has apparently been a change or at least a difference in the way MHSC is viewing out-of-province medical services. Policy area, I thought, would be a reasonable time to discuss now when we're in Administration which must obviously be either recommending to the Minister a change in policy or administering the existing policy. So I thought it was an appropriate place to discuss it now.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we're talking about out-of-Canada coverage of elective cases now. Effective on July 1, 1984, the public was informed that Manitobans who elect to receive hospital medical services outside of Canada that are available in Manitoba are no longer provided coverage.

It should be pointed out though that not all persons electing to go outside Canada for care and treatment will be denied insured benefits. Rather it is anticipated that where circumstances warrant it and with the approval of the Commission certain cases will continue to be paid although the service might be available in Manitoba. These would include bona fide cases where further opinion is warranted, particularly where the prognosis has not been favourable.

It is considered that this change will encourage more Manitoba residents and physicians to maximize the health resources, facilities and expertise that are available in this province. This change in no way affects those residents who are required to go outside Canada for services which are not available in Manitoba, such as liver transplants, bone marrow transplants, etc., where, as previously stated, the circumstances are such that an opinion and/or treatment in a recognized medical centre is warranted. It is expected that this change will produce an annual saving in costs of approximately \$200,000 or \$250,000.00.

I could add to that, we're trying to build a good service in Manitoba. We are talking about having too many doctors and so on, so if the service is available here I think it would be wrong. This is why we're suggesting that they get in touch with the Commission. There might be some decision. Most of the time they'll get the benefit of the doubt, but when it's obvious that - and then it's the costs and the tests and all that will go up, where here they might have certain tests, and out there you'll have three or four tests for every one that we have here that is not necessary. That could add to the cost quite a bit.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's a July 4, 1984, change in policy. Was there a press release put out on that last July? Because if there was, I missed the thing.

Mr. Chairman, I'll ask a couple questions so we're not bouncing up and down. Mr. Chairman, this policy, I presume, would apply to not only out-of-country but out-of-province.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I believe there was a press release put out, but I will check and try to get one, but it certainly was communicated to the media. Somehow it appeared in the newspaper.

No, this is for out-of-country only. There is an agreement between most provinces and so on, so that is outside of Canada.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there can be a subtle difference. Like I realize that the recent articles were talking about the Rochester Clinic and Mayo and those Manitobans, I believe, up to 200 or 300 a year, that use the Mayo Clinic or the Rochester Clinic - Mayo Clinic in Rochester; I'll get it right - on a regular basis. That's one area. The area that I'm looking for now is between provinces.

Now, let's take a scenario where if an individual needs to have a CAT scan or ultrasound or whatever and the

service is delayed because of a backlog for several weeks, and the person could get that service in Saskatchewan or Ontario if they chose to go there, would the policy allow reimbursement of that service if the individual took it out-of-province even though the service was available in Manitoba, the only difference being that it was available more quickly out-of-province in Ontario or Saskatchewan? Does the policy allow for that now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The situation between provinces is, of course, different from outside the country. There have been some changes in the payments that have been made. Now, for instance, if a member would have to go into Ontario, we would have to pay their rates for hospitals and they would pay our rates here also.

Now, yes, they could go for a CAT scan and everything, but the point is they would have to be accepted out there and things balance. They might save on something, and then you know it balances out. They might at certain times or certain times of the year for some reason be able to get something done a little faster somewhere else, but the experience is that most provinces have the same problems in general and so on. It equals out.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's for a service that is available in Manitoba, but the person may elect to go someplace if he can get it quicker. Presumably, the patient gets himself there or gets his family member there at their own cost.

The next question I'd have for the Minister is a diagnostic procedure or a service that's not available in Manitoba. I have one example where an individual phoned me awhile back. It involved his mother and he led me to believe that this service was not available in Manitoba, and he had to take his mother to Ontario to get this particular service or procedure done. His dispute was with MHSC, because it wasn't available in Manitoba he was looking after the transportation costs there. I believe the situation today is that he has had to look after the cost of getting his mother there, plus himself, because I think he accompanied her. Now, is that the policy that is in place for services - and I am only asking for services that aren't available in Manitoba and, on a physician's recommendation, they book it out of province? What costs are covered? Are travel costs covered for the patient and an escort?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, the member is talking just provinces now?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Not the States, just provinces.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, we pay whatever the cost, as I said earlier, the doctors' fees in Ontario. If it's higher than ours here we pay the hospital costs and every province has that, but transportation has never been included. It's not included now, it might come at some time but it isn't now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It would just be the transportation. You know, unless you pay for an ambulance or something, you might have grants, but you pay for the Hospital and Medicare, the two universal programs.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. I think the reason for this individual's confusion, and I think he phoned - I think he might have even talked to some of the Claims Department people - I think the confusion stemmed because it was roughly the same time frame in which the St. Boniface had the overcrowding situation - I believe it was St. Boniface - and a newborn baby was flown to Saskatoon, and I think the department probably paid for the cost of getting that infant out there, not the family. That was the reason for the person's inquiry because I am led to believe that his mother required a service that wasn't available in Manitoba.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's not the Commission that paid for that, it's the St. Boniface Hospital. St. Boniface Hospital more or less was farming it out or something. It wasn't the Commission, as such; it wasn't that change. That was something wrong with the hospital the same as, for instance, if there was a strike and so on and I felt that people were in danger, I would do anything, you know, bring a plane in and send them. I wouldn't be afraid of strikebreaking if that was the case. My responsibility as Minister of Health would be to protect the individuals - somebody else could do the other worries - and whatever the costs would be we would have to take it. That's not an every day occurrence if something happens like that. Then St. Boniface Hospital, in this case, because of some problem, they found out the best thing to do and they paid the costs. This probably was the confusion.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I appreciate the answer there. I guess in a person's mind there is but a subtle difference between the two, and the case, of course, that I think he was making with the Claims Department was that it was really not a different circumstance, but I can see now that MHSC would not be directly involved with the patient. That was out of the global budget allocation for St. Boniface that they would have looked after the transportation, theoretically, out and back from Saskatoon. Okay, that clears up that question.

I think my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell, has a few more questions on this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, we get a lot of calls from people from the Roblin area who go to Yorkton for medical treatment, so the same rule would apply there, I guess?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me. You understand that we pay the costs, but are you talking about transportation?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: No, just . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, there is no problem there. We would pay what's in the agreement that we had;

that's one of the conditions of the plan. It has portability, universality and so on, and we would pay whatever the cost of the doctor in Saskatchewan, pay their fees and pay the hospital bills. They, in turn, would do the same thing. We get a lot of them from Canora and different places also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister can tell me about how long a waiting period of time is there for somebody that needs a CAT scan. I understand that sometimes when the doctor orders a CAT scan it can take up to two - three months before finally a CAT scan is made available. The reason why I am asking this is that in the area that I represent there are some people who were going to the United States in order to receive their CAT scan over there, which is only 25 miles away . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is strictly hospitals now. There is no way, even with all the stretching that we can do, that we can cover it under this. It is the hospitals. I wonder if my honourable friend would take it up when we reach that line, please.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, the reason I am asking this is because, again, we are getting into the payment of things. I understand that the Minister now is refusing to pay for those people who are going to Cavalier to get the CAT scan done over there in order to get it done as quickly as possible. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can tell the honourable member this will be answered because that will be covered fully. That's strictly hospitals, that's where the CAT scans are, there are none at the Commission and so on. If we don't discuss that, I don't know what there will be left under hospitals and personal care homes if we do the whole thing. I think that we have been very co-operative and so on, but this, I would ask the member to wait till we get to the hospitals. We can wait for Don if that's what you are trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ellice now.

MR. B. CORRIN: I am very concerned about this area, Mr. Chairperson. I am very happy to be able to participate in the discussion. I was very concerned, frankly, when I first read about this particular change of policy respecting out-of-province situations, and I was not assured, and I did not feel secure about the decision. I would like more information from the Minister respecting what he perceives as the major benefit to the patient user, to the consumer of medical services from this particular policy change.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba have to pay for this service and that is certainly a factor that we are looking at. We are talking about universal portability and so on, but if the service could be obtained here in Manitoba, that's where it should be. If not, that means that we haven't any

confidence in the health care in Manitoba, medical care in Manitoba. It means that you are encouraging people; you are telling them that all the other services are better. It's certainly not a way to build and attract the kind of people that you want.

I wonder what the Government of the United States is doing in here. We have a service in this country for the people of this country. We will bend over backwards if there is some reason, if something cannot be done here, even if the service is done here; if, for some good reason, it would be advisable to maybe go and see somebody that might save a life, we'll go along with that. But, I mean, to make a policy that you can go anywhere you want to go, we don't think that's right. Furthermore, why should the people that can't afford to go to Mayo Clinic for a checkup every year, why should they have to pay for those that can? We are talking about something that is accessible to everybody and I think that, if the service is provided here, I can't see any reason, except those that I mentioned, where we should allow that, that they would go anywhere at all.

MR. B. CORRIN: Mr. Chairperson, with respect to the Minister, let's use a common example of why people go to, for instance, the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. Very often people are concerned about neurological conditions. There is equipment at that particular facility that simply can't be rivalled by any equipment in this province. There's generational Cat scan equipment, and other sophisticated computer technology at that clinic, at the Mayo Clinic, which in all candor any person who is to be sincere and honest about the state of the art and the state of the science, would have to admit it's simply not available in Manitoba.

So a person going to a highly qualified neurosurgeon in this particular province — (Interjection) — the problem is that when people go here for a CAT scan - and I say this with all due respect - if you go to your neurologist in Manitoba for a CAT scan, you will be told that a CAT scan is available in Manitoba and it will do the job, and it's cost so many million dollars and highly sophisticated and trained technologists will apply the test. But the reality is that that is not the same equipment, nor is it dealt with with the same technical proficiency as it will be dealt with at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester. It's a very different standard of medical science and expertise that's applied there, and I can name individuals who can attest to that. And, as a matter of fact, people who have been very close to this Chamber will tell you about it.

Now I've had family who have worked at the Mayo Clinic in the research area; I've had members of my family who were thought to be in terminal condition who went there and survived as a result of the application of therapy at that institution. I don't think that in fairness one can imply or infer that we have competitive facilities. Yes, we may have the same equipment, but it's not really the same equipment and it's not really the same people.

The Mayo Clinic is operated on what I suppose many of us would see as the most desirable type of principle. Anyone who goes there will get exactly the same amount of treatment, and they will get exactly the same sort

of diagnostic input. There's a certain imperative which simply is a matter of ethical principle requires that within the institutional guidelines of the Clinic. So that, once you go in, it doesn't matter whether you're rich or you're poor, and there is a subsidy program, and the House should know that, there is a subsidy program for poor patients, regardless of their place of origin. I am told that patients come to the Mayo Clinic from all over the world. Now, not all of them come because their physician has attested to the difficulty of their particular case, a lot of them come out of frustration. It is simply not possible to assume that every physician in every place in this province will be able to appreciate when he or she is out of his or her depth. And I don't say that by way of denigration of the medical profession, I think that's a reality. You have many people who have not acquired the same degree of sophisticated training as people who are available in a clinic such as the Mayo.

People go to the Mayo to work, not because they want money, but because, in terms of their professional experience, they want the availability of the equipment and the peer association which is derived from working on term or on contract with that particular institution. Affiliation with that particular association of physicians is very beneficial to the people who go there. The money earned by the physicians at the Mayo Clinic is far less than in almost any major urban centre in the United States. It's probably, in most cases, about half of what the same physician could earn in a major centre in the United States. So most of the people who are going there are going there because they're concerned about research; they're concerned about learning to use the most sophisticated technology available, remembering that the Mayo Clinic devotes a much greater percentage, I believe, of its total medical budget to equipment than most comparable facilities anywhere in the world, and has substantial cost savings with respect to salary because people are willing to make commitments to work there.

Now I had a sister who came out of the medical school in the top three of this province and she spent three-and-a-half years working there. You know, she could have gone to Los Angeles for \$100,000 a year to start, American; she chose to work there for far, far less. So my own personal feeling is that there has to be some latitude and some discretion vested in the individual patient-user.

If the patient feels that he or she might be better served by travelling to an institution like the Mayo Clinic, I don't see why we want to handicap them in any way, it's their decision; they pay the transport costs. If they can't find a physician who says that you need that sort of placement; most physicians in Manitoba don't even what's available at the Mayo Clinic, they don't have the time to go down there. And with due respect, most of the people, particularly those in the general practice areas, simply wouldn't appreciate or understand what technology is there. You know, the changes in medical technology in the past five years have been earth-shaking. What was state of the art in 1980 is obsolete in 1985. If you graduated from a medical school somewhere in Canada in 1970 or in 1975, your knowledge is severely outdated in terms of what is available. I think the Minister quoted a \$250,000 or \$260,000 saving. We're going to deprive the people of

Friday, 26 April, 1985

this freedom of choice. — (Interjection) — This is what we're doing. I mean this is nickel-dime health care, Mr. Chairman.

You know I simply can't approve of it, and it's the same in my profession. To use an analogy, if somebody comes to me with a very sophisticated tax problem or a corporate merger problem, I can't give them any sort of relevant information on that subject, I wouldn't know where to begin. And very often people will travel to Vancouver to get the information they desire, or to Toronto. Health care is a very different thing than business law.

I'm not standing here today to make a personal point with the Minister, but rather to express my personal concern, and I guess some indignation about the way the decision was made. I think it was an important decision and it wasn't made in a manner that was consonant with good public process. Those are my remarks.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept the statement of the honourable member at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: With regard to the CAT scan, I had a call this morning from a constituent of mine.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would be pleased to discuss that when we get to the Hospital, please, we are on Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of what is allowed within the policy guidelines to provide health care to Manitobans has been delineated by the Minister, in terms of equal access within Canada, but if I understand the policy, the circumstance that the Member for Ellice has laid out, that if an individual Manitoban who, on the recommendation of his physician, should have the CAT scan done, and it is going to take upwards of a month or six weeks, whatever the time frame is, that that patient would not necessarily be denied the ability to go to Rochester to the Mayo Clinic and have that procedure done, but prior to getting it done, he would have to get approval from the Commission, and the Commission would cover the cost of the procedure down there. And, furthermore, the Commission may not pay for any other diagnostic test unless they considered it was essential to the

treatment of that patient. They could pick and choose - if those are the proper words - as to what type of diagnostic process the Commission would reimburse to that patient. I guess my question would be, if there is a wait of six weeks for a CAT scan and it's on a doctor's order, how difficult is the Health Services Commission going to be to individuals desiring to go down there and having their costs picked up by the fee schedule in Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if after checking with the Commission, it is felt that the person for some reason, if there is doubt, the person should go and it's covered, then there is no playing games or saying we'll pick and choose. If at once, it's not there, whatever is ordered related to this, you don't go and say I have something wrong with my heart and get something done to your back or leg or something like that. But if you're going down and it is approved by the Commission, I think the question was you might approve, but then you would have to approve every test they would make. No.

Once it's not there, it is deemed that the person should go there, whatever the test, we'll cover.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 12:30, time for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

IN SESSION

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain Resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I would expect all members to be properly dressed when the House is in Session.

The time being 12:30, Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.