

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 15 March, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): The Member for Niakwa.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa): 4.(f), Page 95, Conservation Districts. I just wanted to make a couple of remarks and then I'm prepared to go as fast as the former Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Well, I was busy over the supper hour checking to see what questions I could ask the Honourable Minister, but I'd just like to make some comments rather than some questions on the (f) part, the 4.(f)(1) and the few comments are: first of all, I'd like to say thank you to the Honourable Minister for just making the remark that he hopes that we're friends and I would think that obviously we are friends. The thing I would like to point out is that the Opposition seems to be more friendly with the Honourable Minister than some of his own members. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. KOVNATS: I thought that the sequences or the reasons that we went through these were to investigate the department and not to condemn or to investigate the Minister in it. It seems that the Minister's door is probably more accessible to the members of the Opposition than it is to the members of the government. I would hope that it would be the same but from the questioning it seems that there is no communication between the government, the members and the Minister. I'm a little bit sorry to see that happen because there should be a closer communication particularly with the government members.

I was going to ask some questions and I've lost my notes from before 5:30, so I just kept on talking but I think that I'll just pass at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the Conservation District Authority, is the Cook's Creek District this fiscal year a new district?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Cook's Creek Conservation District came in in 1979.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, there is only one caution I have, and I don't want the Minister to take this as a personal comment, but I read and listened with a great deal of interest to his Throne Speech Debate, and the Member for Lakeside has made reference to it; and I would hope in future years, because this Minister obviously was not here for most of the Estimate preparation and I in no way want to fault him for a stable grant to conservation districts, but conservation districts as he knows and we know, are very necessary parts of the infrastructure available to rural

Manitobans to assure that a number of different concerns are met and ideas are tested. I would hope that the Minister in his next year's Estimate presentation can fulfill some of the expectations he raised amongst Manitobans in his Throne Speech address as to his personal value of conservation districts and follows through with next year's Estimates with at least a recognition of that when it comes to the grants portion and will not see them remain stable, even though he has got a great deal of interest and faith in them. I would hope that he can find the wherewithal to increase the dollars to them in another year.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to confirm my interest in conservation. However my interest in conservation and development of good conservation practice will not be at the prejudice of wanton spending and improper spending. I think if the honourable member does want to see inflated spending in this Department I can recognize that but we have to live with budget constraints and we are facing that problem with the entire budget, not only this Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Yes, under 4.(f)(i), did all the conservation districts receive an equivalent change in funding, that is, no change? Were they all treated similarly?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there was no change recommended.

MR. MANNES: For all seven of them?

MR. MACKLING: That's correct.

MR. MANNES: Thank you.

MR. MACKLING: No one received any discriminatory cutting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(f)(1) — pass; 4.(f)(2) Other Expenditures — pass; 4.(f)(3) Grants and Conservation Districts.

The Member for Dauphin.

MR. JOHN PLOHMAN (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I asked before about the engineering specifications for natural waterways that are designated as provincial waterways by the Provincial Government and taken over as provincial waterways. I asked if they were the same in terms of specifications for dealing with the reconstruction of waterways, it was the same whether the waterways were located in Class 1 or Class 2 soil areas or whether they were different. I was told at that time that the waterways are constructed according to the same specifications, or to different specifications for different classifications of soil, that this was the case. I understand that that is not the case.

Now it is my understanding that there is one set of specifications and whether the drain is in a Class 4 or

5 area, such as up in the Duck Mountain area for example, it is the same kind of Cadillac development that is done in reconstructing that waterway as is done in Class 1 and 2 soils. I had indicated then that I felt we should be developing specifications that are different for different areas so that we could save money in developing more miles with less dollars in some of these areas and therefore get some of these drains reconstructed. I'd just like the Minister to clarify that.

MR. MACKLING: My understanding Mr. Chairman, is that in the past the honourable member is correct. The design of drains was based on topographical information but the Department is now changing to include soil classification.

MR. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize that that change should be accelerated in order to accommodate some of these areas where there is a lot of work to be done on drains but where it is not necessary to develop them and reconstruct them in the same way that is done in some of the areas where the classification of soils and the uses is of a high grade, which is Class 1 or 2 soils.

MR. MACKLING: My understand, Mr. Chairman, is the department is working with agriculture on that very matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(g)(1) Salaries.
The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield): I thought we were still on (f)(3).

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it was passed, (f)(3) was passed.

MR. PLOHMAN: Well, that was what I was speaking on.

MR. ANSTETT: The Member for Dauphin was speaking to (f)(3).

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the opposition has no opposition to the fact that government members might wish to continue the examination of their Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, my comments are directed more to the Member for Lakeside than they to an examination of the Minister's Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. I would ask you to instruct the honourable member who apparently needs some instructing on House rules that it's not the Member for Lakeside or indeed any other member that is under examination here. It is the Minister and his Estimates.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order.

MR. ANSTETT: The examination of the Estimates is directed to the Minister, but the debate in this Committee as in any Committee of the Whole can be engaged in through the Chairman with any member of the committee, and the Honourable Member for Lakeside is aware of that rule as much as I am.

If I may proceed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the question that we engaged in just before supper with regard to the question of environmental assessment as it impacts upon a particular Cordite drain or diversion project in the R.M. of Springfield.

I have a concern, Mr. Chairman, that through the misguided interjections of certain opposition members, you may be under the impression that that drain bears some similarity . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I stop the Member for Springfield? I think we better clarify what item we're on because there's going to be quite a bit of confusion here. What item are you speaking on now?

MR. ANSTETT: I'm speaking on (f)(3), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, proceed. The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: I wouldn't want the Committee or the Minister to be under the impression that there's any reason to compare the diversion of Assiniboine River waters from that watershed into the La Salle or Red River watershed because what we are talking about in the Cordite Diversion is very specifically the diversion of flood waters from — not irrigation waters or any other form of waters but strictly flood waters — from one portion of the Red River drainage basin to the Red River Floodway which is in the same drainage basin.

With respect, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the requirements for Environmental Impact Studies, etc., would be dramatically reduced because of that major difference between the two proposals with respect to both the length of time it would take to do that study and the possibilities of that project proceeding — not with haste — but certainly with much more speed than the Member for Lakeside suggested in terms of a three or four year delay for an Environmental Impact Study.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering what the department has been doing over the last three or four years with regard to encouraging the formation of conservation districts in those areas of the province where they have not been formed, what type of promotion has been done, what type of awareness of the special funding that's available upon formation and the advantages that are available to those participating municipalities when they engage in the shared cost aspects of the Conservation District Program.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, dealing in reverse order again with the observations or questions in respect to development of further conservation districts, there have been five districts developed thus far. It would be our concern to look at additional conservation district development. There has been a hiatus in the development of conservation districts in

the last while and we'll have to look at further development of them.

In respect to the observation regarding transfer of Assiniboine water as against floodwater in the Cook's Creek Conservation District the observations are well founded. There is a different drainage arrangement involved and, of course, wouldn't be subjected to the same kind of environmental impact study.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Springfield is now lecturing us on the geography of the Red River Valley. Let me assure the honourable member that the diversion of Assiniboine waters to the La Salle which both then flow into the Red River, that water coming in so much later, if the honourable member takes a look at Cook's Creek and La Salle, he couldn't tell them apart in terms of scale and scope, size of water bodies involved. They're all in the Red River Valley, all a part of the same drainage system.

I just want to put this government on notice, that if its environmental concerns are for sale, politically speaking, and I accept the Honourable Member for Inkster's concern that prior to any change of this kind, environmental impact studies ought to be done. I just want to indicate to the honourable member that if that holds true for the diversion of waters from the Assiniboine to the La Salle it most certainly holds true for the waters of Cook's Creek within the same basin to the Red River. I see the Honourable Member for Inkster at least having sufficient integrity in shaking his head and acknowledging that situation and that, Sir, will very definitely be a matter of interest to the Opposition as we see the projects unfold under this government.

MR. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, just in following up in what the Member for Springfield was discussing in terms of encouragement of the formation of conservation districts, I believe that there has not been enough emphasis on the formation of conservation districts in the last number of years and I'd like to see this stepped up and I just urge the Minister in this regard that we would step up the emphasis on the formation of conservation districts.

I would also like to mention that in terms of the whole funding for conservation districts, it is a very important item. I mentioned this in my debate Speech from the Throne, the number of municipalities in the constituency that I represent including the arm of Ochre River of Dauphin; there's Ste. Rose which is not directly in my constituency, but close by and the L.G.D. of Alonzo. All of these areas are affected by the Turtle River Conservation District and I would like to urge the Minister to look carefully at that particular budget item, Conservation District Authority, in view of the fact that it is held at the same number of dollars that it was last year.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I really wasn't going to enter into the debate because at first I thought that this wasn't the place to debate the subject. I thought that we were investigating the Minister's department and some of the items in the Minister's department, but I'd like to enter into the debate now that I find out that it is a debate. The first thing that I would like to know is concerning, I heard the terminology the Cor-

dite Diversion and that's a new term to me, probably been in existence for some time, but what is the Cordite Diversion? Is it because it's named after the former Cordite Plant at Transcona?

MR. MACKLING: It's my understanding that there's an area just east of Winnipeg that during the War was the site of the old Cordite Plant and the lands in that area, a lot of them have adopted some of the nomenclature of that plant so there is a Cordite Ditch apparently, or drain.

MR. KOVNATS: It causes me to reflect a little bit on my younger days when I knew that the Cordite Plant was out in the Transcona area and when the Cordite Plant was removed there was a big bundle of wood and junk around, and we as kids went over to the Cordite plant and we used to pick up mercury, liquid mercury, just lying on the ground, which was probably something to do with the manufacturing of the cordite in that area. Has the Honourable Minister checked to see whether, in fact, if this Cordite Diversion does come into effect, the mercury that I know was there many many years ago, could cause any contamination and cause the Minister of Environment some problems and infect the whole of the Springfield area?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if such is the case, that's an environmental matter that would have to be dealt with under the Estimates of the Minister of the Environment, and I prefer that he not deal with that during the course of our Estimates.

MR. KOVNATS: It appears that it could be an environmental problem, but I know how interested the Minister of Environment has been in the past and I know how interested he will be in the future, and I don't believe that anybody has ever brought it to anybody's attention and it only came about this evening because when I heard the term Cordite Diversion and I absolutely know that there was mercury there and I've never known mercury to not cause any problems. But I was just wondering, whether in fact, before this diversion proceeds whether we could have the satisfaction of knowing that the whole area has been checked for mercury and whether it would cause it to pollute the area.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand there has been a drain in that area for many, many years. I don't know whether it has been tested for mercury other than the sampling by the honourable member, and I'm sure that now that it's been brought to the attention of my department and the Minister for Environment, those particulars that you refer to can be verified one way or another. I would be happy if you gave us some details of them, your findings earlier on. Free mercury on the ground, when was that?

MR. KOVNATS: It was right after 1945, if I recall correctly, and we used to take the mercury — and I don't know whether I can get myself into trouble — but we used to rub pennies with the mercury and try to make them look like dimes. Never were we able to pass off pennies with mercury on them to look like dimes,

because even though they were very shiny from the rubbing of the mercury, by fingering the thumb onto the coin, in short time they became very dull and you could see that they weren't really dimes they were pennies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are going to go to 4.(f)(3) Grants to the Conservation Districts—pass. 4.(g)(1) Salaries. Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a series of questions here regarding the Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Program.

I wonder whether the Minister could indicate, previously there was a program which was cost-shared by the province and the Federal Government in terms of building up the dikes and certain flood reduction programs, has there been any change in the policy as far as the cost-sharing is concerned of these programs?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am given to understand that there has been a decision made that the municipalities affected would be assessed 10 percent of the cost of the work.

MR. DRIEDGER: That is a very dramatic change of policy when you consider the cost of some of these programs, I think, understandably till now the province was picking up these costs. I wonder whether the Minister and his departmental people have been in consultation with the municipalities involved along the Red River Valley prior to indicating to them that there is a 10 percent charge to them?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure as to what discussion took place but I understand that in other jurisdictions the cost of the municipalities is much much greater. In the Maritimes, for example, it is one-third.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I am not really that interested what they do out there. I am concerned about what has been policy with major drainage or flooding problems along the Red River Valley in the past and the amount of money that it has cost the people individually, directly, as well as municipalities in terms of certain of these programs. And here, all of a sudden, these communities along the Red River Valley get informed that the updating of the diking program that has taken place was cost-shared by the Provincial Government, as well as the Federal Government; that this program is not adequate now; that an additional program has to be put in place and the municipalities and the communities are going to be billed an extra 10 percent to bring it up to a certain standard.

Now, in conjunction to that, I would like to ask the Minister, what does it mean the minimum required level of protection is the 1 percent flood?

MR. MACKLING: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the Federal Government, in negotiation with Provincial Government on these flood damage reduction agreements, would not accept a 55/45 split and

insisted that the municipalities bear some of this cost and suggested 10 percent. Since this is federally funded we have to negotiate with the Federal Government on these things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You had a specific question, Member for Emerson?

MR. DRIEDGER: I have a few more, Mr. Chairman, if you please. Since when would the Federal Government be indicating to the Provincial Government how they should charge costs against municipalities. I would assume that the Provincial Government would be the one that should make that kind of a decision and, if the Minister would take care to peruse some of the letters that have been sent to some of their villages along the Red River Valley and the costs that are going to be mandatorially applied to them without the municipalities knowing what is going on, I wonder if the Minister could take time to maybe meet with the municipalities, explain what is going on because many of the councillors are very upset. They do not know what is going on and they want to know the reason for this.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, both I and my staff will be happy to meet with municipalities affected and, just to elaborate further in the negotiations between the Federal and Provincial government, I'm given to understand that we wanted the Federal Government to fund 50 percent and we'd fund 50 percent, but the Federal Government was adamant in its position it would only go 45 and suggested that, in accordance with cost-sharing arrangements in other jurisdictions, the municipalities pick up some of the cost since a good deal of the benefit is derived by the municipality itself and, thus the formula that has been arrived at at 45, 45 and 10.

MR. DRIEDGER: Another problem I have with this whole program, Mr. Minister, is the fact that the Flood Reduction Program has been in place, most of the dikes have been updated within the last period of time, the last year. The one dike that possibly has not been updated is the one at Emerson and here according to the correspondence that has been sent out to these communities, it indicates according to the 1-percent flood level required that there will have to be additional work being done now and the costs have been estimated already and it's substantial to some of these communities. I would like to know why there has to be an updating of the dikes after it just has been done by the previous administration or has been done last year?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my advice is they were not updated just recently and they require upgrading now. The information the Member for Emerson had was incorrect.

MR. MANNES: Yes, I'd like to continue along in the same vein if I could for a while. I don't know if the Minister has in front of him a copy of the letters that did go out to many of the municipalities and the towns in the area, but it's under the signature of Mr. Weber and the one I'm quoting from has been directed to Mr.

Jack Murray, the Mayor of the Town of Morris. I don't know if they're all the same or not, but I think they all refer to the breakdown of the agreement as to between the various authorities.

My first question though, particularly the one relating to Morris: reference is made in the letter and I'm quoting, "The reason for the upgrading is that the existing dikes do not provide the standard of protection required under the Flood Damage Protection Program. The minimum required level of protection is the 1-percent flood." Could somebody define what is meant in that last statement, the 1-percent flood?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it's a flood that occurs once in 100 years or 1 percent.

MR. MANNES: Can we measure that then in terms of a 1950 or a 1979 flood? I think that means a lot more to me.

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the 1950 flood would be a 50-year flood or a 2-percent flood, so the requirements for the 1 percent would be even higher than that, if you can follow that. Do you understand?

MR. MANNES: I am having some trouble following that because I don't know where the 1979 flood falls into this because that was a major flood in case we forget.

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand the '79 flood at Emerson would have been a 1 in 95, so you're getting close to 1 percent again.

MR. MANNES: Okay, I'm going to try and recap this or summarize this. What we're saying then is if another flood comes equivalent to the 1979 flood, that would be the 1 in 100 you're talking about?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, yes, just about.

MR. MANNES: And, therefore, the dike at Morris would be able to withstand that?

MR. MACKLING: If it's upgraded.

MR. MANNES: What happened to the same dike that withstood the 1979 flood?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the flood at Emerson at the border was a 1 in 95, at Morris it wasn't quite as high as that in '79 — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, let me indicate again that the standard that is suggested is a 1 percent. In other words, that it be upgraded from what it is now.

MR. MANNES: Yes, I've been part of this too. We've made some light of this, but it's a tremendous of that particular town. They don't know whether they have flood protection or not to withstand a 1 in 100 year flood. Do they have that?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, no. And that is why the upgrading is being recommended.

MR. MANNES: Well, at least, we understand that.

MR. MACKLING: You understand it now.

MR. MANNES: Yes. The proposal to change the various funding breakdowns, were the municipalities or the towns, were they included in that decision at all?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is no.

MR. MANNES: Their 10-percent share then was an arbitrary decision made without their knowledge.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, it was made after negotiations between the two levels of government.

MR. MANNES: The maintenance and operation also, I think, on these letters; again I've only seen the one directed to the Town of Morris and again if I could quote a paragraph and I can lay this into the record if somebody wishes.

"The Provincial Government has also requested municipal sharing in the annual maintenance and operation of these works at 25 percent with the province assuming the remaining 75 percent."

Has this been the traditional breakdown in maintaining these dikes?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand that is Treasury Board decision.

MR. MANNES: My question hasn't quite been answered. Is that the way the cost breakout has been maintained as far as the maintenance and operation of these particular dikes, that splitting of responsibility?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand in the past the province assumed 100 percent of the cost and this is a departure from that as well.

MR. MANNES: Again, then the question, were the municipalities and towns, were they included in that decision?

MR. MACKLING: No, I understand they weren't. I might say that in connection with all of these negotiations apparently with the Federal Government, they were started during the course of the previous administration as well.

MR. MANNES: The final question I have at this time on this particular issue is because these letters went out to a great number of authorities, the total of which I do not know. Can you tell me what the total request would be for the towns and the municipalities as far as their share; the total impact on this new division of responsibilities would be to the whole area?

MR. MACKLING: In just a moment maybe we can quantify that precisely, Mr. Chairman. I'll see if Mr. Weber has his notes here. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the entire cost of this upgrading is \$4 million, and 10 percent of that would be \$400,000 involving eight communities and that costing is spread

over three years.

MR. MANNES: Two other questions, and again I don't know if I'm rushing into one of the projects that may be discussed later in detail under Section 13, but was Brunkild one of these communities?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand that's the case.

MR. MANNES: Then to sum up, the total new responsibility that will come to the citizens locally in southern Manitoba will be half a million dollars, of which they did not have an understanding or say in, as far as assuming that part of the debt; is that correct?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I'm given to understand, although the honourable member says half a million; \$100,000 means a lot to government; it was \$400,000.00.

MR. MANNES: I retract that, \$400,000.00. Thank you.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, eight communities over three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, getting back to our 1 percent flood. How much freeboard does raising a dike around the Town of Morris to the 1 percent level; how much freeboard is required?

MR. MACKLING: Can I get that question again, I'm sorry.

MR. ORCHARD: If you are going to raise the dikes around Morris, to give them protection in a 1 percent flood, how much freeboard is there?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Minister, I'm given to understand that it depends on the location of the dike. Dykes on the western and northwestern portion of Morris, because of wave action from the prevailing winds, have to be a little higher, so you're looking at four feet there, and probably in the other areas a couple of feet.

MR. ORCHARD: There was some upgrading done to the dikes in a number of communities between Winnipeg and the U.S. border in 1979 and 1980. What levels of flood protection were provided in that upgrading during the flood, in anticipation of the flood, and after the flood?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Minister, I'm given to understand that during the course of the '79 flood effect, there was fill put on top of the dikes, and that's involved in grading that down and then building it up, in upgrading the dikes.

MR. ORCHARD: Then you can't give me an answer as to what levels or what flood protection was provided by that upgrading? Was it protection against a 2 percent flood, 1.5 percent flood?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand that during the course of the '79 flooding it was an endeavour to get up to the level of a 95-year flood, because that was the predicted flood, that being the level, I guess, at Emerson.

MR. ORCHARD: Okay, so then it was very close in 1979 to a 1 percent flood and, I assume, will not require that much more expenditure to get it to the 1 percent level?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Morris diking doesn't involve a great deal of height.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, you're talking a figure, I believe, of \$66,000 to accomplish that upgrading over the next three years.

MR. MACKLING: Maybe if the honourable member would give me a copy of the letter he's referring to I could . . .

MR. ORCHARD: That's no letter I'm referring to, I haven't read it yet.

MR. MACKLING: Oh, okay. Mr. Chairman, rather than hold up the questioning, maybe staff could take that as notice and if they can get that information before we complete the questions I'll deal with it.

MR. ORCHARD: In the extensive, Raising and Moving Program that was undertaken after the 1979 flood and, I believe, was just completed last summer in '81, what was the levels established in any of the farmsteads and businesses protected by the Raising and Moving Program; was it the 1 percent flood with freeboard?

MR. MACKLING: Sorry, can you repeat the last part of the question?

MR. ORCHARD: Was it the 1 percent flood plus freeboard?

MR. MACKLING: When?

MR. ORCHARD: That was the Raising and Moving Program that was completed over the summer of '79, '80, and '81 for various farms and businesses outside of the major communities; the Raising and Moving Program, what was the flood protection afforded there?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised there was no upgrading at '79, all that happened was a trimming of what had been placed there.

MR. ORCHARD: No, no. Outside of the communities of Letellier, Emerson and Morris we undertook, after the '79 flood, a Raising and Moving Program which involved private farmsteads, private businesses outside of the protected towns. I just want to know if that program gave them protection at the 1 percent flood occurrence, plus freeboard?

MR. MACKLING: The work carried out was intended to bring it up to the 1 percent level, but apparently has not.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, if there are any farms or businesses outside of the main communities which are going to bring their flood protection up to the 1 percent, is there funding available?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand that individuals were given a level to build to and some of the individuals may or may not have built to that level.

MR. ORCHARD: Fine, I know they were given the levels to build to and they also received a compensation on the joint federal-provincial funding to accomplish that flood protection. Is that option still available to those farmers, businessmen outside of the protected towns for next summer, for this summer for instance, is that program of funding still available?

MR. MACKLING: My understanding was that individuals were given, through the Department of Government Services, the Flood Board, some assistance in that but that financing is not available now.

MR. ORCHARD: So those individuals who did not receive protection under the Flood Board Compensation on the Moving and Raising Program no longer have any avenue of cost-sharing available to them from the provincial and the federal level.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that they didn't exercise that prerogative; there is none now.

MR. ORCHARD: So then what we are talking about here in Item (g) is, let's say a number of communities from Emerson, Letellier, Morris, St. Jean, those communities along the Red River are going to be receiving funding under Appropriation (g)(2)?

MR. MACKLING: Yes. I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the valley town dikes that are involved are: St. Jean at a cost of \$934,000; Emerson \$519,000; St. Adolphe \$380,000; Letellier \$281,000; Brunkild \$569,000; Morris \$671,000; Rosenort \$368,000; and Dominion City \$185,000; a total of \$3,907,000 and that item is provided in capital.

MR. ORCHARD: Okay, that item is provided in capital, over three years I take it?

MR. MACKLING: \$1.9 of that \$3.9 million is in this year's capital — pardon me \$900,000.00.

MR. ORCHARD: I assume then, Mr. Chairman, that there is the proviso under the new funding arrangement established by this Minister, that \$1.9 million will be expended provided the communities involved come up with \$190,000.00?

MR. MACKLING: That would be \$90,000 this year on the part of the communities.

MR. ORCHARD: \$90,000.00? So that means you're

spending \$900,000.00?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, \$90,000.00.

MR. ORCHARD: So then that means, Mr. Chairman, that the capital appropriation is not \$1,900,000, but only \$900,000 for this year?

MR. MACKLING: \$900,000 appropriation for this year.

MR. ORCHARD: I must have misheard you because I thought you said \$1.9 million for this.

MR. MACKLING: I did initially and I corrected myself to \$900,000.00.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I'm rushing you. Then in order for those communities, whichever ones are identified to undertake provincial expenditure of some \$900,000, they must somehow come up with \$90,000 contribution?

MR. MACKLING: We're just verifying our figures. Would you give me that question again?

MR. ORCHARD: For this particular capital expenditure of \$900,000 to be undertaken by those communities in the Red River Valley that you identified earlier, in order for that \$900,000 to be expended this summer, those communities favoured with the funding are going to have to raise \$90,000 from their local taxpayers.

MR. MACKLING: I assume such to be the case.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I find this to be a very interesting development particularly when such an arrangement was made between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government and according to this letter from Mr. Weber communicated to the municipalities on March 4, without consultation with them I submit, Mr. Minister, that they are going to find themselves indeed hardpressed this year to accumulate that \$90,000 in the communities so favoured, as I said before, with the \$900,000 expected funding. Would you not think that diversion from the established practice of no municipal contribution to flood protection in those communities would have been best initiated only after some extensive consultation with the municipalities?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't be defensive about that at all. If I had been the Minister probably at the time and the matter had been discussed with me, yes, I think that I would have liked to have informed the municipalities but I don't think any municipality wants to pay this money. It's a question of getting the work done.

The Federal Government takes the position that this is eminently reasonable because for the protection involved to the communities it's relatively high from a point of view cost-benefit. After all the general taxpayers of Canada and the province are picking up 90 percent of the cost to protect these communities and I don't think it's an unreasonable ratio.

Now in respect to the impact on mill rates or taxa-

tion, that's something that certainly could be considered. It may be that we can be persuaded and we could work out a term of longer phasing of that expense involved on the part of the municipalities or the towns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to have the record clearly indicate that certainly the question of municipal participation in the upgrading of the valley diking systems was made known to the previous administration.

I can also recall indicating to staff at that time, that's a position that the Federal Government is putting forward, let's try it on if you like. I think I probably tried to use those very terms.

However, there has always been a special and unique situation with respect to Red River Valley flooding for some very understandable reasons, the first one simply because of the massive scale of that flooding. The fact that International waters are concerned, the diking activity in the State of North Dakota and to a lesser extent Minnesota, continue to aggravate the flooding problems for us in the Red River Valley here on the Canadian side of the border and for these reasons, historically and traditionally since the mid Sixties when major flood protection works were undertaken, the decision has been made that the senior governments, both Federal and Provincial share 100 percent of the cost.

The citizens of Winnipeg did not participate in the \$65-million floodway that has granted such marvelous protection to half the population of Manitoba. The same is true for the diking in place in the valley towns throughout the Red River Valley. I make that point because the record should be clear.

On the other hand there have been, as there ought to be, negotiations take place with municipalities where for one reason or other they did not fit the rules, the regulations, or the cost-benefits studies didn't indicate the kind of support that they should get. One that immediately comes to mind is the Community of Gimli; Carman is another one; Ste. Rose is another one. But I would like to put on the record, the action taken by the department and the Minister at that time in coming to grips with the situation in Gimli, where the government of the day wasn't prepared to enter into a flood-protection undertaking without some municipal participation. Extensive discussions took place with the Reeve and Council of the R.M. of Gimli.

Indeed, I think, Mr. Minister and the department has a resolution on file that was unanimously passed by the Gimli Council, agreeing to a participation in these flood protection works. To me, Mr. Chairman, that is an appropriate procedure which the Honourable Member for Pembina alluded to in consultation with municipalities effected before arbitrarily suggesting to them that they have a payment to pick up.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly felt at the time that I was first made aware of the Federal Government's insistence or decision to make a change in the funding procedure, that it was going to be difficult to bring about, for a very simple, understandable reason that once a pattern of assistance has been established it is pretty hard to break that pattern.

I won't necessarily argue the merits of the proposed change, one side or the other, but I suggest to all members that it is as difficult for the Minister of Natural Resources to change the funding arrangements that have been practised in the Red River Valley for the last ten or twelve years or two decades, as it would be for the Minister of Education to cut out transportation grants to school divisions or to alter in some other substantive way the kind of grants that have been provided to the educational system over the number of years.

I didn't have an opportunity of raising the issue to this extent with the departmental people when it was my responsibility, but I was certainly aware that we would run into this kind of a situation. I am somewhat surprised that the decision to proceed along this basis was made obviously with very little consultation, because, Mr. Chairman, even at 10 percent, I submit that the 10-percent impost on a community like Morris or Emerson is as substantive as the 45 percent is to the province. That being the case, then, Mr. Chairman, they might well of at least been given an opportunity to express their ideas as to the necessity of the expenditure, how it should be spent, whether or not, to use the words of my honourable friend from Dauphin as to whether or not the Cadillac treatment is always necessary, or whether the same level of protection, the 1-percent level of protection could be achieved in a matter that was somewhat less costly to them.

In other words if a community is being asked to contribute \$70,000-\$80,000 to a flood protection works, then I think they do have a right to sit in Council with the engineers, with the department in the planning of that additional flood protection.

Mr. Chairman, yes, certainly, it should be clearly noted that the changes that are now being adopted as policy were made evident to me as Minister and to the previous administration; it should also be made very clear on the records that the administration at that time, had made no decision on the matter. It is obvious to me that this administration has made a decision. I suggest that it will be made with some resistance in the communities involved.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know it is a difficult area for government when you rely on arrangements with another government, but as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated, it is not easy when you are dealing with the Federal Government. My understanding is that we really didn't have that many options. We could have taken the position that it is 50-50 or we won't go ahead with it. Well, then we wouldn't get an agreement with the Federal Government. The Federal Government cut back its share to 45 percent. I am sure that if we had said to the local governments and if we said that now it looks like you're going to pick up 10 percent, the reaction would be as perceived. Who wants to spend money today? Who wants to be caught with additional expense?

The taxpayers in Manitoba are certainly not enthusiastic about it. The taxpayers of anywhere wouldn't be enthusiastic about it. I suppose it is open to the taxpayers of the towns now to say, "That's too much money and we can't afford it." Well, the alternative is no diking, perhaps and that wouldn't be a desirable

thing. I think that what is desirable is that I am prepared in my department to sit down with the municipal officials involved and review the situation. If they don't want diking, if we can't work out that arrangement, that would be something that I would hesitate to contemplate. However, if it is a question of funding over a period of time, we are prepared to look at that. That I can undertake.

In respect to the honourable member's suggestion that the City of Winnipeg got all the benefits and didn't have to put anything out, I'm advised that the City of Winnipeg paid for its own dikes and built its own dikes and maintained them. The taxpayers of Winnipeg were saddled with those costs and including pumping stations to deal with flood. It's not like the citizens of these communities are being called upon to provide expense where no other community has.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose perhaps, even though the item looms large enough in the case of the communities involved but it is an indicator to us that when the Federal Government pulls back, the charge will be passed on directly to the citizens of Manitoba as it is in this case. The option certainly was there for the province to pick up the extra 5 percent and not charge the municipalities that charge.

It has more serious connotations, I suppose, if the same policy is adopted by this government, if serious reductions as being forecast, take place in the field of health, field of secondary education where the Federal Government is talking in terms of hundreds of billions of dollars. It will be interesting to observe how this government passes through those increased costs as they are apparently prepared, without too much consultation, to pass those charges on to the communities of Morris, Letellier, St. Jean, Emerson, and St. Adolphe.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not here to speculate on what the Federal Government is going to do or how we are going to react to that. I know that we have reacted to the Federal Government in this instance. I have indicated that I'm prepared to sit down with the municipal officials involved and see whether or not they want a longer period in which to finance this, or whether they want the diking at all. I think that's fair.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the valley towns and the diking around those towns, I appreciate the argument that is being advanced by several members of the Opposition with regard to the municipalities being put in the position of picking up 10 percent of the cost of the capital construction because of the Federal Government pullback.

I have to take from the argument advanced by the Member for Lakeside though some solace in the fact that in the past he suggested Gimli — and there were also several other towns involved — the proposition was put by the province then that when the cost-benefit ratio was such that it indicated greater local input was required, I think that was the term expressed by the Member for Lakeside, that the money was provided in the Estimates of the Province on the condition that the local municipality picked up its portion of the cost.

I don't think anything more is being required here in terms of the cost-benefit ratio to the valley towns. The cost-benefit ratio in Carman, Gimli or Ste. Rose is certainly not as good, nowhere near as good as it is in the Red River Valley towns, but the proportion required from the municipalities in Gimli, Carman and Ste. Rose du Lac was substantially higher than 10 percent under the proposals in which they were involved at that time. They were talking larger percentages than 10 percent, Mr. Chairman. So I have some concern here.

When the Member for Lakeside suggests that all of the costs of federal pullbacks and programs — and he knows as well as other members of the Committee and as well as the Minister knows that these cutbacks involve a lot of cost-shared programs as well as equalization grants — he's suggesting that the people of Manitoba are going to have to pick up the tab and I don't think anybody's going to argue with him. What he is suggesting here now is that all these costs are going to be passed on to municipalities, or whatever.

Mr. Chairman, the reality of the situation is that a lot of these costs are going to have to be picked up by the Provincial Government and anyone who tries to suggest otherwise is fooling themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside can't have it both ways. He can't decry this government for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. ANSTETT: I'm glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member for Lakeside suggests that he wants to have it both ways which points out the fallacy of his argument when he decides that he wants to have it both ways.

If he's going to argue that the costs of this program and many others are going to have to be picked up by the province — or should be picked up by the province — and at the same time decry the present administration for exorbitant spending increases which he did during the Throne Speech Debate then I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we have to call him to task for trying to have it both ways. I think that applies to this cost that has to be passed on to the people of Manitoba since the Federal Government won't continue to supply funding at the same level they did in the past and it applies to many other programs.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the Minister with regard to this program though and the first one would be, when was the program for individual farmstead grants discontinued? At what point was the program for upgrading onto pads at certain levels which was funded after the 1979 flood discontinued. I heard it stated that that program was no longer available. At what time did that end?

MR. MACKLING: I'm advised March 31, 1981.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification then, that program was not discontinued by the present administration but rather by the previous administration?

MR. MACKLING: Well on March 31, 1981, I would assume it was the former administration.

MR. ANSTETT: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Yes, I'd like to ask a couple questions again along the same line that the Member for Springfield did.

That announcement was made March 31, 1981. Did it run out its natural life? Can anybody tell me that?

MR. MACKLING: There was an ongoing program of \$8 million and when the monies ran out the province apparently went to the Federal Government and asked for a continuation of the program and the Federal Government said no, so then the program died.

MR. MANNES: How many applications were left wanting at that time?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the suggestion was made in half banter but probably correct. The former Minister of Government Services would have that information. It was under Government Services under the Flood Funding Program and we don't have that information. I would imagine that there would be some.

MR. MANNES: When was the decision made and by whom, to pull back the provincial funding from 50 to 45 percent and why was that decision made? I believe it was a 50-50 cost-share.

MR. MACKLING: I believe I'd indicated earlier that it was made by Treasury Board and that was February of this year.

MR. MANNES: Was there some reason that the Treasury Board felt obliged to cut back their share because the Federal Government did also?

MR. MACKLING: A recommendation was made to Treasury Board by the negotiating group in the department that that arrangement go forward, 45-45-10.

MR. MANNES: In other words Treasury Board could have seen fit to maintain that share at 50 percent and pass on only a 5 percent allocation to the municipalities.

MR. MACKLING: Oh yes, that was open to Treasury Board, sure.

MR. MANNES: Am I right in concluding that what the Minister is saying is that these local authorities, really they can make the decision as to whether they want to increase the level of the dike or not?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. MANNES: That if they decide they don't want to make that commitment of funds, that they then can remain at the mercy of that one in a 100-year flood?

MR. MACKLING: I would assume so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Dauphin.

MR. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that only the communities in the Red River Valley are included in the Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Agreement? . . . Communities in the Red River Valley area are the only . . .

MR. DEPUTY MINISTER, Nick Carter: Yes, communities are included under the list of communities under the Flood Damage Agreement, yes.

MR. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, would that mean then that no other areas of the province are subject to cost sharing Federal-Provincial Flood Damage Reduction Agreements at this present time?

MR. MACKLING: There are other communities in the province that are under the Flood Damage Reduction. There are a number of other communities in Manitoba that are subject to these arrangements with the province and the Federal Government. If you like, I'll give you a list of those.

MR. PLOHMAN: Well, I just want to explore this further. Is it correct that the municipalities around the Riding Mountain National Park have not been included in any Federal-Provincial Agreement, are not included?

MR. MACKLING: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the agreements cover 45 Manitoba communities. To date five communities have been designated; these are the towns of Melita and Wawanessa on December 20, 1979; the City of Winnipeg on February 15, 1980; the Town of Souris on October 1, 1980; and the Community of Elie on November 5, 1980.

MR. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking is whether the municipalities, and I've obviously got my answer, that no municipalities around the Riding Mountain National Park, which dumps a great deal of water - and it's federal jurisdiction - on the municipalities that surround it is not under any federal-provincial flood reduction agreement at this time?

MR. MACKLING: My understanding is that Dauphin is included.

MR. PLOHMAN: Well, I don't understand that it's under . . .

MR. MACKLING: And the Town of Ste. Rose.

MR. PLOHMAN: At the present time, Mr. Chairman, because I understand that the basis for this is on a cost-benefit analysis, cost-added basis, and I'm wondering whether these were included under that basis in this agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd remind members that we're having problems with the taping back there; you have to wait until you're acknowledged by the Chair.
Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: My understanding, Mr. Chairman,

is that the designated community is subject to a cost-benefit analysis on the Flood Prevention Project. If the cost-benefit analysis indicates a benefit of one or greater, then the Federal Government will participate; if it's under one it will not.

MR. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add, on that basis, that certainly the communities in the Red River Valley are receiving a great deal of benefit under this; they are getting 90 percent of the payments of the cost of flood protection for their communities and many communities in my area that are subject to flooding very frequently are never able to get this kind of funding at all. While I can sympathize with the Member for Pembina, in terms of discussing this and saying that the communities in the area should have been told or consulted in some way before this agreement was signed, I don't think that it's a major problem in that they are having 90 percent of their flood protection paid for by the senior levels of government. I think that while the Member for Pembina decries this I think there are a lot of areas that don't receive any of these benefits and I think we should look at it from that point of view as well.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what the honourable member is saying; that there may be communities who would jump at the chance to share in a flood-reduction agreement and would welcome that opportunity if it were even greater than 10 percent, but do not qualify because of the cost-benefit analysis, or an Estimate hasn't been made yet, I don't know. There may be some communities that fall in that category. Certainly I can appreciate that there may be communities who would welcome that sort of an arrangement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to express deep concern as to how this whole matter has been handled. The letters that went out to the municipalities were dated March 4th; the councils have to have their budgets completed this month, many of them will probably have one meeting in which to consult on this matter and, without any consultation at all, they've been hampered with this kind of a program; the changing of the formula, which is something that I think would take lots of consultation on behalf of government and municipal people. I have to decry the action that has been taken for a government that has been maintaining open government, consultation; we see the exact reverse of this in this case, as well as in quite a few others.

The question that I have further, Mr. Chairman, is what happened to the Flood Reduction Program outside of the diking areas, where people have spent monies, cost-shared federally, provincially, to provide protection. In their minds the kind of protection that the engineers and governments decreed was necessary? Now we find out that the rules have changed, it is not adequate. We will be building bigger dikes around the communities and we will be landing the residential and farm people in the rural areas are hung to dry after having spent considerable monies. I just find this hard to comprehend, exactly how this

whole things been handled and I feel very very disturbed. I know the municipal people are going to be extremely upset and so will the people along the Red River Valley when they find out what has happened here. There's been a real cross-up here somewhere along the line and it's been handled very very poorly.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that after the '79 flood elevations were given, as he indicated, to individual property owners and they were encouraged to build to those levels. During the course of the settlements, in respect to flood damage and flood compensation, monies were paid for individuals out of Government Services. If they chose not to build dikes to protect their properties that was their own responsibility, and I gather the previous administration, nor is this administration, going to force people to do things they don't want to do.

Now, to suggest that there is something wrong with that, I don't know, that would be criticizing what the former administration did and I don't think the honourable member would want to do that. Now, to suggest that there is something wrong with this program, I have indicated, and the member seems to take umbrage at this, that we are prepared to sit down with the municipalities involved, the towns involved, and if they don't want the program, of course, that'll mean that funds would be available to some other communities if they wanted to get involved and give priority to their construction of diking around their communities. If they want a phasing of the expenditures we'll certainly want to listen to that and talk to them about that. But I don't think it's constructive for the honourable member to put on a position of anger that this is a terrible program.

When he suggested that somehow there has been a breach of good faith or something on the part of this government and suggest there are quite a few other instances of high-handedness or arbitrariness, I'd like to know what the honourable member is referring to?

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I find this hard to believe. The Minister has indicated to us that he has \$900,000 put aside in the Capital Expenditures for this kind of a program along the Red River Valley for this year, and in less than a month the councils will now have to decide whether they will accept their portion of the \$90,000 expenditure, or else, you don't have to have it and the money will be spent elsewhere. Unbelievable, that kind of an attitude and approach. It's almost like blackmail being put on; either you take it and give us the \$900,000.00. Now the Minister is indicating to us, well, if the need be we will consult with the municipalities and see if they need more time. When? They have their budgets to prepare; they have to be committed before the end of the month. It's sort of, we've hammered you one now, well maybe we'll talk to you but already the damage has been done and the \$900,000, as he has just indicated, if they will not accept it and don't want it, well, we'll spend it somewhere else; we'll spend it in Dauphin or wherever. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster): Okay, we could go on for

quite some time, Mr. Chairman, on floods and flood damage, flood-damage protection and what-all under this appropriation and I'd just like to, I guess, review a little bit of what's happened in the past and really just what kind of results are we getting. How much planning has there been really in the past on flood damage mitigation, on flood damage reduction? You see, during the last flood, right in the middle of the 1979 flood, we had the City of Winnipeg which was diking to the tune of several million dollars within the City of Winnipeg approving for suburban development, housing development, a flood plain and it just makes absolutely no sense to me that we are going ahead, under the guise of protection forever from the Winnipeg Floodway. The Winnipeg Floodway — correct me if I'm wrong — but I think the Winnipeg Floodway is designed to hold a 160-year flood. I guess that would be — what percent is that, a 160-year flood? — is that a two-thirds-of-1-percent flood? It is well known that this area has floods of much greater intensity, of 250 and as high as 400 years and there was a 400-year flood, I think two of them, within the last 400 years if I'm my memory serves me correctly — not that I lived back then but from some of the history that I've read of the Red River Valley.

So we seem to be painting ourselves into the corner as governments, and I'm not trying to be partisan; it's right across the board that we are building flood protection to some degree; we are giving people the idea that they are not going to have to worry about floods of greater significance and when they do happen, the damages that are going to be incurred in the Red River Valley in particular are going to be several times as much as what we've had before.

Since the 1948 and 1950 floods, we've had the development of much of the flood area of Fort Garry, all of Fort Richmond. We've had areas on the east side of the Red; we've had areas north; properties have changed hands, in many instances a number of times, and then we found ourselves in the last '79 flood of going in and offering compensation to people who went down along Turnbull Drive, built in many cases quite elaborate homes and here we are coming in as a province to pay compensation to those people, to ring-dike groups of homes, to ring-dike individual homes, to assist people who have moved out of the city to buy a piece of the countryside and then all of a sudden they find out that they've bought a chunk of FloodMan.

Now, for God's sakes, anyone who has grown up in this area, even someone coming into the area relatively recently, should certainly know that the Red River floods from time to time. My concern is that the government, by perpetuating really poor flood-damage studies in the past, not really addressing the situation, going to the homeowners themselves and saying to people, "Okay, you've been flooded. Your property, the deed on it or something alongside the deed, should be stamped that the property is flood property." When a person comes and buys that next time around, he recognizes it as flood property and the province should not be held reliable to giving flood damage compensation to many of these properties.

Now, I exclude from this the ring-dike towns. I exclude from it many of the rural farms, the people

who have been there a number of years and whatnot, but any new properties and I believe there is some legislation on the books already for building standards and building codes, that when they build buildings they're supposed to build them at above a certain level. Okay? And if they don't build above those levels, they're not having any compensation. That is their tough biscuits. I think that we have to take this kind of strong action — (Interjection) — I'll grant you, no I fully appreciate what these . . .

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Everytime you bang that damn thing right close to the microphone, it comes through this and it just murders my ear, so I would ask you on a point of privilege to be kind enough to just gently bring them to order. Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: In continuing then, I would like to see us take even stronger action than has been taken in the past; force the City of Winnipeg to go along; that there will be no provincial cost-sharing in the areas that have flooded in the past to any degrees. I participated for a couple of evenings, and I just got sick of it and walked away, the diking of Scotia Street during the last flood. Now, the people in the homes along Scotia Street, those homes have transferred property titles to most of those homes several times since 1948 and yet the city, I believe, spent \$1.5 million building that ruddy dike. The province paid in to contribute, the Federal Government contributed towards the cost of that dike. That dike disappeared within a month after the flood. You drive along there now, there's not one sandbag along that whole area and yet if there's another flood coming along, we're supposed to go and build another dike there to protect those homes. I think it's total foolishness.

The dike was built on the west side of those homes down Scotia Street. Scotia Street was raised and the properties that are on there, I think, should have designation on them that the city, the province, the Federal Government has no liability towards moving in and assisting those people in another flood. So I think the studies over the years in the past have all said that zoning is one of the best and the cheapest form of flood planning and we still are not using it. We've got to use a heavier hand perhaps with the city in particular, with some of the other jurisdictions if need be, and with the individuals who are buying the land, so that they know when they're buying a piece of property that the province has no liability to protect them and to undo flood damage.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the problems associated with people building on flood plain, the province has designated flood plain area, but it's left to local government to enforce. Now, if there's any deficiency I won't criticize local government, but there could be perhaps some strengthening of local government's concerns there, I don't know.

In respect to the generality of the concerns here, protection of communities from flood damage, I want to indicate to the honourable members that I'm sure there'll be many communities who will be anxious to have flood protection on the order contemplated for these communities and we'll endeavour to provide all

communities in the same fair and reasonable cost-sharing arrangement. If there is any burden, as I have indicated to communities in this rather recent announcement, I suppose that the program needn't be proceeded with if there's no forecast of flood this year; perhaps it can be phased another year. I think that certainly we want to be open to talk to these communities, if there're some problems involved I'll hear what their problems are. But there is a commitment, I think, on the part of us to at least provide for some standard of cost-sharing that's reasonable.

I might further indicate that I think the way that in modern society, we ought to be addressing the flooding problem is not building higher dikes, but trying to find the problems for the flooding because everyone in this room now knows, I think, that the 1950 flood was considered to be a unique flood and yet, in 1979, in some parts of the Red River Valley, the levels were almost as high and so the concern has to be that changes are taking place in the Red River Basin. More water is being rushed off the land more quickly and there are problems involved in this for us in Canada and I think a large part of this has occurred in the United States.

There have been concerns from time to time about what's happening in this Red River Basin and I think concerns have been evidenced through the Government of Canada to the United States in respect to development south of the border and some changes were made. But it's significant that more and more water is being rushed in a short period of time into this Basin and that creates problems. This Canada-Provincial Program is designed to meet those problems as evidenced in the '79 flood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I will defer to my colleagues and later on I will take my opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Not to detract from the validity of the concerns just expressed by the Minister and indeed those that have been expressed earlier by the Member for Inkster, but the fact of the matter remains — and the Minister has available to him staff that can supply him with these figures — that the highest possible flooding ever occurring in the Red River Valley occurred possibly in the year 1826 or thereabouts. There were at least two floods in the last century that exceeded the 1950 and the '79 floods. Those occurred long before man tinkered substantially with the Red River Valley, or long before drainage projects were put into place, and long before we collectively decided that instead of 20 to 30 million buffalos roaming the prairies, that wheat fields, barley fields and cattle should use the resource in that way.

I said at the outset, it doesn't mean that substantial changes in the way and the manner in which we husband our land cultural practices should be seriously undertaken, but there is a danger here that some of my environmentalist friends seem to overlook, that Mother Nature in all her glory has not devastated this Valley to the extent that we have yet to experience. In those years there were no handy scapegoats around

like farmers who abused the land, or overeager engineers that dug too many drainage channels, or other reasons that have changed the landscape of the Red River Valley.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of keeping historical records straight for those who read these words in posterity, those few comments ought to be added to the record.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I just want to put on the record too, that I for one have not accused the farmers of abusing the land or I haven't recognized them as a scapegoat for any criticism. I've indicated that we have to be concerned about changing farming practice and more intense use of land. I haven't laid a heavy hand or pointed a heavy finger at either my honourable friend from Lakeside, who is a farmer, or any other farmer in Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Well, you said you'd cheer me on and now you're backing off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. SCOTT: In reply to the Member for Lakeside, —(Interjection)— no, it's not a point of go getting them, I can assure my colleague here.

What we are speaking of on these floods, those are supposed to be I believe the one in 1825 or 1826, they've estimated or I should say guesstimated was a 400-year flood. We have had since 1948 of the variety between a 70 and 100-year flood some five of them I believe. There's 48, 50, 66, 74 I believe was in the 60-80 range, and in 79 again. So what we are doing is, we have aggravated the product of them.

The next 400-year flood, unless we start getting back and restoring some of the capacity of the soil to hold water back, is going to be one heck of a lot worse than the one in 1826, and the one in 1826 as the honourable member well knows, the only place that the people and the little tiny settlement which was in the Red River Settlement had to go to Birds Hill and I believe, Stony Mountain, to be able to get away from the flood.

Now what my concern and what I was trying to raise on my concern, is that these things are going to happen; we don't have any control over them happening. The things that control floods are such things as the water levels in the river systems in the prior year, the soil moisture in the soil during the winter, the snowfall, the lateness of the spring and if there's any kind of rain and whatnot with a late spring coming because the later the spring is the faster you melt and whatnot is and things are all aggravated and when they're aggravated to various degrees, you have floods of various degrees.

What I'm afraid of and what I'm worried about more than anything is that we've planned everything around the 100-year flood and there are such things as 200 and 400-year floods and when they come, the devastation that they're going to bring to this area, largely because of poor planning, is going to be just almost unfathomably worse than it was in 1948 and 1950 with what the City of Winnipeg and the Red River Valley witnessed. That's all I'm trying to point out, I'm not taking away from your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't pretend to be expert in this matter, but I would suggest that a study into the matter, a research into the matter would suggest that the works undertaken by the Department of Water Resources, the Department of Natural Resources have probably precluded forever a 400-year flood arising again of the magnitude of 1826.

I believe the historical record will show that an abnormal amount of fall water, summer water, stayed in the valley, would not run off, that in effect provided the base for the then, what we now call the 100-year flood, arriving on top of that water. There were no Norquay channels or Grassmere ditches or those things to drain that water off, in the summer, in the fall prior to freezeup so that massive base stayed in the Red River Valley and then when the waters that can come, as you quite correctly pointed out, come across us on a 100-year basis, then we had the scale of a flood that the Red River Settlers experienced in 1826 and that kind of situation.

So I would suspect — I do not make an assertion of this fact — but I would suspect that the computer run-through could probably indicate that the probability of the type of flood that was experienced in the Red River Valley may well be a thing of the past, may well be a thing of the past because of the admittedly sketchy records that were available at that time. But they do indicate that the Valley went into winter that year with all the sloughs, all marshes full, and subsequently with the frost conditions that we had, stayed that way over winter, then perhaps with an abnormal snowfall created that 400-year flood. That kind of situation is no longer possible because of the man-made improvements that the Red River Valley have seen.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, in this case I share a belief that the former Member for Inkster used to express from time to time, all things that man do to this Mother Earth need not be bad, they need not be bad ecologically and environmentally. We simply have to do certain things from time to time for our convenience and for our sustenance. There are more and more of us people living on this globe from time to time and they have to be fed.

So I reject the super-environmentalist view that man dare not tinker with nature, only at his peril. I happen to think that on many occasions we improve on nature; and I happen to believe that the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Water Resources very often is a forefront in making some of these improvements.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I won't speculate on the weather. I think the honourable members will appreciate the changes that we've noticed here in this province in the last few days and in the last decade, and I'm not going to say that we're not going to have this or we're not going to have that. A lot of it depends on the vicissitudes of nature that we can't control. As to the general concern, yes, what we do in association with nature has to be moderate; it has to be reasonable, but that shouldn't stop us from making changes that are to the benefit of man.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I see that everyone is entering into the debate and I would like to enter into it again inasmuch as there was some discussion concerning the protective dike along the Scotia Street area, I'd like to go back to 1948, 1950 when I was working on the Lyndale Drive dike and also on the dike along the Seine River, and just sort of reminisce and advise the honourable members that I am aware of the destructive nature of floods and it frightens me and I can understand the Minister's position in trying to encourage — I'm not using the word "force" — but encourage these towns along the Red River Valley to strengthen their dikes because of the destructive nature of floods.

I guess I could carry on for a little bit longer, but I really just wanted to let it be known that we are not here to discuss the past to the extent that we have. I think that if we're going to do this there's got to be some agreement. Otherwise, we're going to be here until July or August, and I really don't think that's the nature of it. I think the Minister would like his department investigated to the satisfaction of all, and if we can do that and get through with it, we'll all be much happier. And I won't reminisce concerning the 1950 flood where I took a very active part on the Lyndale Drive area and it was first-hand.

But there are some benefits that come from a flood. —(Interjection)— But the benefits that come from a flood, if you look in the Norwood Flats area along where the Norwood Community Club is, there's a sports complex and that sports complex is in a dugout that was made when the earth was removed to provide the Lyndale Drive dike which is still there. Lyndale Drive is the original dike and it's been reinforced and it's protecting the people in that area. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(g)(i) Salaries.
The Member from Morris.

MR. MANNES: I'd like to ask a question on the Brunkild dike. I indicate by the comment made earlier that it will be included under Section 13 under the Capital Projects.

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. MANNES: Does this particular town have an existing dike at all?

MR. MACKLING: I'm advised that it has a partial ring-dike, but the proposal is to put in a permanent ring-dike.

MR. MANNES: Of all the towns in the valley, was this the last particular town that was subject to major flood damage, was this the last town to be diked with a permanent dike?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. MANNES: Can the Minister tell me through his associate, roughly what level of dike is required to give this Town of Brunkild its needed protection?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you repeat that question, please?

MR. MANNES: What height of dike?

MR. MACKLING: Additional height?

MR. MANNES: Additional height.

MR. MACKLING: We haven't got that at our fingertips here.

MR. MANNES: I would like then to move on back to the dikes at Morris. Can the Minister give me any idea first of all, of the height of the dike at Morris and maybe more importantly, what depth of water it restrained in the 1979 flood?

MR. MACKLING: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, without asking Mr. Weber that, I don't think he'd have that information again right at his fingertips what the depth of the water was at the '79 flood and how that compared with the top of the dikes now.

MR. MANNES: What I'm trying to ascertain is the difference in levels between the water outside the dike and the basic level of ground inside the dike during the peak water height in 1979.

MR. MACKLING: About 10 to 12 feet.

MR. MANNES: The point I'm trying to make is that the height of water in Morris certainly has to be considered in a completely different light than many of the other examples that have been used here. First of all, we must bear in mind that the majority of that water is not our water. In most cases our water in the valley is long gone before the onslaught of water from the south and some from the far west. I'm wondering when a town is faced with 12 feet of water and knowing that if the dike is breached or if the one flood in 150 years comes along and pours over those dikes, that in fact the town will be totally destroyed. I'm wondering how they're going to go to that negotiating meeting with respect, Sir, with you, the Minister, and how they will be able to negotiate at all and that's why I have to ask the last question. Is the cost-sharing still negotiable at all or is it fixed at 10 percent?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I assume that all things are possible. I think that is a proposal to the municipality based on what was considered fair and equitable.

MR. ORCHARD: I want to start out by responding to some of the fairy tales the Member for Springfield has indulged in tonight and you know, over the past two or three weeks we have come to appreciate that the Member for Springfield has the impression that he knows more than anybody else about what has gone on in this House in the last four years. He made the comment that the Member for Lakeside was in some kind of error in pointing out a change in the funding arrangements for flood protection in the Red River Valley. He refers to communities of Gimli and Ste. Rose and Carman, I believe.

Well, to refresh the Member for Springfield's, memory and to make sure that some of the newcomers in the ND party who may get from time to time

mesmerized by his apparent wealth of knowledge, I'd like to point out that in Carman's situation — and I will deal with strictly with the Town of Carman — the Red River Valley has enjoyed flood protection provided by the Federal and Provincial Government in joint-funding because the cost-benefit has exceeded one; as a matter of fact I believe, and maybe Mr. Weber can confirm this, it's been a cost-benefit of even upwards of three and four. Therefore, it has been deemed by the Federal Government to be a project they can participate in because it is cheaper to provide flood protection than to continually pay flood damages. Those citizens, traditionally, since I suppose prior to 1950, have received flood protection at no cost. An example of that has been mentioned tonight, the Winnipeg Floodway, which was provided at no cost directly to the citizens of Winnipeg, other than their contribution to provincial taxes which went towards the Provincial Government's share of the Floodway, and that incidentally, the residents of Carman, Miami, Roblin, Russell, you name it, Flin Flon, Thompson, Steinbach, The Pas all contributed to that provincial contribution, not just the people of the City of Winnipeg.

Now when the Member for Springfield says that it is no different than what was being proposed for Carman, Gimli and Ste. Rose, he knows not of what he speaks, because those communities, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, did not have any flood cost-benefit analysis, a unity position. I will refer, specifically, to Carman, where it was established that a cost-benefit ratio bases the flooding pattern from 1969 - 1979, a cost-benefit of .7, less than unity. In other words, the Federal Government position was that it was cheaper to pay flood damages as they occur than to provide flood protection for that community. The similar situation existed for Ste. Rose and for Gimli. The province, under our term of government, decided that that was not good enough for those communities and we embarked upon a rather unique concept that we put before the Federal Government - and I will deal specifically with Carman's.

We said that when the cost benefit ration was .7 in Carman we are prepared to do this: we asked the Federal Government, would you provide 50 percent of the identifiable cost-benefit, i.e. .35 of the costs of providing permanent flood protection; in return the province will provide the other .35 of the .7 cost-benefit ratio for flood protection. We then went to the municipalities, in this case Carman; we said to them, we believe we can get the .7 shared with the Federal Government if you will agree to split the remaining portion of the cost-benefit to bring it to unity, i.e. the .3, the 30 percent of cost. If you split that with us 50/50, the province putting in 15 percent, the Town of Carman putting in 15 percent, then we believe we can proceed with project.

That same proposal was made to Ste. Rose; that same proposal was made to Gimli; and it was under that circumstance that they were being asked to participate in the Capital costs of permanent flood protection. An entirely different situation than was traditionally, and by traditionally I mean for 35 years that I know of, the circumstance in which flood protection was permanently provided to the residents of the Red River Valley, including the City of Winnipeg.

So, I find a great deal of frustration when the

Member for Springfield attempts to speak knowledgeably of something that he doesn't appreciate the facts of.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is why we went to the communities of Carman, Ste. Rose and Gimli and we negotiated with them. We negotiated with them for approximately a year on the basis of municipal participation in permanent flood protection; I suppose, tenderly and compassionately, as the Member for Lakeside did because he was part of that negotiation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we see a circumstance develop where the Federal Government has decided that they do not have the funds anymore to provide permanent flood protection in the Red River Valley where the cost-benefit ratio is 1 plus. They have said to this Provincial Government that we have today, that we will only provide 45 percent flooding.

What I find reprehensible about this Minister's position in providing flood protection for the Red River Valley, is that he has used the excuse that the Federal Government is only providing 45 percent of flood protection costs in the Red River Valley to reduce, arbitrarily, the provincial contribution from 50 percent down to 45 percent. He has chosen to climb on the back of the Federal Government, that doesn't want to provide flood protection in the Red River Valley, and reduce the provincial portion that has been traditional of 50 percent down to 45 percent.

What is even more reprehensible, Mr. Chairman, is he has done this without prior consultation to any municipal official in the Province of Manitoba. He has sent out a letter on March 4, 1982, not the Minister directly but his departmental staff, saying that this is the new way that we are going to operate. This coming from a government who has said that they are going to base their government on consultation with interest groups; on discussion with the different affected peoples of Manitoba; people affected by government programs are going to have full and open access and discussion with this government. Well, the open, full and accessible discussion came to those municipalities in a letter dated March 4th in which they received the new terms of condition under which the Red River Valley is going to receive flood protection.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has to bear his part in this, because I don't know whether he didn't know that the Natural Resources Department was doing this to his municipalities; if he did, then his actions are inexcusable in letting it go by. But, for the time being, we will wait and we'll let him off the hook until we get to his Estimates and we will find out how much he did or did not know about the matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have the municipalities, striking their budgets in this month, being faced now with the requests for 10 percent of the Capital contribution of flood protection, at a time when we heard that party, in opposition, constantly criticize our government anytime something came up. They were saying that were passing the costs on to the municipalities; we were passing the costs on to the user groups; we were passing costs on, that's how we were saving money, and here we find this government, in 3-and-1/2 short months, doing that very same thing without one word of consultation with the affective municipalities. We have this Minister saying, "it is eminently reason-

able that we should make this request for 10 percent of the Capital costs from the municipalities affected."

What this Minister is prepared to do, which I believe is diametrically opposed to what his party stands for, or tries to stand for in the eyes of Manitobans. They are creating two classes of citizens in the Red River Valley; those who have received the majority of their permanent flood protection at the 100 percent cost of either the provincial and the federal government and no cost to the individual resident via municipal taxation; they are creating two classes of citizens, particularly in the town of Brunkild which have not received primary flood protection, and if they are going to now they are going to have to pay 10 percent towards the cost of it. Two classes of citizen from the party that claims they are for all Manitobans equally, fairly and equitably; two classes of citizens, Mr. Chairman.

Now, this represents, Mr. Chairman, a radical departure in previous policy of the Department of Natural Resources undertaken by this Minister, by this department and this government. They are now demanding, in cases where the cost-benefit ratio is greater than one, that no longer will the tradition of joint federal-provincial, 100 percent funding be carried on, but rather they are going to insist that individual municipalities now must bear a portion of that cost. That is a radical departure of policy, Mr. Chairman, it is a radical departure brought in by the N.D. Government, not by the former Progressive Conservative Administration but by the New Democratic Party.

That is what their new policy is meaning to municipalities affected in flood zones where the flood protection costs are greater than the cost-benefit of one. That is the kind of consultation and caring government that they are giving to rural Manitoba and tonight, Mr. Chairman, what is more reprehensible is that the Minister has in essence, threatened those municipalities by saying that, well, if they don't like the new rules of the game then I suppose we can spend that capital money elsewhere. Take it or leave it; my way or the highway; to hell with you and the municipalities. We're not going to consult with you; we're just going to impose an arbitrary and radical change in previous policy and demand that they pay that 10 percent or they don't get their flood protection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think in the history of this province that kind of an uncaring and brutal attitude has ever been adopted by a Provincial Government towards the municipalities. It has now in the past three-and-a-half months. It is a godfather offer that the Minister is making to the municipalities; it's an offer they can't resist. Put up 10 percent of the cost or you don't get any flood protection and the next flood that comes along, you can drown. But you have to put up 10 percent if we're going to help you to stop flooding in your town and your village.

Once again, what can councillors do at this late stage of the game when they're striking their new budgets? And I would ask this Minister to seriously reconsider his position about demanding an extra 10-percent contribution from those communities in the Red River Valley who need additional flood protection. I would ask him to reconsider his position; I would ask him to remove his gun-to-the-head offer, and I would ask him if he would drop the requirement

tonight, give us the commitment tonight that he will drop the requirement of 10 percent contribution by those municipalities so that they will not be forced to take nothing for flood protection if they don't agree. I would ask him to reconsider that. I would ask him to continue back on the former policy where the Federal and Provincial Governments cover 100 percent of the costs, take the gun away from the heads of the municipal councillors in the Red River Valley. Would he consider that and would he give us that commitment tonight?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Pembina waxes indignant about equity for people in Manitoba. —(Interjection)— He says, "You bet." You know, whether you're flooded in Carman or whether you're flooded in Morris, you're flooded; and I think people have a right to expect from their government the same sort of equitable treatment. Now, what did the honourable member in his administration do in respect to his Town of Carman?

Two years ago, they proposed that the Town of Carman finance the cost of diking to the tune of 15 percent. Now, at the same time he said that he would say to the people of Morris, or the people of Letellier, or the people of St. Jean, "You don't have to pay anything," but the people of Carman, "You have to pay 15 percent." You're going to treat some people a lot differently than other people. Mr. Chairman, that's what the honourable member was talking about: that's equity. But what did the honourable member's administration do? They worked out that arrangement; they went back to the Federal Government and what kind of negotiations did they have? The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that the Federal Government said no, and as a result of the Federal Government saying no, the honourable member's compassionate government did nothing for those people, nothing. Now, the honourable member says that we have offered something to these communities and it's high-handed, it's arbitrary. I've indicated that if those jurisdictions have trouble with that, they have a Minister that's prepared to listen to them and to talk to them about that financing and about that programming.

Now, the honourable member says that's high-handed. Well, someone has to make a decision about the diking. We have the money in the budget, if they're prepared to take it we want them to take it, because we want the protection. If they don't want to take it certainly that would trouble us, but the money is there and we want to afford them that protection at 10 percent not 15 percent of cost. So, the honourable member can make all he likes about that, but that is a fair and equitable arrangement. It's fair and equitable for those people because the honourable member wanted to charge the people of Carman, Ste. Rose, Gimli or anywhere else 15 percent.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister has been in his department a little longer, he will understand recommendations made on the basis of a cost-benefit ratio, not rules that I have made . . .

MR. MACKLING: When you're flooded, you're flooded.

MR. ORCHARD: . . . but rules that have been abided

by throughout Canada for providing flood protection for I don't know how long, and what we did — and the Minister will know this in a few short months — we made the only offer that has ever been made to Gimli, Ste. Rose and Carman who have been faced with flooding since the mid-60's on, and we made the only proposal in which they might be able to achieve some form of protection and certainly we asked them in Carman for 15 percent, and when the Federal Government would not participate, we had to start new negotiations and the Minister says we didn't do anything.

Now, Mr. Minister, the monkey is on your back. What are you going to do?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, that's right. You had the monkey on your back and you did nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. ORCHARD: And when the Federal Government is now cutting back in funding which has traditionally been 100 percent provincial and federal, when the cost-benefit is greater than one, what does this Minister do? He cuts back and uses the excuse of the Federal Government cutback to carry more cost to the municipalities and make the citizens in those rural municipalities pay more. He's riding on the back of the Federal Government and he tries to make out that he's doing something fair and equitable for the people of Manitoba. Balderdash, Mr. Chairman. That won't wash.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we've heard a lot of balderdash from the Honourable Member for Pembina. When he wants to talk dollars no matter whether it's 15 percent or 10 percent, he wants to treat everyone the same. It's not the same. You're demanding from the taxpayers of Carman or Gimli 5 percent more than what you want to demand from the people of Morris and that's equity and he talks about problems. Yes, you had those problems and you didn't deal with them.

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

The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Is there a meeting at all being arranged this week, a meeting with the municipalities in the area to explain this further or any other program of this nature?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the letter went out I understand, that's the first time I've heard of it, March the 4th and I haven't had any inquiries yet, but certainly we will initiate inquiries to see whether a meeting is requested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(g)(2)—pass.

MR. SCOTT: Before we leave this item, I'd just like to bring up some points on dealing with the 1979 flood and with the rather pompous response that we've had this evening from some members of the official Opposition in regarding the supposed callousness of the

present government towards municipalities —(Interjection)— No, it didn't. And I'd just like to recount a couple of things that happened in that '79 flood.

The government was receiving notice for a couple of months period that we were expecting a flood of some degree. As time went on, they became more aware that there was going to be a more serious flood. I remember watching the then Premier standing on television telling the people there would not be a flood in Manitoba; we did not have to worry about a major flood when everything was flooding in North Dakota and when the levels were rising very rapidly in Emerson, refusing to admit . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster, I believe you're out of order. We are on Crop Production.

MR. MACKLING: We're on (h). Yes, you're out of order, now. We've passed that. Let's complete this.

MR. SCOTT: Oh, I am sorry. We were on (g)(2). So we're on (h)(1) now.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I move Committee rise.
Mr. Chairman, you have a motion before you that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of rising? All those opposed.
The Nays have it.

MR. ENNS: A recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MACKLING: We can't have a recorded vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am advised that we can't have a recorded vote.

MR. ANSTETT: A recorded vote on Committee to rise is in order at any time. We cannot have a vote after 10:00 p.m. to change or modify the Estimates, that's all, but a vote for Committee rise is in order.

MR. ENNS: A recorded vote, all those in favour of rising.

MR. KOVNATS: On a point of order, I would suggest that maybe the Clerk should count.

A COUNTED VOTE WAS TAKEN the results being as follows:

Yeas, 7; Nays, 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Motion that Committee rise was defeated.

We're on 4.(h)(1) Salaries—Pass. 4.(h)(2) . . .
The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, now we're going to have a new ball game here. Could the Chairman indicate where we're on right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(h)(2). Public Expenditures.

MR. DRIEDGER: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Canada Manitoba . . . Manitoba Crop Production.

MR. DRIEDGER: I thought there was a bit of a feeling here before that we would complete this section and it would appear that we had given our consent that we now are not prepared to proceed with this section.

I would like to ask the Minister under the Canada . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. DRIEDGER: . . . under the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Program, whether the Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. DRIEDGER: . . . whether the Minister could indicate whether there's any changes in the projects that were designated prior to the change of government?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so. The Cooks Creek drain drainage system, that one as indicated earlier is under review.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, then I'd like to ask a question regarding the Marsh River Project that was part of the program or project that was agreed to.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand that's provided for in the Capital Item — I3.

MR. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister indicate which municipalities are involved under the Marsh River Program as it has been designated?

MR. MACKLING: I am given to understand the RMs of Montcalm, Franklin, Morris and De Salaberry.

MR. DRIEDGER: Have the municipalities and the Provincial Government agreed to cost-sharing formulas on the projects that are affecting each municipality?

MR. MACKLING: There is a committee arrangement — I won't give you the specifics — but it involved the RMs and the costing is 60-40; 60 federal, 40 provincial; and the local municipalities look after the lesser waterways involved themselves.

MR. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister possibly indicate between the four municipalities when he indicates 60-40 between Federal and Provincial Government — my understanding was when I saw one of the proposals that was being worked out by some of the resource people and the management people involved with the projects, that the relationship cost wise was much different than 60-40 federal-provincial and that the municipalities only looked after the first and second order drains. My understanding was substantial cost-sharing involved for the municipalities.

MR. MACKLING: My understanding is that the first and second order drains are being looked after by the local RMs and the third and higher are being looked after under these arrangements.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, then to the Minister specifically on the Marsh River Project, in that particular project is there any work being undertaken on the Marsh River itself in terms of cleaning out the Marsh River which is a natural waterway?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand this is new, Mr. Chairman, but all of this is dealt with under Item 13 under Capital.

MR. DRIEDGER: I understand . . .

MR. MACKLING: If the honourable member wants to go on now, I have no trouble with that, but it is covered under Item No. 13. That's the Capital Items.

MR. DRIEDGER: I have some difficulty with that. When we consider that under the previous arrangement or the previous item here, we had \$900,000 or \$1 million under the Capital Projects there as well, and here we have under the federal-provincial arrangements under the Value at a Crop Agreements certain monies that are going to be under the Capital Projects — I realize that it's probably not. You know, this is one reason why we initially asked whether we could have the Capital Projects presented to us at the beginning of the Estimates so that we knew where we were at in terms of asking these things.

Coming back to the agreement between the Federal Government and Provincial Government, I understand initially it was a five-year agreement that was signed. Could the Minister indicate when the initial agreement was signed and when this program will terminate, because I think time is of essence here somewhere along the line?

MR. MACKLING: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the agreement was signed December, '78, and expires March 31, '84.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you. I understand there's three major projects in progress right now. There's the Cooks Creek one, the Marsh River one and there's also one to the western part of the province somewhere.

MR. MACKLING: That's correct.

MR. DRIEDGER: Is the Minister within his department considering to approach the Federal Government for an expanded program along these lines? Certainly there are other areas. The question that has been raised to me by municipal people, "Why should only a certain area have this benefit?" Why, for example, could not the area of Southeast Manitoba where there is a crying need for drainage, why could not one of these areas be designated as that where we have virtually no drainage, where there is a requirement for water storage, water drainage; where we have the whole Roseau River drainage basin involved with the creeks which lead first of all from Manitoba into the States, into the Roseau River, and then back into our country again. I'm just wondering, how are these projects established and why can't we go back to the Federal Government and designate certain other areas where there is a crying need for these

kind of things?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the honourable member is referring to programs in the southeast area that obviously have been longstanding; he complains that nothing has been done there. I don't know why nothing has been done. I am new to this ministry and I'll have to see why in the past four years nothing was done there.

In respect to the item we're dealing with, however, it deals with value added crops production. This is where, ostensibly at least, there can be an improvement in the crop production in the area if the drainage is improved and it doesn't affect the southeast area. I don't know of any added value crop projects in that area, unless you can enlighten me on that?

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I will be very pleased to try and shed some light on that matter. We have an organization called SPADA, Stuartburn-Piney Agricultural Development Association, out there that have entered into an agreement with the Federal and Provincial Government in terms of establishing specialized crops, cash crops in the area; this is in conjunction with the programs that we had in place.

If the Minister is indicating that we have done nothing in the southeast for four years, I would just like to put on record here what has happened: is that we have initiated a program of selling up Crown lands; I have mentioned it before and I will mention it again, and the selling of LGD vested lands. In conjunction with that we have brought in the Tree Land Program where we have cleared a lot of land; 16,000 acres have been put into production in just the last winter where the questioned program has been in effect, it's been a very instrumental program and I think the government of the day is planning to expand that program.

Now, my request is to the Minister: why could not an area — here we have a drainage problem in the southeast with the expanded development that is taking place if there ever was a need for a value added crop arrangement to be presented to the Federal Government, this would be an ideal situation. This is why I say I'm wondering how some of these projects were initially picked to begin with.

Now, possibly we can say the previous administration did fine. What I'm asking this government to do, this Minister to do, is to go back to the federal people and say: hey, listen, we have an extreme situation in the southeast where a program of this nature would just be totally beneficial for the LGDs. We have limited tax space and monies to be spent on drainage projects of this nature.

So, I just wanted to draw this to the Minister's attention and ask him whether he's prepared to go to the federal people and see whether we can have this kind of a program initiated for that corner?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to look at programs in any area of the province, whether they've been considered in the past or not, and that includes the area the honourable member is talking about. Now when I suggested that he was concerned about some drainage that he says has been of longstanding and something should be done, I'm referring to, of course, just what he's indicated.

However, if some additional program is necessary there then I will be happy to consider it as and when the proposals are submitted to me. I understand that there has been some special crop products considered under this program and that might apply in the southeast area.

MR. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister just maybe clarify that a bit more? Under the present arrangement with the Federal Government it is also almost a value added program that is in place there right now, but it does not involve the drainage at the present time.

MR. MACKLING: That's right.

MR. DRIEDGER: It is the Department of Agriculture, I understand.

MR. MACKLING: That's correct.

MR. DRIEDGER: This is why I'm asking the Minister, because it has already been designated under the Agriculture Program for certain crop improvements, whether he would consider applying that same basis on the drainage aspect through the water resources to the Federal Government.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the honourable member, I'm prepared to look at any reasonable proposal from any area.

MR. DRIEDGER: I would just like to indicate to the Minister that I will be working, and as I hope that he will, be working together with the councils and the LGDs to come forward with a proposal for the Minister to consider along those lines.

MR. MACKLING: Sure, we're open to anyone — an open government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: I was wondering if the Minister could indicate or give us the list of all the drainage programs that are under the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement.

MR. MACKLING: I'll be able to give that detail under Item 13; that's the capital.

MR. MANNES: What you're saying is that everyone of those projects are . . .

MR. MACKLING: Involves capital.

MR. MANNES: Fine. What share of the total Agro-Man Program falls into Natural Resources, specifically into the Water Resources Section?

MR. MACKLING: We have to split some of the items out, Mr. Chairman. 6.8 million.

MR. MANNES: That's not a share?

MR. MACKLING: No, that's the total cost; total 5-year cost.

MR. MANNES: The total AgroMan agreed cost?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. MANNES: What share of that is going to accrue to the Water Resources?

MR. MACKLING: It would be 2.5 million.

MR. MANNES: Rather than a list which you may furnish under Section 13 as to the projects, can you tell me . . .

MR. MACKLING: No hangup about furnishing it right now.

MR. MANNES: Fine.

MR. MACKLING: Although the Cooks Creek Area Project is still under review, it is included; the Marsh River Area Project; the La Salle River Area Project; the Morris River Area Project, The Domain Crop Area Demonstration Project; and the Almasippi Wet Sands Management Project.

MR. MANNES: Could you tell me specifically what the La Salle River Project involves?

MR. MACKLING: What it involves?

MR. MANNES: Yes, what is the intent of this particular program, what was the program attempting to do?

MR. MACKLING: The description that I have is the La Salle River Area Project is proposed to include activities in the La Salle River Watershed and on adjacent lands. The project area extends east from Portage la Prairie along the south bank of the Assiniboine River through to the Red River south of Winnipeg. There are 520,000 acres of crop land with 14 percent in special crops. The adoption of advanced land and water management technology can increase crop yields by 15 percent and would provide opportunities for diversification of crop production. Activities would include channel improvements in co-ordination with extension activities provided by the province to improve agricultural practices. That's what the project apparently is.

MR. MANNES: The emphasis on this particular program, is it towards better drainage or is it towards irrigation? I couldn't read out of that.

MR. MACKLING: My advice is that it's intended to improve drainage but with the value-added crops benefit.

MR. MANNES: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

MR. MACKLING: I'll give it to you again. The benefit is to improve drainage plus to provide the added benefit of irrigation to crops. Just drainage, I'm sorry. Specifically drainage.

MR. MANNES: There was no irrigation potential whatsoever considered in this study?

MR. MACKLING: Not on these projects, no.

MR. MANNES: Specifically, what drainage considerations were being looked at, at this time and in what area?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry, what was the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you ask the question again, please?

MR. MANNES: Specifically, what drainage improvements were being considered?

MR. MACKLING: In the La Salle?

MR. MANNES: In the La Salle Study.

MR. MACKLING: Improvement of existing drains and laterals.

MR. MANNES: Was the Mills Wheatland drain one of those?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. MANNES: And what is the status of that particular drain at this time?

MR. MACKLING: It's in the detail of the Capital item.

MR. MANNES: Do I understand that then to mean that there will be spending allocated towards that particular drain this coming year?

MR. MACKLING: If we get to Item 13 and if it's approved.

MR. MANNES: What types of crops were being envisaged as far as value-added, I think, crops production?

MR. MACKLING: I don't have those details at hand. I'm sure that we'll have them when we get to Item 13.

MR. MANNES: The Morris River, specifically, what types of programs are being envisaged along this drainage course?

MR. MACKLING: I think I can give all those specific details under Item 13 because again that's in the Capital item.

MR. MANNES: You were so kind to read me the description on the La Salle . . .

MR. MACKLING: If you want the detail on each one and providing I don't have the same questions under Item 13, I'd be happy to deal with it now, but if we're going to have it again for those members of the Committee who are not here, then it would be better if they know that we're dealing with that item that they'd be interested to hear it.

MR. MANNES: Seeing three of these projects in fact do fall within my constituency, I think . . .

MR. MACKLING: I'd be happy to give you that information under Item 13 if you want it then. You want it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would caution you once again that this is being recorded and I'd ask you to be recognized by the Chair; otherwise, they're having trouble taping.

The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Are you that indicating to both of us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm indicating that to both of you.

You have a question?

MR. MANNES: I'm waiting for an answer.

MR. MACKLING: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the Morris River area project is an area that includes lands within the Morris River Watershed and contains 580,000 acres of crop land with 23 percent in special crop production. Most of the grain corn produced in Manitoba is grown in the well drained soils in this area. Crop productivity constraints are excess water in wet years, particularly in the heavy soil area and drought in dry years in the lighter soil areas. The adoption of advanced land and water management techniques will provide opportunities for increased productivity and expanded acreage devoted to special crops. Activities will include channel improvements in co-ordination with extension activities provided by the province to improve agricultural practices and I'm sure the honourable member would like to give detail on all the other items. Correct?

MR. MANNES: I'd like to ask some specific questions on the Morris River. Along what stretch of the Morris River are we talking about? It's a long river, it's some 20 miles long.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we don't have the map with us, but the Morris River is an extensive river but it is particular sections of that drainage basin that are being dealt with under this program.

MR. MANNES: I realize that. I'm wondering if you can tell me which specific sections. That's my question.

MR. MACKLING: If I give you the section, township and range, would that be helpful?

MR. MANNES: It would be helpful if I could go and get my constituency maps so I could make reference — I would prefer a town location if I could.

MR. MACKLING: We'll have that detail, but we don't have it now because we didn't think we were going to be on Item 13 tonight, but I'm giving you as much information as I can now.

MR. MANNES: Will the Minister then allow me to ask questions specific to this under 13 then?

MR. MACKLING: Surely.

MR. MANNES: I then would like to ask a question further to the fourth project that you listed and you may want to again read it out because I wasn't able to write it all down. I believe it was called the Domain Crop Improvement.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, it's called the Domain Crop Area Demonstration Project. This demonstration will provide opportunities for evaluation of methods of optimizing water and land management programs. The comprehensive system will be developed in the domain area where excess precipitation, heavy soils and flat topography combine to inhibit productivity. A comprehensive land and water system would be put in place which will allow for documentation of productivity changes which can be realized from an optimized system of land and water management. The project will serve as a demonstration of the methods of optimizing productivity for a large land area with similar problems.

MR. MANNES: I should probably put on the record that in fact this particular project is very close to my home, so I would like to ask some specific questions about it. First of all, how was this particular drain selected? What was the criteria established that brought forward this drain as a demonstration drain?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that a committee of officials from Agriculture and Natural Resources studied areas and came up with this area as a good project area for testing given the soil conditions and water and other characteristics indicated in the study.

MR. MANNES: Can the Minister give me some indication as to how much money was expended in this particular project in 1981?

MR. MACKLING: I could give you that particular during consideration of the item under Item 13.

MR. MANNES: Could the Minister also tell me specifically who in the Water Resources Branch took the responsibility or has the responsibility for managing this particular project?

MR. MACKLING: The Regional Water Manager would be responsible for the overall development.

MR. MANNES: And that person is?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Moffat.

MR. MANNES: Can the Minister give me some idea what major work was done in 1981 in particular in regard to this drain? What type of major excavation was performed?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we could probably get further information on that, but Mr. Weber's recollection is that a main channel was excavated.

MR. MANNES: You may not wish to answer this now, you may want to leave it until 13, but what is the intentions as far as 1982 in this particular project?

MR. MACKLING: We'll have all the detail under Item 13.

MR. MANNES: I suppose my final question on this particular project is what was the intent as far as bringing forward the value at a concept into this particular area? What crops were considered as being considered as potential?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, we again under Item 13, probably Mr. Weber will have all the details of that and corn was one commodity; probably he'll have the specifics on the others at the next meeting.

MR. MANNES: I'll defer to the Member from Pembina if he's next on the list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't got a list. The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Almasippi Wet Sands were mentioned as the third area in the Value-Added Crop Production Agreement. What's the closest community to that test project?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that this is a portion of Manitoba, south of Portage la Prairie. It's in the Gainsborough Hall area, or southeast of that, and it's called the Overhill Drainage Area.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, what's the predominant agriculture in there now, is it pasture land or is it cultivated land?

MR. MACKLING: No open areas, mainly pasture land.

MR. ORCHARD: What does the development of this involve — is it drainage — to bring it under cultivated crop production, or are you attempting to improve is as the fodder production area?

MR. MACKLING: I will read what the project has indicated to me. This project will demonstrate improved technology applied to crop production on a large sandy land area along the base of the Manitoba escarpment. Spring flooding has led to pressures for increased drainage. On the other hand, current research indicates that while existing circumstances provide problems in the spring, the highly pervious nature of the soils requires retention and storage of water to prevent depletion of water in the root zone during the growing season. Demonstration works will include the provision of water controls and the development of management techniques for operating these controls. Since these wet sands rely heavily on a perched water table to maintain their productivity, the developments of proper land and water management systems can increase production. Activities will include development of methods to improve land management practices, ground water utilization and agricultural practices.

MR. ORCHARD: One phrase in there caught my ear,

water controls. Are you contemplating the holdback of spring run-off water for retention in these pervious soils, is that what the water controls are?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it would involve controlled runoff, so that the runoff wouldn't be as fast and the water would be held to dissipate into the root zone.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, now that intrigues me, Mr. Chairman. Does this mean that since this land area is at the foot of the escarpment, does this mean that you're contemplating retention ponds in the ravines in the escarpment?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, this doesn't mean retention up in the escarpment, this is temporary retention as the water flows normally through that land.

MR. ORCHARD: How? What controls?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's what the experimentation is all about.

MR. ORCHARD: Absolutely, and I'm all for experiments when I know what they do — what water controls are going to do. If they're not holding dams with slow release in ravines in the escarpment, then what are they, are they dikes thrown around square miles of land to allow them to flood, and then the dikes opened up once the soil is saturated? What's the controls?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, these are holding dams within the drains themselves. In other words, they're control structures within the drains. There's no large retention ponding anywhere.

MR. ORCHARD: So that you're hoping by holding the water back in the drains that it percolates sideways into these permeable sands?

MR. MACKLING: That's right.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, are you contemplating, in this Almasippi Wet Sands Area, corn production as a value-added crop?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I understand that's one of the crops.

MR. ORCHARD: You see, you present rather a unique set of circumstances when you are going to allow lateral percolation of spring run-off water. Quite likely you're going to delay the time in which you can get on those soils with agricultural equipment. Are you contemplating a successful growing of grain corn, which requires quite an early planting in the spring to garner the necessary heat units. How do you correlate more water infiltration with the need to get on the land at an early date, or are you not contemplating grain corn?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this will not change in a deleterious way the surface of the soil for agricultural practise. This will facilitate the holding of moisture or the distribution of

moisture through the root zone, and the whole purpose of this is to study the probability or the possibility of development of the land in this way for these special crops. It may prove that it's not productive and possible, but this is experimentation.

MR. ORCHARD: How big an area is involved?

MR. MACKLING: We'll have the details under Item 13.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you. The control structures that are envisioned for the existing drainage system, will the placement of these control structures during peak runoff in the spring cause flooding of the adjacent lands? In other words, will they cause the normal run-off waters to inundate adjacent farmland?

MR. MACKLING: That will be determined.

MR. ORCHARD: So that is a distinct possibility that these control structures could possibly flood adjacent farmland?

MR. MACKLING: Well, that isn't the anticipated reaction, but the project will be, I assume, to regulate the control works in the drains. If it appears that flooding is imminent, the controls will be released. Certainly, the object won't be to flood land.

MR. ORCHARD: So that these are lock-type control structures?

MR. MACKLING: I don't have the details here, but they'll be control structures adequate to the test program.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, if this test here — how long are you going to be undertaking this test? Was it three years from this summer on?

MR. MACKLING: Three years and it started last year so we're into them.

MR. ORCHARD: Okay, are the control structures in place now or will they be put in place this summer?

MR. MACKLING: I have to give that detail under Item 13. I don't have that information at the moment.

MR. ORCHARD: What was undertaken last year? Was it mainly an improvement of the existing drains?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to give all the details of what construction took place, if any. Studies were made and we'd have to reserve on the extent of the construction that took place last year.

MR. ORCHARD: Is part of this test going to be an alfalfa rotation that can utilize ground water?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if that's a suggestion, we'll have to take that under consideration.

MR. ORCHARD: No, I wasn't making that as a sug-

gestion. I thought you knew what was going on in this project.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this was a project initiated under the former Minister presumably, so I hope that someone knew what was going on.

MR. ORCHARD: Maybe then since this Minister doesn't know, I should ask my colleague for that answer if that's not available.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the honourable member would have had that opportunity had he exercised it some time ago.

MR. ORCHARD: I detect a slight amount of sarcasm in the Minister's answer.

MR. MACKLING: No, no.

MR. ORCHARD: That's very unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, when all of us as Manitobans, even my friend from Dauphin here, are greatly concerned with how you expend money for the betterment of agriculture in Manitoba. I'm sure that all Manitobans would be gratified and rest easy tonight knowing the depth of knowledge that you have of this project, Mr. Minister.

So, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Minister when we get to Item 13 will be able to give us more definitive answers as to what target crops are there, whether potatoes, other root crops are being considered in these Almasippi Wet Sands so that we can evaluate how well he is carrying out a very worthwhile project that we initiated in our term in office.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it indicates that we believe in providing information when we have it. As I indicated to the honourable members, this information would be produced under Item 13. We're not at Item 13, but I'm prepared to stay as long as the honourable members want to get information on these projects in anticipation of the item to come without our having the necessary detail. We'll certainly be open to all the constructive advice that the honourable member wishes to bring in respect to the excellence of specialized crops and any other particular knowledge he has now or should have had before when he was with the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert back to Item 4.(g)(2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been passed.

MR. KOVNATS: If I could just explain, the reason that I would like to revert back to that item inasmuch as I thought at the time when I was the member to speak after the Member for Inkster and then there was a motion for committee rise and I think that I was the next one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll let you go back. Go ahead. Go back to 4.(g)(2).

MR. KOVNATS: Actually, I was going to discuss the diking on Carriere Street during the 1948 and 1950 flood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have some order, they are unable to catch the tape. Could we have some order please?

The Member for Niakwa.

MR. KOVNATS: I was going to discuss the diking on Carriere Street which was the dividing line between St. Vital and St. Boniface during the 1948 and 1950 flood, but under the particular circumstances, I would believe that it could be discussed more under Minister's Salary and I would defer to that. I just wanted to bring a point up that whoever had made the motion of committee rise was out of order at the time. It was my turn and if there was any motion to be made at the time, it would have been my motion and now that I have the floor, I would suggest committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, say aye. All those opposed?

The nays have it.

MR. ENNS: Am I next on the list, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are next on the list.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I now would like to take this opportunity to enter into a lengthy dissertation to the Honourable Minister about a subject matter that is a serious matter and that we spend a great deal of time discussing in the House. It, I suppose, partly comes about because of the polarized situation of politics in Manitoba and it is germane, Mr. Chairman, to the subject matter under discussion.

You see, Mr. Chairman, whenever Conservatives speak out in favour of, in support of, various public undertakings particularly of the kind that this department has a very big hand in, and this particular branch has a very big hand in, we hear cries from the honourable members of the government suggesting that we are a bunch of socialists or that we are supporting socialist measures. Of course, if you want to use that description, it's a very frank acknowledgement that has always been there with the Conservative Party about the legitimate role that government and the public sector has to play in providing the kind of infrastructure that any civilized and modern society requires in this day and age to provide for the many needs of its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to take the next 15 or 20 minutes to recount that certainly the Conservative Party on record simply on what it has accomplished in this particular area, germane to these Estimates, in the area of Water Resources, I remind you it was a Conservative administration that acknowledged the sound suggestions that a previous Liberal administration shortly after the 1950 flood in a very substantial study that suggested that the public should undertake massive water control, you know, projects . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order?

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order.

MR. ANSTETT: I was waiting to be identified, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is I believe we reverted back only for the Member for Niakwa and we I understand are on (h)(2). I'm waiting to hear the honourable member's contribution on Other Expenditures under the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement. I'm sure he wishes to speak to that, but I didn't hear that in his comments.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, did the member have a point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the member has a point of order. We are on (h)(2) at this time.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interjection because what we are dealing with, (h)(2), is the rather significant amount of both federal and provincial tax dollars that will be expended on various different projects in the Domain area, on the Marsh River, on the Morris River, on the Almasippi Sands; these are public monies that we are asking our citizens, not just from Winnipeg, not just from Manitoba, but from Peterborough, Ontario, from Kamloops, British Columbia, to Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, to help us build a better, what? A better drainage ditch for the Member for Morris; certainly not, Mr. Chairman.

What we are talking about is the whole philosophy of using public dollars for the improvement of infrastructure in a province. Mr. Chairman, I for one, I can appreciate that any government — and I'm happy that the Minister of Economic Development is with us shortly because I look to this Minister as an ally, as a friend of those who think that there is an appropriate role for the public sector to play and indeed, particularly in times of tight money, a role which they should think twice about.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, I know that this government can build airplanes; they proved it — \$44 million worth, and they actually flew, Mr. Chairman. The trouble was they couldn't get the necessary air-worthy certificates or they couldn't get the necessary sales for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm coming very close, we're talking about the spending of millions of dollars by the public sector.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that this government can explore and develop mines, etc., etc.. I know that they can drill for oil and probably if they drill enough holes they'll find oil, Mr. Chairman, but, Mr. Chairman, and I'm coming right to these Estimates, I want sufficient public dollars left over for the kind of value-added crop projects to be undertaken and not to have to compete, not to have to compete with the moneys that your colleagues, Sir, your colleagues are going to want to find the mines and to drill the oil wells and to build airplanes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I really look to this Minister, and I want to assure this Minister that he has far more sup-

port from the members of the Conservative Caucus then he realizes in this particular area, but I say very seriously, Mr. Chairman, it's not my mistake that in our society, particularly in North America, that we have with all our faults and with all our problems, but nonetheless have managed to probably lead the world in providing at the same time a superstructure, a climate; whether it's in health, whether it's in education, whether it's in roads, whether it's in drainage, and at the same time provide a society with an abundance of consumer goods that are the envy of the world and cause us all kinds of problems.

Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that this set of Estimates — we've heard as a result of these discussions where this Minister, this government, when faced with a shortage of funds, when faced with a cutback from Ottawa took the first . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside, could I remind you that Rule 39 says you have to speak to the item that is being discussed at this time and you are a way off base.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously concerned and I have reason to be concerned that the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crop Production, which last year we had budgeted \$221,500 for; this year this government has reduced that to \$121,200, is the point that I'm trying to make.

I admit, Mr. Chairman, that I am perhaps using some licence, but I want the members of the Committee to understand that that is an inevitable result that there will be a reduction and there will continue to be a reduction in these kind of public programs; whether it is in the building of highways; whether it is in the building of water conservation projects; whether it is in many other what I call high-priority functions of government to undertake. If this government and if this Minister allows himself to be bamboozled in Cabinet to let some of that money that he should have in this department go to building another Chinese food manufacturing company, or some other particular venture that happens to be the vent of the Minister of Economic Development on any given particular day.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I'm doing, and I want to come to order, that the concern that we have is that in these set of Estimates that are before you, and Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be out of order, I just want to allude. We've already passed the one appropriation that says the six or the five very worthwhile conservation districts have received zero increase despite a 11 percent inflation.

We can just about know that he can cut out \$900,000 from his capital diking program in the Valley, because of the way it's been presented. So, there's another \$900,000, that no doubt, she will gobble up, Mr. Minister. I want you to dig in your heels and fight for these battles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside, I think that you're out of order again. Could you get back to the item we're discussing?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I keep coming back. We are talking about the Manitoba Value-Added

Crop Production.

Mr. Chairman, I might just remind the Honourable Mr. Chairman and government members of the Committee that we were prepared to pass these Estimates at 10 o'clock sharp, but it was government members that chose not to allow that to happen, so, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that some latitude be given to the Members of the Opposition who now are faced with the opportunity of expanding on some of our long held concerns.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister specifically to interrupt my dissertation with him, because I intend to carry on for a considerable time, to explain the just about 100 percent reduction in item under discussion (h)(2) from \$221,000 to \$121,000.00.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this interruption, because I think that I could speak for at least a half-an-hour in explanation of this, but I hesitate to exercise all of that time. If the honourable member would refer to Item No. 13, when we do get to that item, a substantial portion of the former budgeted item of \$276,000 now is transferred to the capital portion. If extensive detail is wanted, I can do that at length, but I think that that would be an abuse of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield): The honourable member has 28 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I do now want to raise a rather serious matter with that appears to be an obvious, perhaps an oversight on the part of my government, my former Minister of Agriculture, although I hardly doubt that, but with an issue that was raised earlier in the same set of Estimates and that is it would seem to me, although I note the Minister pointedly excluded irrigation and the impact of irrigation in some of these value-added crop production areas, and I'm thinking particularly of the area adjacent to the La Salle River, the Domain Improvement Project Area — was that some sort of description — Mr. Chairman, I don't fault the Minister at all for not necessarily being personally apprised of the situation, but it takes little imagination to realize that in that portion of the province perhaps some of the greatest potential lies for intensive high-yield high-production specialty crop of all kinds to take place.

I know, Mr. Chairman, because I was privy to Treasury Board discussions at the time the Value-Added Crop Agreement with the Federal Government was discussed and signed, that it was with that in mind, that the initial agreements were signed, the areas such as Domain were selected because of the soil, because of the availability of water, and because of the tremendous potential that lay in intensive irrigated farm production in this area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, earlier the Minister had indicated a cancellation of a project that would divert some Assiniboine River waters into La Salle, and I have to call it a cancellation because the Reeves involved in the RM of Cartier and Montcalm, Macdonald, await that project. They were given every reason to understand that project was to proceed with. I

remind the Honourable Minister that on two occasions we have spent upwards of \$90,000 in pumping water from the Assiniboine to the La Salle.

So to my friend from Inkster who expresses the environmental concerns — you know, we are not now talking about transferring Missouri River water into the Hudson Bay River Basin, we are talking about transferring water that is in the same watershed as lies within a half a mile of each other and in fact that under government policy, both I might say by the New Democratic administration of the '70s and by the Conservative administration spent upwards to \$90,000 in the temporary pumping of the water from the Assiniboine into the La Salle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a fairly simple straightforward project, not a big capital project, estimated in the range of \$300,000 to \$400,000 would provide a permanent capacity to divert, when needed, waters from the Assiniboine to the La Salle, so the Minister regrettably had to inform the Member for Morris and the residents along the La Salle that that project may not proceed with. I hope the Minister will consider it.

I raise it, Mr. Speaker, because if the Chairman would be on the bit he would be calling me out of order right now. I raise it only in conjunction with — here we are talking about Value-Added Production Program which involves irrigation, and if ever you have a situation where one hand of government doesn't know what the other hand is doing, we are prepared to expend several hundred thousand dollars now to invoke an education program in an intensified sophisticated water development program in the Domain area. What for? So that it can avail itself to the waters of the La Salle to be irrigated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. May I ask the member if he could direct his comments on the diversion of waters from the Assiniboine to the La Salle on the next item, the Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement. I understand the funds for that project are included in that item. It's the very next item.

MR. ENNS: It's questionable whether we'll get that far in the Estimates tonight, but Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I would ask the member then to direct his comments to 4.(h)(2) please.

MR. ENNS: No, I'm raising it only because, you know, we are now dealing with a Value-Added Crop Production Program, and whether or not irrigation is specifically singled out in the program. I appreciate that the projects as such, as they involve this department, have to do with the upgrading, cleaning out, further, you know, sophistication of the drainage system in that area. All of that is being done with the consideration that irrigation will be used. Mr. Chairman, you cannot expect the landowner on whom an ever increasing assessment is going to be placed with these drainage improvements — (Interjection) — certainly he's going to benefit from it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm being lured into being out of order by all the members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Will you allow the Member for Lakeside to make his contribution?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, what I'm saying is that for the individual and indeed for the public to get its return from the dollars that we are expending under 4(h), we need to have heightened agricultural production or else somebody will suggest to us that we have spent money foolishly. No government wants to spend money foolishly.

So, Mr. Chairman, I point this out to the Honourable Minister; I believe there's a contradiction here; I believe that he jeopardizes the success of the Value-Added Crop Production Program Project, particularly the Domain area and the lands bordering the La Salle or the Morris Rivers, because all of these lands — the several hundred thousands of acres of lands — I'm looking to the Member for Morris for some confirmation, but I believe we are talking about upwards to 500,000 acres of land that through these projects can considerably enhance the agricultural productivity of the Red River Valley.

Mr. Chairman, that just automatically leads to what I know will interest the Minister of Economic Development, the countless canning and food processing industries that can be brought into production if we have these intensive farming take place in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Honourable Minister to specifically answer the question for us about whether or not he does not share the concern that on the one hand projects should be cancelled or delayed that would facilitate irrigation and improvement through the agricultural productivity in the area; while with the other hand he is spending dollars to create the necessary environment to handle that kind of intensive farming; to handle that kind of irrigation system that his other branch wants to cut off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (h)(2) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond at some length, but I'll resist the temptation.

Mr. Chairman, obviously we are concerned to be innovative and we're concerned to know what is in the interests of Manitoba agriculture despite the fact that these programs were initiated under previous administration. We aren't doctrinaire and we haven't cancelled them; we haven't abruptly terminated the endeavours here. We are going to be pragmatic; we're going to be concerned to see what is in the interests of Manitoba agriculture and while we're doing that we're going to be protecting the environment.

Now in respect to that, certainly we're going to look at the effect on the environment. These projects are not absolute in their result; otherwise they wouldn't be investigative in nature. We don't know what the potential is. We will have to await the test from these various programs and certainly we'll be heartened if those tests are favourable. We'll be concerned as I've indicated to be very scientific; to be pragmatic, not doctrinaire and we won't be making partisan politics out of what has to be in the interests of all Manitobans, a concern to make the best of our soils and our waters in this province.

Now, to go further at length in respect to this, I think

would perhaps be taking away from the full discussion of Item 13 when we get to that item and I know honourable members have specific questions about that, but let me say that we haven't cancelled any projects, even though they might be suspect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4. (h).

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: It was an error before when I indicated that three of the projects listed were in my constituency, as a matter of fact, there are four. So I would like to ask some additional questions on the Almasippi Wet Sands Project.

I am wondering, specifically where this problem, this specific water problem, where is it located in the Gainsborough area? I am led to believe it is about some two or three miles south of the 240 junction, is that correct?

MR. MACKLING: I don't know that in the relationship to the neighbours that the honourable member is talking about. If you can give me more specifics, I will try and locate it for him.

MR. MANNES: More of a concern is to where is the source? From what municipality does most of this water originate? The problem, as I understand it, is in the Municipality of Portage but is it strictly Portage water, the Municipality of Portage water? In fact, does that water come from some other municipality?

MR. MACKLING: Gentlemen, I understand that the waters involved here commence from in the RMs of North Norfolk and North Cypress and the R M of Grey, and then run northerly into Portage La Prairie.

MR. MANNES: I am mostly concerned with those RMs of North Cypress and — what was the other one?

MR. MACKLING: Grey, Norfolk and Cypress.

MR. MANNES: Okay, are they involved in this project at all, representatives of their councils?

MR. MACKLING: The committee met with the representatives of the RMs last summer and since then has been in frequent consultation with them.

MR. MANNES: I am told that if there are any control structures they will not be received gladly by the representatives of those particular two municipalities. Is there any truth to that remark?

MR. MACKLING: Well, the honourable member is wanting me to indulge in rumour and I don't operate that way, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MANNES: What are they called — the controlled structures, where would the location of them be? Is anybody putting forward an idea at this point in time where they might be located?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we don't have the specifics here tonight, we will be happy to give that under Item 13. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that all of

these questions are more properly dealt with under Item No. 13 and I am undertaking that staff will have that detail when we get to Item 13, if and when we get to Item 13. I certainly want you to put all the questions you want tonight and we will probably take it as notice so that we will be better prepared to give you the specifics under Item 13, so I am happy to deal with it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNESS: Mr. Minister, my fear is that once Item 13 comes that there will be so many other items that, in fact, we won't be able to give it the amount of time.

MR. MACKLING: We are here until July.

MR. MANNESS: July, oh I thought it was going to be August.

MR. MACKLING: August, September, if you like.

MR. MANNESS: This particular drainage problem, I believe is referred to, is it the Overhill Drain?

MR. MACKLING: That's what we indicated, yes.

MR. MANNESS: It was something that came up consistently during the campaigns and people indicate to me that the way they are flooded at this particular time and many years out of a decade that, in fact, once this flood water spreads out over the whole area, in fact it doesn't subside into the natural drain and it does not allow them to put heavy machinery on that property or that land at all. Is the attempt to allow farm machinery on these particular soils — I believe they are some three miles south of the Gainsborough, in that area — by particularly those flood years and were to allow the placement of heavy machinery on those lands by the middle of May?

MR. MACKLING: The experimentation will prove whether or not some of these things are possible or otherwise.

MR. MANNESS: The project in 1982, can you give us any detail whatsoever, to what you envisage as far as continuing along and demonstrating what you are attempting to do?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if the officials of my department had that detail here, I would be glad to give it to you. We don't have it tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the Valued-Added crop trial area that is in the vicinity of the La Salle River — you may have answered this earlier on and I apologize for not catching it — but is there within that project the opportunity for irrigation trials, several irrigation trials?

MR. MACKLING: Not in the Valued-Added

portion of this.

MR. ORCHARD: Then since you are quite open to suggestions from the Opposition, particularly those of us who represent the areas, would that not be a logical extension of the Value-Added trials and experiments there to undertake several irrigation projects to determine whether the periodic weeks of drought that we can get ourselves into in the Julys and Augusts when the grain is filling that irrigation would be most beneficial, to add a lot of value to any crop that is there?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I had earlier indicated, these projects do not involve ponding of water. They involve limited reduction in flow during a periodic time to allow a greater dissipation of the water in the soils so that there is the added benefit in the root zone area. So there is no provision in these projects for ponding of water and thus irrigation; however, irrigation is something that we can look at in the future.

MR. ORCHARD: Not that I want to second guess the Minister, but I believe the Almasippi Wet Sands is a project where you're going to retain in the root zone quantities of water to be utilized by the crop during its natural growing season. But I don't believe, if I heard properly, the intentions in the La Salle River area that is the purpose of the experimentation there. I believe you indicated earlier that it was a drainage improvement and not a water retention and temporary ponding proposition, am I correct?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the La Salle Project is just the reverse endeavour to improve the removal of water that is trapped in the heavier soils.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, that's exactly the point I'm making. We've got two different types of soil, each with different capabilities, and that's why I make the point that if you're going to follow through with the most informational experiment in the La Salle area, it should be coupled with the drainage to ensure that the land can be accessible early in the year, but should follow through with some irrigation trials utilizing water from the La Salle River; and in that way this value-added crop production experiment in that area will give us the true indication as to whether we can support potatoes, sugar beets, corn, a number of crops that suffer seriously from the temporary drought periods that we encounter in the growing season in south-central Manitoba. So I would ask if irrigation can be part of that one particular experiment in the La Salle area?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the previous administration, under whose aegis this agreement was negotiated, apparently had not included that and it would now mean reopening the agreement with Federal Government and that isn't something you do lightly because you lose the project. In these days of Federal cutbacks, they'll be happy to get out of any spending program that we have ongoing now, so it's not my concern at this time to try to change any of those Federal agreements because I think we'd lose

Federal dollars if we went that route, but some time in the future perhaps we could consider something like that.

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly, I can appreciate that you wouldn't want to go back and try to open the agreement again, but let's say that the area involved in this value-added crop production; let's say that a farmer, a producer, in that area was interested in undertaking irrigation. I'm sure the Minister would deem that as a worthy addition outside of the agreement. All the producer would need in this case was access to the water, that he would consider that to be a very valuable addition to the existing experiment base.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, that might completely upset the careful recording of the result otherwise and so you wouldn't allow that to take place or you wouldn't get a reading on the project.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, that all depends on whether you — we have not got before us the land area that's going to be involved in this. If it was only two sections, for instance, certainly irrigating a quarter section of that would seriously jeopardize the overall project results, but let's say you had ten sections of land under this, surely irrigation of one or two quarter sections would not seriously jeopardize the kind of results you get and the Minister might consider an application to irrigate in conjunction with this program on a limited amount of the land that's in the project.

MR. MACKLING: Again, Mr. Chairman, I think my understanding of Federal-Provincial agreements are such that you don't depart from them. The minute that you would allow some irrigation to take place, the Federal Government would probably vitiate the agreement and we don't want that possibility to be given.

MR. ORCHARD: You know, that may well be, but I'm quite sure the Federal Government being an open and caring and considerate government would probably welcome the addition at your suggestion of a couple of quarter sections of irrigation and I'm quite sure if the Minister were to broach that subject with them and if he would give us that undertaking that he would do that, I'm quite sure he would find the Federal Government most co-operative with him in bringing some irrigation into that particular area as an additional trial.

MR. MACKLING: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member has been very successful in his negotiations with the Federal Government and certainly we'll take his advice and perhaps we can use his good offices in some of those negotiations from time to time.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, at any time that the Minister wants me to undertake negotiations with the Federal Government on his behalf, I'd be more than pleased to do that.

This gets us into that very touchy area that was alluded to earlier on of the whole matter of irrigation

on the La Salle River. When it could become a very valuable addition to the total experiment, a value-added crop production along the La Salle River, I think this Minister would be remiss if he passed up an opportunity to undertake some irrigation along there if the producers indicated a desire to irrigate there. I guess the difficulty this presents is in the position put forward by the Member for Inkster indicating that any — like to irrigate as I understand it on the La Salle would require some transfer of water from the Assiniboine over to the La Salle River and since the Member for Inkster has already given notice that would probably be one project that is going to take years and years of study before it ever comes to any meaningful conclusion, this brings quite a — I guess I might say — an alarming spectre for those hard working farmers and producers along the La Salle who may be desirous of doing some irrigation on lands adjacent to the La Salle River and, of course, that's why I posed my previous question as to whether the Minister would consider the addition of irrigation as part of the experiment in the Domain area. I don't want to read into the record any ulterior motive by the Minister, but it would seem that there may be some reluctance on his part and I only hope it's not reluctance predicated on the information the Member for Inkster has given us that transfer of water from the Assiniboine to the La Salle is indeed a long way down the road. I hope that's not the reason for the apparent reluctance to undertake irrigation along the La Salle River.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, these projects that fall under capital, of course, are in the work. I've indicated that we haven't changed that; they are ongoing. We will look at them when we get to Item 13 if we ever do, we'll be in a position to consider them and if at that time the Committee deems fit to pass the Estimates then there will be provision for the work to go ahead.

MR. ORCHARD: That's most encouraging. Then the transfer of water from the Assiniboine to the La Salle would be one of the capital projects you're willing to include this year?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, that is not on the list for this year.

MR. ORCHARD: But, with the Minister's good office and our gentle encouragement in the Opposition, there's probably no doubt in my mind that this Minister will have that included next year in his Estimates.

MR. MACKLING: We'll, in our usual pragmatic, fair and forthright way, look at all considerations, all requests.

MR. ORCHARD: That is what is of concern, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to not go off necessarily on the La Salle, but I do fear that the members in the Opposition feel that any kind of an irrigation project is an essential thing, that they're

trying to move ahead on them and feeling that there's some sort of essential need that the Province of Manitoba be irrigated.

I'd like to bring to their attention that in an area, and perhaps the La Salle could be included in this and the areas adjacent to the La Salle, that if it is a general low water area, if the area has experienced the drying up of the La Salle to the extent that they could not irrigate in years in the past, then maybe we should be considering not introducing, in a low water supply area, crops which have a high water demand. It makes a touch of sense to stay away from the crops where you're trying to build into the infrastructure not only the cost of farming and the cost of irrigating the land and what not, but it makes good common sense that you try and adjust the types of crops you are growing according to the situation in the area in which you are farming. So this idea that you can turn any part of an area, be it semi-arid, be it not necessarily a full semi-arid area, but you are going to move it into some kind of an oasis, I think it is really a misunderstanding in many areas.

Now, one thing I'd like to ask the Minister, and that is regarding cost benefit analysis, and recognizing that all these projects must pass a cost benefit analysis before they are approved. What I'm wondering in the length of this program, the Value-Added Crops Production Program, has been in place with the demonstration projects, I am wondering if we have any kind of data so far. Once the programs are ongoing, if there is still a CBA above one, or is the CBA less than one. We've had so many projects where the benefits have been so overstated compared to the costs, and the costs have been purposely understated in the past, in many projects throughout the world, I might add, not just here in Manitoba, and what I'd like to see is some kind of analysis of the projects that we have gone ahead with in the past, and see just how much of a benefit, if the benefits they are giving is anything close to what was being projected. As a matter of fact, since this is largely a demonstration sort of program, I would suggest, that in the Annual Report of the department, that there be given comparisons of what the initial project was estimated, what the cost benefit would be, and that when the Annual Report of the department comes out that they give actual year-by-year benefits with the apportionment of the cost, both of initial construction and also the cost of operations, so we can have a better idea of just what kind of cost benefit in dollar terms. We should also consider the concept of introducing energy balances into the things as well, and see how much energy the land is producing under these new higher value-added crops and the amount of energy that we are consuming.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's part, of course, the experimentation is to determine whether or not the cost benefits really are there. These projects, with the exception of one, were given a cost benefit of one, or better, and unless they are one, or almost one, they don't receive serious consideration, the Federal Government will not participate.

MR. SCOTT: Then, Mr. Minister, of the ones that are ongoing so far, what kind of a cost benefit are they producing once they're installed?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, none of them are in being yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to wait until you are identified by the Chair, please? Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Well, I think I have answered the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCOTT: At what stage, Mr. Minister, will we start getting responses and start getting data from these projects?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in about two years.

MR. SCOTT: Is it our intention to keep forging ahead with projects under this program until we start getting some initial data back?

MR. MACKLING: Well, the proposals that have been referred to are the proposals that are committed to at this time, and there's no commitment beyond those at this time.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The dissertation by the Member for Inkster on cost benefits, etc. etc., I would only make one small suggestion to you, Mr. Minister, not knowing which side of the argument the Member for Inkster is on, whether he is with us or agin us, and with you or agin you, that if you were to assure adequate supplies of water in the La Salle River on a transfer basis from the Assiniboine River, I am quite sure that the Member for Inkster would not have to worry his little heart about the cost benefit ratio because farmers would use that water if it was available in irrigation systems, and any cost benefit analysis would not be needed. The producers would do their cost benefit analysis and they would make it pay as they have in irrigating from the Assiniboine River in Portage la Prairie, as they have in the pumping irrigation systems in Carberry, and as they have in some limited irrigation from wells and borrow pits in the Winkler area. That economic decision would be made by producers, if and when, water supply was available.

And I think, Mr. Minister, that's why this side of the government — Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition — has placed some considerable emphasis and some considerable advice to you tonight on the advisability of proceeding posthaste with the water transfer from the Assiniboine to the La Salle River. Give the producers in that area the water and, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Minister it will be well made use of to the benefit of the producers in the area and to the benefit of all Manitobans, because anytime one of our farmers can produce more value per acre in diversified crops he helps all of Manitoba, and every single Manitoban through that increased production, so that leave the Minister not be hung up on some of the cost benefit analysis that the Member for Inkster wants to make on these irrigation projects. Provide the producers the water and they'll make the cost benefit analysis; they

will produce the added-value crops under irrigation as they have in a number of areas throughout the province, with water supply being made available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(h)(2)—pass; 4.(g)(l) Salaries — the Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS (Lakeside) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement is again a fairly comprehensive program that covers a number of matters. What I'm particularly interested in is that we had undertaken in the last few years a Drought Proofing Study with the Federal Government, and I am wondering — I apologize, I should know perhaps — whether or not any of the expenditures on that Drought Proofing Study are included in this appropriation?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Drought Proofing Studies are involved in this item, and included in this is increasing the storage capacity of the existing Morden Dam, and that item, I think, is reflected in the Capital item, again. Drought Proofing Studies — The Assiniboine South Hespeler Project and Water Supply Investigations, Investigations of Ground Water.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I recall, with some pleasure, having been at the sod turning, if you like, of the Morden Dam improvement that took place this summer. I could hardly fail to notice the presence of the Federal Minister who arrived - I'm not sure if it was just one helicopter or two helicopters - he had a long distance to come from. He was coming from Morris, Manitoba where he was in his capacity of Minister of DREE, I believe, was involved in some meeting with the people of the . . . but in any event the two birds came down from us on that fine sunny day in Morden and the thought crossed through my mind that the Federal Government probably spent more money in getting their Minister there on that particular occasion than on the project. Nonetheless, that's the way things are done, you know, in a grand manner. It is called a greater presence on the part of the Federal Government in getting a greater share of their political credits when they contribute to a particular program.

I must admit the school children of Morden had delight watching the birds come down from the big sky, and they are an impressive sight, you know. The Federal Minister didn't offer me a ride, by the way; I came by car from my ranch.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would be good enough to give us an update of that particular project? I would assume that a fair bit of earth has been moved. Is the project on schedule — a status report of the project at Morden.?

MR. MACKLING: The project, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside indicated, has been in the work now for some time. My advice is that it should be finished this spring providing we get the money.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, one of the major undertakings of this study group is of course to do precisely what the title of the study indicates — drought proofing. Drought proofing in

Southern Manitoba means, among other things — but we are now dealing with the Department of Water Resources — the provision, the capacity, to store surface water. It can do many things; it can replenish ground water supplies in certain areas. But certainly Manitoba and that portion of the province has a unique capacity to considerably enhance our capacity for ground water or surface water and storage of that valuable resource. The various significant impounding of water behind the Shellmouth Dam along the same river, the Assiniboine demonstrates that.

There are those members here with the possible exception of the Minister of Economic Development and myself who are of course too young to remember. I show no fear of favour to members of the opposite sex; I regard her as my equal in every way. There are younger members here that don't recall the very high degree of controversy that took place in this province in the mid '60s when a decision was made to proceed with the \$19 million-\$20 million Portage diversion as opposed to, at that time the proponents of a Holland Dam.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the Holland Dam is far from dead. In fact, the issue is perhaps more alive today than it ever was. I also have reasonably good information from the federal department who is now well served by a former Deputy Minister of mine, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Collins, who is the Deputy Minister to Mr. DeBanne, who indicated to me on that occasion at Morden that the Province of Manitoba would be well advised to push and to move forward with the Holland Dam as a major water conservation project. For those who are not fully familiar with the area, we are talking about a major water conservation dam project near the community of Holland where the Assiniboine River, the valley of the Assiniboine River, is ideally suited for that kind of a project. I understand it is a major project. I don't pretend to know precisely the dollars involved, but it could well be in the \$40 to \$50 million, \$50 to \$60 million in terms of today's inflationary costs. We are not talking about a minor project and I would ask the Honourable Minister to comment on whether or not any preliminary or interim reports of the drought proofing committee substantiate a gut feeling that I have always had, that project in view of the heightened demands for water, not just for the primary and principal users such as people who are actively involved in irrigation, but for the replenishment of aquifers for the maintenance of ground water levels in the whole region and for the possible diversion.

I know that words like "diversion" seem to upset socialists. I can recall having a great deal of difficulty in 1969 with the diversion planned for another river up north, the Churchill Diversion I think it was called. Diversion seems to get kind of knee-jerked reactions from the members opposite, but I must indicate to the Honourable Minister, the same drought-proofing committee looks upon the possibility of diverting substantial quantities of water from the Assiniboine into that rich, fertile, Southern Manitoba country all the way to the Morden area. Mr. Chairman, this would of course call for the construction of the Holland Dam and I would be delighted if the Minister would choose, now that he has kind of gotten his second wind in the consideration of these Estimates, to feel free to

expound at some length about his concepts of what he would like to accomplish during his period of time that he has a responsibility for this department.

Mr. Chairman, I indicate you with all sincerity it is a tremendous opportunity. I openly acknowledge that, you know, the problems that we face in getting things back into the planning stage after eight years of neglect was such that the four short years and the one and-a-half short years that I had in terms of being responsible as Minister, I could not achieve it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hold that opportunity open to the present Minister. Mr. Chairman, I know that honourable members from my side of the House would forgo naming that the Holland Dam, we could call it the Mackling Dam. —(Interjection)— Your name would be prescribed for generations to come, Mr. Minister, if you would indicate to us some progress with respect to that Drought Proofing Committee and the particular project that I am interested in is the Holland Dam.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the dam subject, is one that I suppose we could spend a lot of time on, but seriously I think that it is one of those concerns that has been with us for a great many years. As the honourable member has pointed out, I suppose that he was in government when people seriously considered that proposal back in the 1960s and regrettably there wasn't sufficient political will on the part of people in government at that time to deal with that question.

Now, the honourable member has quite rightfully pointed out that it is at the study stage once again and, I think, that we have to be open and reasonable and look at things and not be blinded by prejudice that someone else looked at something and disagreed with it or felt that another priority should hold sway. That will be my approach and I hope it reflects the approach of my colleagues.

We will look at projects such as the Holland Dam with a fair and reasonable mind and not prejudice what the studies will indicate. If they are favourable from both points of view, from the point of view of improving upon environmental conditions and not detracting from them, then we want to seriously consider that kind of a proposal. But, if it would have the effect of any one of a number of deleterious environmental effects, then of course we would have to reconsider.

As I've indicated earlier — and the honourable member for Inkster, I'm sure would remind us — that in some parts of North America they have installed dams and river systems to the point now where the rivers are virtually without water when they normally flow to the sea, and that's highly undesirable.

On the other hand, if what we're doing by way of a dam or a structure that ponds water is to retain water that normally would just be quickly swept to the sea, then perhaps we have gained something environmentally. However, again we have to reflect upon what the environmentalists tell us and our engineers will tell us about the natural flushing action of rivers running at more than capacity during spring runoff.

So, all of these things have to be weighed and weighed carefully, levity or otherwise in respect to dams and their multiple benefit as against the cost and the possible detriment. Those kind of evaluations

will be made and as I've indicated, in a reasonable manner, free from doctrine or doctrinaire ideas on the question. If the benefits, overall, are favourable, I'm sure that you'll see progress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you accept the naming of the dam after you?

MR. MACKLING: Oh, in respect to the naming, the Chairman has asked me — I would decline with a great deal of honour.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't leave on the record any suggestion at all by this Minister — I'm rather surprised that he makes it — that the decision to proceed with the Portage Diversion was one that was ill-conceived or that it was done in haste or now regarded by anybody as being a mistake, Mr. Chairman. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, I want to put it on the record, that the thousands of acres of land between here and Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, now I have a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MR. MACKLING: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It's fair game politically to indicate that someone has implied something, but the honourable member didn't even go that far. I did not say that the Portage Diversion was a mistake and the honourable member ought to correct the records.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Minister has a point of order. Would you . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister said is that because a government had the lack of will to do something — and at that time the question was not — you know, at a time when a government had a budget, the total government budget was \$200 million and a government with will found \$100 million to protect half of its citizens by doing three major works; the Winnipeg Floodway at \$64 million, the Portage Diversion at \$18 million or \$19 million and the Shellmouth at another \$17 million or \$18 million, at the time that the total budget for the government was some \$250 million. That took some will.

There is a distinct difference between a flood control measure, which the Portage Diversion is and a water conservation project, which is the impounding of water for a reservoir, for release, for irrigation purpose, for recreational purposes, for municipal purposes and for doing, in our geography, precisely what you alluded to, because we are not in the deep south; we are not the Colorado River; other streams and rivers do flush through in a short five, six weeks in the spring time, often with great damage and overflowing their banks and then for the rest of the summer, indeed, we're looking for water, we're short of water, we have to ration water users along the sides and our aquifers aren't being supplied.

But, it wasn't a question of either/or. We were reacting responsibly to one of the, I suppose, one of the most in-depth serious water hydraulic engineering

study ever undertaken in this province, which determined — and by the way, Mr. Chairman, if you want to take the color of politics up, that study wasn't undertaken by a Conservative administration, it was undertaken by a Liberal administration. But it took a Conservative administration to have the will to expend the dollars to bring about that flood protection for essentially the City of Winnipeg and its half-million people. It does include — the Portage Diversion is an integral part of the flood protection works undertaken as is the Shellmouth. It should not be confused with a water conservation project.

So, Mr. Chairman, that was the reason. If there was a misunderstanding, I withdraw any imputation to the Minister that I made, but it seemed to me that he suggested that because the Conservative administration did not have the will to proceed with the Holland Dam at that time, that I took that as implied criticism of having proceeded with the Portage Diversion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, having straightened that little matter out . . . I'm satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that again — and I'm trying hard not to stray from the actual Estimates, but if the project such as the Holland Dam were to be completed, it would provide the kind of waters in the necessary quantity that could enable stable supplies of water in the La Salle; it would enable stable supplies of water downstream from the Holland Dam and the Assiniboine; it could enable diversion of waters to more distant parts of southern Manitoba from that source; it could do all kinds of things, but it's all part of the package and it's a very legitimate area for the public sector to be involved in.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm encouraged that the Minister has at least made himself aware of the Canada-Manitoba Drought Proof Committee that has, among other considerations — and I'm sure some other members will want to allude to those other projects — the very substantial project known as the Holland Dam and I urge the government, particularly with the knowledge that the Federal Department appears to look with some favour on the project that they should proceed to press ahead with their investigations of this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4. (j) (1) — The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: I'll defer to the Member for Emerson. I think he has some very important questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To the Minister then, I have a few questions that I'd like to raise at this time.

One of them is, how many dam projects would be under consideration — 1. (m), Sir? How many of these projects would be under consideration other than study stage or planning stage at the present time in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to the Morden Dam which we have alluded to earlier that's under construction, in the Capital item under Item No. 13, there is the Edwards Creek Dam

improvement and the Grandview — it's really a dugout, it's not a dam — the Altona structure, it's a water supply study and the Pine River Water Supply Study, the Pipestone Creek Water Supply Study and the McAuley and Morris Water Supply Studies. PFRA, that was a few years back.

MR. DRIEDGER: I would like to thank the Minister for that information, that is approximately six projects that are in the various stages of planning and studies, et cetera. — (Interjection) — Eight different projects. Does this specific area that we are dealing with here, do these people have any affiliation or any contact with the people on the American side where there are major projects of this nature undertaken as well that could possibly affect the flooding aspect of the Red River Valley somewhere along the line? Is there any contact with them at all in discussions, because I know that the flood committees that have been involved have been on the American side and that various projects are on stream, so to speak, and I'm just wondering whether our people have any involvement or any knowledge of what's going on out there.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I'm advised by Mr. Weber that there is ongoing consultation with American engineers.

MR. DRIEDGER: Does the Minister feel with this kind of communication with them that eventually as these projects develop in the States that it will decrease the flood problems along the Red River Valley?

MR. MACKLING: All of the projects referred to have nothing to do with flooding but water supply.

MR. DRIEDGER: Would the Minister then possibly consider some of the areas where there was discussion about certain areas and communities that were flooding, that maybe water retention could serve two purposes, flood protection as well as water reservoirs to be used for certain projects as indicated by the Member for Lakeside?

MR. MACKLING: I am certain that my officials and I have heard that subject — I don't know whether you can improve upon what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said. If you want to say it over again, I'll be happy to listen.

MR. DRIEDGER: I just want to assure the Chairman that I would not want to repeat or have any repetition going on. Could the Minister possibly then, indicate how do these projects get initiated? Is it strictly through the advice of the Water Resources' engineers? Do municipalities make requests? Do communities make requests?

MR. MACKLING: The water supply projects — are those the ones your talking . . . ?

MR. DRIEDGER: I'm talking about — let's say dam locations where you have water reservoirs, holding areas, within the municipality.

MR. MACKLING: Either the municipality or the Water

Supply Board or both approaches the department and then studies or enquiries are initiated.

MR. DRIEDGER: How closely is the contact or let's say the liaison with municipalities in these areas when this kind of thing takes place. I hope it is not the way it was with the . . .

MR. MACKLING: Very close, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DRIEDGER: That would be a little different than we had dealing with the situation along the Red River Valley with the change of formula that we just discussed a little while ago. If the Minister is indicating that there is a better rapport and communication with the municipalities, I want to compliment him on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNESS: I am wondering if the weirs, a weir that was proposed — particularly the Morris Game and Fish have talked about — has it all been proposed for the Red River and whether that comes under this section at all?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the weir proposal was reviewed some time ago by the branch and found to be uneconomic.

MR. MANNESS: I take it that means it is obviously not included in the Capital expenditures.

MR. MACKLING: I think one could draw that conclusion.

MR. MANNESS: Well, I get sharper at 5 after 12. I'm wondering if that means, first of all, on what basis was that decision made, did that go through a cost benefit analysis also?

MR. MACKLING: I am advised that the administration at that time considered the cost wasn't justified. You might have to speak to your colleague on that, I don't know.

MR. MANNESS: I am wondering if the new administration would be amenable to this project coming forward again.

MR. MACKLING: Well, if the honourable member is making this a serious proposal, of course, we would have to take anything he says very seriously.

MR. MANNESS: Does that mean "yes?"

MR. MACKLING: I'm not making any formal commitment but certainly I'll ask staff to look at that and advise me about it, if that's a serious proposal?

MR. MANNESS: Yes, it most definitely is a serious proposal. You know, the people that are members of this particular organization feel that it's the long-run solution to attracting a lot of tourist trade and traffic. They feel and as also do the residents of St. Jean and Letellier that if there was a water retention system somewhere on the Red River and there is a particular

place about three or four miles north of Morris that lends itself well to putting that type of facility, even a rock facility, that would raise the water level some six feet that, in fact, they could develop an awful lot of recreation facilities along the Morris River up stream from there. So I think that it is a sincere and a serious request and one I hope the Minister will consider if not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe we're out of order, we're speaking about recreation. Does this come under this department?

MR. MACKLING: I understand it's a waterhole for swimming or other purposes.

MR. MANNESS: Yes, and the hole gets pretty deep, particularly when a flood comes along. So, I hope that the Minister might take it under advisement and maybe would consider including it in the 1982-83 Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're in 4.(j)(l).
The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not that I want to, Mr. Chairman, appear to be picking on the Member for Springfield but once again he did — I apologize for . . . unduly harsh to the Member for Springfield.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, the member has something to say, so let him have the opportunity.

MR. ORCHARD: I very much have something to say, Mr. Chairman. When we were discussing Item 4.(f) in which we pointed out certain concerns that we had as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition as to the statements that the Minister made in his speech . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 4.(j)(1) now.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, I realize that, Mr. Chairman, if you will just be slightly patient and allow me to get to my point you will see it is very pertinent to Item 4.(j), but whilst we were chastising the Minister for blowing up his belief in the conservation districts and saying that he believes in their intent and he supports them, et cetera, et cetera, but as we found in the Garrison, didn't have any additional money for them. In the Garrison Office the same problem occurred as you well recall, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Springfield pointed out that there was a massive increase in funding in Item 4.(j) and that this department had done its homework etc., etc. I only want to point out to the Member for Springfield that a great proportion of that additional funds in Item 4.(j) are from the Federal Government, not from the Provincial Government, so the credit that he was trying to take as being provincial credit is really not so; so I didn't want that incorrect impression to be left by the Member for Springfield to the members of this Committee and indeed to all Manitobans. We know that deep down inside, the Member for Springfield wants to be honest with the people of Manitoba. I just wanted to bring that to your attention, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have got a number of water development projects that have been under consideration for a number of years. One of them, of course, has involved the Pembina River which is a trans-border river, it crosses the US-Canada border approximately south and a little bit west of Morden in my constituency, and it joins up with a series of lakes that are very important to the recreation and water supply of many communities . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to tell the Member for Pembina the Hansard recorder is not picking you up. You'll have to speak a little closer to your mike, or if the House would have a little order so we can hear him.

MR. ORCHARD: How's that now, Mr. Chairman, is that . . . Did you get that first part?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Start from the first.

MR. ORCHARD: But at any rate, Mr. Chairman, even though members on the government side, the back-benchers, think this is a very delightful and amusing subject, it is of quite serious concern to the members of rural Manitoba who are part and parcel of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. We have the concerns and the future well-being of our constituents at heart, which means, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain projects, which if undertaken, would not only be of benefit to the residents in our constituencies but indeed to all Manitobans.

The Pembina River, which has its headwaters in the chain of lakes, the Pelican, Little Rock, the Rock, Swan Lake; and Swan Lake is the last lake which the Pembina River feeds and from there on it crosses the International Border approximately south and west of Morden and from there pursues approximately a parallel course with the United States Border in northern North Dakota. Because this river is both in Manitoba and in North Dakota it has some international concerns and indeed has been a subject of the International Joint Commission studies; various studies with a corps of engineers.

Now, this Pembina River system, Mr. Chairman, leaves south central Manitoba with its only lakes, with the exception of Killarney Lake which is an artificial lake near the thriving community of Killarney in south central Manitoba, but this chain of lakes, the Pembina River and its chain of lakes, The Swan, the Rock, the Little Rock and the Pelican, form the major recreational potential for south central Manitoba. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it had in the '50s and early '60s a considerable attraction to the U.S. tourists coming up from North Dakota. Now that has since fallen down slightly but these rivers and their accompanying lakes are the only recreation potential we have in south central Manitoba. In fact, it's been said, Mr. Chairman, that if it weren't for those lakes that Southern Manitoba would be akin to a desert in the amount of fresh water that it has available for recreation; for municipal industrial use, so that river, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister knows this, I'm quite sure, is very important to south central Manitoba and that importance extends all the way to the Red River.

The Minister has mentioned here that there is a

project — and I assume that it's a project on the Pembina River, south of Nechi, North Dakota — which is going to supply additional supplies of water to the Town of Altona. That is the last water project on the Pembina River that has importance to Canada. That water, Mr. Chairman, comes from the United States; from Nechi, North Dakota.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister what percentage of flood waters in the 1950 flood were attributed to the flood flows originating from the Pembina River and its contributory streams?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand by Mr. Weber that it's really hard to relate. The flow on the Pembina was 15 percent of the total flow but since the peak didn't come coincident with the peaking of the Red itself, it's hard to relate.

MR. ORCHARD: That's right, I understand the problem in the non-paralleling peaks in flood flows of those two mighty rivers in Southern Manitoba, but it's my understanding that an educated guess of the contribution to the flood flow in the Red River in 1950 was some 11 percent from the Pembina River. That was my understanding in a study undertaken in 1973.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, that may be about right.

MR. ORCHARD: I'm quite sure it's right because I happened to participate in that study.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the current status of the development on the Pembina River which has been one of three programs, either the single high level dam at Pembina, North Dakota — the Pembilier Dam — or failing that one the status of the multi-dam proposal for the Pembina River with a low level dam at Pembina, North Dakota; second low level dam at Kaleida and then I believe there was even a study done at one point in time of a three-dam concept with a low level dam at Pembina; the second low-level dam at Kaleida, and a third low-level dam further upstream towards Swan Lake, in the vicinity of Swan Lake. Can the Minister indicate the status of the studies on the Pembina River?

MR. MACKLING: I am advised by Mr. Weber that these other projects are not really under active study now. The Walhalla Dam is still under active study, and I might say that I would appreciate honorable members dealing with any of these questions that would come up under Item 13. Mr. Weber is on holidays and we didn't want to have him back here unnecessarily and I hope that in dealing with all of your questions, dealing with Item 13 as well, that will likely satisfy your request. If there is any further information you want, of course, I will ask Mr. Weber to come and attend again.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that it would be a little difficult to deal with the Pembina Dam or the Pembilier Dam under Item 13 because I don't believe you have any Capital funding for it, so that's why I have chosen to deal with it under this Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement. Since we do have Mr. Weber here tonight

we can probably deal with it and not have him come back at a later date to deal with it.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers in 1972 and 1973 had some intention to build the high level dam at Walhalla — and I thank the Minister for his correction, it's not Pembina, it's at Walhalla — as a single dam project on the Pembina River and they had at that stage of the game undertaken some substantial investigation on the economic cost benefit of that single high-level dam. Are such negotiations currently under way?

MR. MACKLING: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that they are into their pre-design study, and there has been liaison with the department in respect to that, and the earliest probability, if all the studies are favorable, the earliest beginning of construction would be in 1986.

MR. ORCHARD: That is indeed interesting. In 1973 I had the unique opportunity of undertaking a study of that high-level dam and the benefits that would accrue to Manitoba from construction of that dam vis-a-vis flood reduction, municipal water supply, irrigation water supply, recreation potential, and I was a consultant to the previous administration in undertaking and updating certain information and facts that were available on the Pembilier Dam.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, and I only say this to put it on the record — I think the study is still available, well it certainly would be available because the government paid reasonably good money for it — the cost benefit at that time, I believe, came out at 1.15, and under those kinds of circumstances it was a worthwhile project for the province to participate in.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that in arriving at that 1.1 something or other cost benefit, I, as the consultant for that study in updating the agricultural portion of the benefits from irrigation, was restricted to a 10-year crop value average, and if the Minister will well recall that 10 years in 1973 included the years of '72, '71, '70 and '69 and '68. Those five years crop values in Manitoba were indeed very low. So the benefit derived in that study from the added value of irrigation in the area south of Winkler from waters derived from the single high-level dam at Walhalla were, in my estimation at that time, quite understated, because naturally you have to work with certain parameters and the one parameter was a 10-year average on price. Should that study be updated today vis-a-vis the kinds of production values in potatoes, in corn, in soya beans and in a number of other crops that would be beneficially produced under irrigation, should that project proceed, I am quite sure the cost benefit would increase dramatically and probably increase to 1.5, maybe 1.7, maybe even 2.

The second thing that I'd like to indicate is that now that there is already a study under way to utilize probably certain capital works on the lower reaches of the Pembina River at Neche to improve and increase the water supply to the community of Altona, and indeed the community right on the border, Gretna, that now the value of municipal water supply would also be greatly increased, because as members of the government may well not be aware of, because I doubt they have been down to Altona lately, that very thriving community is undertaking some major

expansions in oil-seed crushing at the CSP plant and a number of other industrial undertakings. It's a growing, thriving community with increasing water demands. Should we update the benefits of Pembilier Dam with its incumbent increased water supply for irrigation as well as municipal water supply, I think we would find that indeed the cost benefit would be much higher than what it was in 1973 when I had the opportunity to update the study.

I want to point out to the Minister, because I know he was part of the government at that time, but he probably wasn't aware of the study because it was undertaken at rather, I suppose, lowly levels in the Department of Natural Resources. I was disappointed, needless to say, that the provincial government of the day in 1973 did not take on that participation with the United States Government in that high-level dam, because, in my estimation, in the negotiations that we had undertaken with the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and hence the U.S. government, that they were offering us a participation percentage in the Capital cost, which I thought was very, very attractive. It sticks in my mind and I'd have to check back, but it seems to me that we were going to be required to contribute approximately 40 percent of the Capital cost and in return we were going to receive in excess of 50 percent of the water which would be available for irrigation in municipal water supplies. So the Americans, it seemed to me, were very anxious to proceed with that project in 1973 and were willing to make what I thought were most favorable terms with the Province of Manitoba at that time to assure that the project would go ahead.

Unfortunately, as I have mentioned, with the constraints that were placed on myself as the agricultural consultant, and the value of crops that I had to work with to arrive at a cost benefit ratio for agricultural production under irrigation, the cost benefit did come out to 1.11 or 1.15 and unfortunately the gentleman to whom I presented the report and I wish I knew his name, he's no longer with the department; I think he might have departed in 1977, late in the year, but, he was overjoyed and indeed gleeful, Mr. Chairman, that the cost benefit came out at 1.15 or thereabouts. I'm not precise on the hundredth decimal place, because he had projects in Northern Manitoba that were of a higher ratio of cost benefit and that's where he was going to recommend the money go.

Now, I know that the government of the day had its problems in any kinds of funding in south-central Manitoba because it was not politically in tune with the administration of the day, but I know this Minister is much more open-minded and I know this Minister, if he were faced with the same circumstances and faced with that kind of a very, very beneficial proposition from the State of North Dakota to the Province of Manitoba, that he would leap at such an opportunity to participate in the high level dam at Walhalla.

The benefits today are multiple and I would encourage the Minister since he is so open to suggestion from members of the Opposition that since the U.S. Government, and I assume it would probably be the core of engineers again, are undertaking a renewed study — I believe he said a pre-engineering study — on the high level dam at Walhalla that the Minister would offer to participate in that study and go one

step further, to not only participate in that study of the single dam at Walhalla, but indeed to add in the second dam at Kaleida and renew the economic analysis of the two dam project. I say that from the standpoint, Mr. Chairman, that at the time the study was undertaken in 1973, it was identified that such a multiple dam undertaking on the Pembina River could reduce the level of floodwaters on the Red River by some 11 percent and I might submit quite naively, Mr. Chairman, this evening and, no doubt, Mr. Weber would probably back me down on a moment's notice, but I suggest that if the Pembilier Dam system were in place and functional as a flood control dam system that indeed we may not have to go to quite the height of dike protection in the Red River Valley for the communities of Emerson, Letellier, St. Jeanne, St. Adolphe, Morris because removing that last 11 percent in the 1950 flood situation would decrease the need for flood protection of the height, the level, that is needed in the dikes around those communities.

We would gain the multiple advantage, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister can very readily identify with because it fits into his philosophy that he identified in the Throne Speech Debate of conservation of a resource, of providing flood protection, of providing recreational water, of providing municipal water, of providing irrigation water and utilizing a resource, Mr. Chairman, that speeds its way to the Hudson's Bay. —(Interjection)— I didn't intend it to be, but this, Mr. Chairman, to me is one of the very classic projects that this Minister and his newly announced philosophy on water management and conservation, that this Minister would jump at and I know he will, Mr. Chairman. I know that he will be indeed very interested in this project and so I would ask the Minister now if he views this Pembina Dam project and the whole Pembilier project, the Pembina Water Retention System Project, with favour?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, obviously this is a very complex recommendation and not having the advantage of having been paid to study it as the honourable member was I'm not in a position to have the cost benefit ratios in my mind.

I understand that the Department is looking at alternative sources of water for the communities of Altona and Gretna, which communities now obtain 75 percent of their potable water supply from Necchi. Now that's subject to an agreement and we have, I believe, a five-year agreement now, a 10-year agreement with a five-year renewable, but the Department is looking at alternative sources for that because it's a relatively expensive proposition. We have a 10-year agreement with a five-year notice.

MR. ORCHARD: Which expires when? When does the 10-year expire?

MR. MACKLING: 1991.

In respect to the other matters, I'm sure that the honourable member is sincerely interested in anything that deals with his constituency including the Pembina River and I'm sure that I could probably talk for some time about my concerns about the transportation or the possible contamination of that river by waters from down south, but I will resist that

temptation at this time.

If the honourable member would like, I would elaborate on my concerns there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure I speak on behalf of all members of this Committee for the courtesy and the time that the Minister and his officials have given us in the examination of this particular division of his Estimates and would be prepared to indicate that we are prepared to pass the remaining portions of this appropriation at this time.

I should, before doing that, indicate that we would undoubtedly have spent some more time if the member for Rhineland had been present particularly on this last subject. Because of another commitment, equally important, he was not able to be with us in committee, but if there's one member in this Legislature who along with the member for Pembina has an equal concern, as the staff in the department is well aware, for the projects that have been mentioned by the member for Pembina; the Pembilier, the Walhalla Dam, that is the honourable the member for Rhineland. and I would like to put on the record that he certainly continues to have that concern. His absence from this committee should not be construed as anything other than the commitments that he had to undertake.

Mr. Chairman, with one further question from the member for Pembina perhaps we can . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the co-operation of members. Mr. Weber as I have indicated is on holidays; he is not going away so he will be available. I'd rather that he not be required to be here all the time during the course of the other portions of my Estimates that do not deal with water resources, except that when we get to Item 13 and I think that we will have a sufficient notice that we can alert Mr. Weber as to when we would like him back before the committee, but, at least having gone through extended time we've been able to complete those items where otherwise Mr. Weber would be here tomorrow and I appreciate the member's concern.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we pass Item 4.(j), can the Minister indicate whether there is any active status, either study or otherwise, on the Treherne Dam on the North Boyne River?

MR. MACKLING: Apparently none.

MR. ORCHARD: Okay, I'll pursue that at a later date then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 4.(j)(1) Salaries; 4.(j)(2) Other Expenditures. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,780,800 for Natural Resources, Water Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1983—pass.

MR. KOVNATS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what Resolution No. was that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 104.

MR. KOVNATS: Just for the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): I'll direct your attention to page 25, 4. Child and Family Services. I believe we're continuing under No. (d) External Agencies.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert): Mr. Chairman, at 5:30 the Member for Ellice was speaking. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister if he is following the same procedures with respect to child abuse cases that the previous administration was following contrary to the position taken by the Member for Ellice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): There is no change in the policy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, at the dinner hour break at 5:30 the Honourable Member for Ellice had just been making the point that he saw a certain inconsistency in the positions that were being expressed from this side of the House on the question of intervention and protection in the child abuse area, when compared with the positions taken, some other aspects of legislation when the Progressive Conservative Party was in government. I just want to reassure the Honourable Member for Ellice that my position on child abuse has never changed. My position has been consistent throughout the time I've been in this House, both in Opposition and in Government and again now in Opposition.

So, although there may be some aspects of inconsistency that the honourable member may see in connection with some positions taken by my party or even by myself on certain questions similar to the one in front of us, I think if he checks my record he will find that there certainly is no inconsistency in my position on child abuse. I believe that it is a major social ill and social agony that requires protection of the innocent. If protection in that instance has to go one step beyond what one would normally wish to be the case in normal conduct of affairs, then I'm prepared to make that exception because this, I think, is a particular field. I had asked the Minister just prior to the remarks that the Honourable Member for Ellice, Mr. Chairman, whether the Parent Aid Project is tied in with the Child Protection Centre or vice versa, whether the Child Protection Centre is going to be working with those parents who are part and parcel of the Parent Aid Project, i.e., parents who have been guilty of abuse on their children and who have come to the Child Protection Centre through one means or another for help and counselling. Is the centre and the Parent

Aid Project tied together?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there are no formal ties, but there is an informal relationship.

MR. SHERMAN: Just one other point that I think is worth making on this particular subject, Mr. Chairman, and again it relates to some of the comments of the Honourable Member for Ellice. I agree with what he had to say about the legislation that's in place and the onus of persons aware of abuse situations to report same but in many cases the persons who are aware of it and the only persons who are aware of it are members of the same family. In many cases they are the children themselves and I think he would agree that no law can ensure that those persons will speak up in the case of abuse and help identify the specific instances for action and repair and protection.

So, I think, it is important that an extra mile be gone, an extra effort be made, not only to ensure that the legislation to which the Honourable Member for Ellice referred is being honoured and being observed but that all who work in this field remind themselves that the best of legislation is not going to protect some children, and as a consequence there must be a careful tracking of instances of child abuse to ensure that, where possible, the child is protected from repetition takes place.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with that subject of child abuse with the Minister because I think it is an important one. I'm pleased that the government has followed through on an initiative that was begun by the previous administration to put that Child Protection Centre in place and to give tangible support, financial, physical and public to the work that persons like Drs. McRae and Ferguson have done for so long in what is really one of the most tragic corners and often a hidden corner of the spectrum of social problem and social difficulty.

Also under External Agencies I assume, Mr. Chairman, would come the Manitoba Foster Parents Association. I'm not sure whether the Minister made reference to it earlier, but there had been an initiative launched to assist that association to promote better standards of foster care for children to work with foster parents in that regard. I would ask the Minister whether that is being continued and what the 1982-83 budget is for the Foster Parents Association, if it is still a part of the program spectrum of the division?

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes, it is still four programs. I am pleased to report that the organization is interested in expanding and we want to help it expand. Last year, it received \$13,000 and we have now increased that to \$21,400 to assist that association in promoting its aims which is to have a better standard of foster care for children. This money will go towards promotional costs to increase its membership. So this little bit of extra money, hopefully, will allow that organization to expand significantly.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, at one point in time, in the very recent past there was discussion held with the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities in respect to their somewhat cloudy future

as a part and parcel of the so-called Lions Learning Centre, a learning centre operated by the Lions Clubs of Winnipeg. There were discussions between the association and the Lions Learning Centre and I think three departments of government: the Department of Community Services, the Department of Education and the Department of Health, with a view to the possibilities of a tri-department funding initiative from the Provincial Government to take over and support that centre for children with learning disabilities in the future because the Lions Club was getting out of that particular field. Have there been any developments in the way of implementation of such an initiative? Where does that subject stand at the present time?

MR. EVANS: We are supporting the MACLD, I think it's called, the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. As the member may know, the budget is shared with two other organizations, the Department of Health and the Department of Education, as well as this department. The Estimate for this year is \$120,000 in total; \$40,000 coming from each department.

MR. SHERMAN: Where would that \$40,000 show in the Estimates of this department, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: This was paid out; I should have made it clear. This was paid out of 1981-82 funds, so it's not shown in the 1982-83 Estimates. It was your government that made it clear it was a one-time grant, so it's not repeated this year.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, is that where the situation then now rests, that it was a one-time grant and that the 1982-83 Estimates will not include provision for further support for that centre?

MR. EVANS: I'm advised that the Minister of Education is continuing discussions with that organization with a view to continued support.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, does it continue to operate on the same site that it occupied before or can the Minister advise the Committee as to whether there's been any change in site or location? There was a specific centre but the Lions Club was tied in with that. Has their departure from the field changed that physical aspect?

MR. EVANS: Yes, we're not precisely clear on that, not to our knowledge. There hasn't been any change but we're not clear on that.

MR. SHERMAN: So, Mr. Chairman, at this juncture the intention is that the step taken in 1981-82 which provided the one-time support which I concede, as the Minister has stated, was a measure that was undertaken and described at the time, as a one-time grant, now is under review and under consideration as a possible initiative towards or forerunner of permanent funding support by the province for that learning centre for those particular children. Whether or not it involves one, two or three departments is another question. I know that there have been three

departments involved, but my question to the Minister is, can he confirm that consideration is being given to an ongoing commitment of that kind?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I can't confirm really what might or might not go on in the Minister of Education's department. I can't confirm it on behalf of the government. My information is that there are some ongoing discussions; now what comes out of those discussions, I am not able to say at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d).
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Has the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities been in to see the Department of Community Services on the subject?

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Those are all my questions on External Agencies, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)—pass; 4.(e) Seven Oaks Centre for Youth: (I) Salaries.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there an increase in staffing requested at the Seven Oaks Centre for 1982-83, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: There is provision for an increase of six staff.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister advise the Committee what categories those increased staff members would be in?

MR. EVANS: My information, Mr. Chairman, is that it would add to the counselling staff. They presently have a staff of 42 of which 30 are counsellors, 30 of the 42 are counsellors. We would be adding 6 to the counselling staff.

MR. SHERMAN: The nature of Seven Oaks Centre has changed in the last year or two. It was at one time, if I'm not mistaken, essentially a child-caring institution related to children who were at risk, but were also, in many cases, in some difficulty with authority. They were in many cases children who had come into conflict or contact with The Juvenile Delinquents Act. The nature of the centre was changed to turn it into a facility more directly oriented to and related to child welfare cases, if I'm not mistaken. I wonder if the Minister could just confirm my impression of that.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the impression is correct.

MR. SHERMAN: Has that change resulted in a clear and final separation from the Youth Centre of child welfare cases of children-at-risk, who are assigned to care and shelter under the Director of Child Welfare?

MR. EVANS: Yes, the Seven Oaks Centre for Youth is now essentially a reception facility for children who require care, it's a children's care program purely.

MR. SHERMAN: In the past there had been some difficulty with the mix at the Youth Centre involving children whose care came under The Juvenile Delinquents Act and children whose care came under The Child Welfare Act. Can the Minister advise the Committee whether the reorganization at the Seven Oaks Centre and its restructuring as a shelter facility has accommodated that problem and enabled the proper separation of juvenile delinquent cases and child welfare cases that was the objective of the change.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I understand the situation is much better at the Tuxedo Youth Centre and there's not the confusion that there used to be. The administration seems to be much better and the separation has been a good move.

MR. SHERMAN: How many children would there be at the Seven Oaks Centre and is it a mix of boys and girls?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there are 45 boys and girls.

MR. SHERMAN: 45 boys and girls? Are they accommodated in cottage settings or dormitory settings?

MR. EVANS: Yes, there are three wings in the dormitory. It's a dormitory setting.

MR. SHERMAN: There were 30 counsellors in the establishment on the 1981-82 budget and an additional six are being sought, so that hopefully the establishment will provide 36 counsellors for approximately 45 boys and girls who are at the Centre, which brings it up to fairly close to a one-on-one ratio, which certainly for some children is a highly desirable and indeed often necessary ratio. Is this the sort of area of children-at-risk or children in difficulty that a one-on-one ratio calls for?

MR. EVANS: Yes, there are some very difficult cases; many difficult cases in this Centre. I want to point out that with the addition of the 6 we'll have 48 people, including 3 teachers, a nurse and some cleaning staff and so on. You must recall there are 3 shifts per day; 7 days a week. You'd have to take that into consideration when you're looking at 48 people. They don't work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; there are 3 shifts. People normally work 5 days a week so you can see that at any one time there's probably a third of that, maybe a quarter to a third of that number on staff. I'm just sort of guessing from about 12 to 15 on staff at any one time. It may vary, probably there's more there during the daytime than the evening. It's not one-to-one 24 hours a day.

MR. SHERMAN: But there are cases obviously that require a pretty intensive staff-to-resident ratio?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there's no question about that.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there an educational component and is there a health component? Does the Minister know?

MR. EVANS: Yes, as I said, Mr. Chairman, there are three teachers and there's one nurse, so there's an education and a health component. And sometimes if there are a particular number of more difficult cases, it is found necessary to bring in extra staff. So extra staff are sometimes brought in on a very short term basis, depending on the kind of children they have at that particular point in time.

MR. SHERMAN: Before the change in function and nature of the Centre, did the main clientele at the Centre consist of girls who were in trouble with the law or was it a mix of cases?

MR. EVANS: Apparently at one time it was strictly for females, but that goes back a long time ago. Today it's a mixture.

MR. SHERMAN: Where would the girls who in the past would have gone to Seven Oaks Centre now go?

MR. EVANS: Doncaster Centre, Mr. Chairman, which is part of the facility at Tuxedo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(e)(1)—pass; 4(e)(2), Other Expenditures—pass. That concludes the items under Item No. 4, Child and Family Services.

Resolution 33 — Therefore be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$40,480,500 for Community Services and Corrections, Child and Family Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March, 1983—pass.

Moving to Item No. 5, Rehabilitative Services, Resolution No. 34, 5(a)(1), Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: The divisional administration component for Community Mental Retardation is requesting an addition of two staff man years for 1982-83. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister describe the categories of those additional staffers.

MR. EVANS: They're both administrative personnel and of course this is the central office where the administration is done, so that should be no surprise.

MR. SHERMAN: So the office will include in 1982-83, if the Estimates are approved, would include an executive director, a director of mental retardation, four consultants, one term SMY and four administrative support personnel. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5(a)(1)—pass; 5(a)(2), Other Expenditures.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Not much of a change in the print figure requested for '83 over '82, Mr. Chairman, but I'd like the Minister's comment on it. Is it simply a reflection of increases in the cost price column or are there

other activities encompassed in the increase?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that's strictly an inflationary increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(2)—pass; 5.(a)(3) Professional Training.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: The increase in Professional Training provides for what, Mr. Chairman? Is that an inflationary increase or is there an increase intended in the training of professional staff itself?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there's no program increase there. It's strictly an inflationary increase again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(3)—pass; 5.(a)(4) Financial Assistance — Clients.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could provide the Committee with a number on the total of approved residences for mentally retarded adults in Manitoba, and how it compares with the situation a year ago, and what the intentions are for additional community residences for adults in the fiscal year beginning April 1.

MR. EVANS: Yes, the funding for community residences for the mentally retarded — these are adults — goes up from 1,657,000 to 2,590,000. As the member knows, these community residences are alternatives to institutional placement for retarded citizens. At the moment, there are 30 residences approved in Manitoba with a total bed capacity for 247 clients. The majority of the residences in operation provide basic supervised living accommodation for moderately retarded adults and some informal training and social and self-help skills. I might add, Mr. Chairman, these approved residences are throughout the Province of Manitoba, quite a wide dispersal. The monies for expansion are \$525,000, plus another \$75,000 for contingency funding. It's impossible to say exactly how many beds or how many residences we'll get for that. We can make some guesses but it will depend on the location of the particular facility which quite often it's a house and depends on the cost of acquiring those residences in the different communities.

But that will give you some idea of the direction in which we would be moving. So, the difference between the \$2.6 million for this year and the \$1.7 for last year is inflation, plus this additional \$600,000 for expansion. So there's the two, as per usual, the two components; one simply to cope with the rising cost of purchasing food, materials and supplies plus, as I said, this money for expansion.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that there are 30 residences currently operating in Manitoba with a total bed capacity of 247 clients? Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's 30 residences with a bed capacity for 247 clients.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I may be skating on thin ice here, but I'll have to take a chance anyway. It is my understanding that there were 30 residences with a total capacity for 248 clients, give or take one client. It is not significant, but 30 residences with a capacity for 248 clients a year ago and that 1981-82 Estimates provided for a program expansion that would put four or five new community residences into the field. Is the Minister saying that no additional community residences have been added to the 30 that were in place a year ago?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we stand to be corrected. There was an error in the briefing material here; there are 38 residences. I'm glad the member pointed this out. There are 38 residences and 274 beds.

MR. SHERMAN: 38 and 274.

MR. EVANS: As of, let's say, the end of this fiscal year. Then, as I said, we have \$600,000 for expansion.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister provide the Committee with a rundown of those eight new residences? What happens, for example, to the Covenant homes' proposal in Winnipeg and Steinbach residence and two or three others of that nature. Can he supply the Committee with the names or locations of those eight new residences?

MR. EVANS: The eight new residences are — with some trepidation I read this list because the two on the top are from Brandon — I can't take any credit for this because the decision was made before. So, I'll take either the credit or the criticism.

There's a four-bed residence on Victoria Avenue in Brandon; another three-bed residence on 16th Street in Brandon; there's one in Stonewall, four beds; Virden, four beds; Swan River . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Just one second, Virden, four beds?

MR. EVANS: Virden, four beds; Swan River, four beds; Morden, four beds; and lastly, Boissevain, another four beds.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's seven, Mr. Chairman, two in Brandon, Stonewall, Virden, Swan River, Morden, Boissevain. Did the Minister have another one there?

MR. EVANS: It may be that one of the items that was in the existing residences should have been in the new one. We believe it may be covenant homes in Winnipeg with eight beds.

MR. SHERMAN: Covenant homes? Okay.

MR. EVANS: Yes. I might add just for the general information — and I'll do this quickly — we can get you a typed copy of this if you want. For the information of the Legislature of the Committee there are 10 in Altona; 8 in Arborg; 12 in Boissevain; 7 in Brandon — this is a different residence of course, the Covenant Homes I just mentioned — 8 in DASH in Winnipeg for the very severely retarded; 8 in Dauphin; 4 in Flin Flon;

8 in Gladstone; 4 at L'Arche Farm, Lorette; 8 at L'Arche in Rousseau Court; 10 in Morden; 10 in Nee-pawa; 8 in Portage; 6 in Selkirk; 8 at the Shalom Residence Incorporated in Winnipeg; 8 in Steinbach - that's another one for the severely retarded - another 10 in Steinbach; 8 in St. Claude; 8 at St. Malo; 20 at Swan River; 8 at Thompson; 12 at Virden; 10 at Winkler and then the Windsor Residences and there are different addresses, 6, 10, 4, 8, 4, and 4.

As the Member for Fort Garry probably realizes there is some considerable pressure from the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded to move quickly into the area of de-institutionalization which means providing more and more community residences. So there is certainly this continued thrust that has been and will continue towards community residences.

Having said that we appreciate the problem and perhaps when we discuss this later then not everyone can be accommodated that easily in these community residences. It's not that easy to move some of the people that do live at Portage or in St. Amant into community residences as certain people would like us to do. But nevertheless there has been a fair amount of residential accommodation provided for the mentally retarded adult population. For various reasons that population seems to be growing and it's going to be an area where there is going to have to be more money found in the future if we want to go the route that we have been going in looking after the mentally retarded.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman. He has suggested that there is some \$600,000 in the requested appropriation this year to provide for new community residences. Can he advise the Committee where those residences would be? Has there been site selection determined for those residences and how many beds would that total?

MR. EVANS: The Member for Fort Garry can appreciate that the demand or the size of the request far exceeds the supply of money available to meet that demand so it's going to be a matter of prioritizing and making some rather difficult decisions as to who will get this money.

We are not in a position to tell you at the present time where we will be putting the money but we are working on it and hopefully we will — and we won't please everybody, there are going to be a lot of people disappointed, I'm sure — but we will do it as fairly as possible in meeting the need where we think the need is the greatest.

I might add and this is an important point, Mr. Chairman, we expect as in the past that the Manitoba Marathon Fund Raising Drive will pay for the capital cost. What we're talking about here are operational monies. It is one thing to purchase a house and the other thing of course, to keep it warm in the winter, turn the lights on and provide food, supplies and so on.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the Minister is intending to announce a program of community residence construction or operational support — I understand the distinction he makes between the

capital costs and the operating costs — but one is dependent upon the other once the determination is made as to where they're going to go and I presume that the Minister who is in front of the Committee now with his Estimates is very shortly intending to announce the program of new community residences in the province in the fiscal year 1982-1983. Is that a fair assumption?

MR. EVANS: I'm advised that normally at the time of the Estimates review the decision on the exact location for any expansions is simply not made that early. Probably in another two or three weeks, Mr. Chairman, we'll be sitting down with the Marathon people to make a decision on the location. It'll be done expeditiously after the Estimates are passed. I don't think it's necessarily appropriate to do it before the Estimates are passed.

MR. SHERMAN: How many beds will that \$600,000 provide in terms of annual operating costs?

MR. EVANS: A rough guesstimate as I said earlier, the costs vary depending on the location of the residence. If you're looking at a residence in Northern Manitoba the heating bill alone will be much higher than it is in the south, so it does vary. But we think we might, and this is our best guesstimate at this point, that it might provide for another 75 people.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there a likelihood, Mr. Chairman, that some of those beds will be in Northern Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to ongoing communication and liaison with Manitoba Marathon and that was going to be one of the questions that I was going to ask him, whether there had been any developments in terms of the objectives and goals of the Manitoba Marathon and the department, this division, that differ in any way from the kinds of objectives and understandings that have been in place over the past two or three years.

At the root of my question, Mr. Chairman, is the feeling that many in government have had for some time, that without denegrating the interest in the offer and the motives of the Manitoba Marathon in any way, it is far easier for an agency or government or anybody, to provide the capital funds for these kinds of facilities and projects than to provide the ongoing operating costs. I don't say that in a critical way. Certainly whatever the Manitoba Marathon is able to do is very much appreciated, I'm sure, by the government and by the people of Manitoba, but I think the Minister would have to concede that there is a rather subtle and inexorable pressure that results when an outside agency, with some access to the media, and therefore to the public, is able to make the case vocally and make it repeatedly that they have funds available for the capital construction of community residences, and that the only thing that's holding them up is the fact that the government is not prepared to fund their operation. That puts government in a difficult position and I know there have been some discussions in the past that perhaps the arrangement

should be the other way around; that the government put up the capital costs and the Manitoba Marathon give serious consideration to providing the annual ongoing operating costs. Have there been any further discussions in that vein?

MR. EVANS: To answer the question specifically and directly, there have been no discussions along this vein. I think, admirable as that might be from the point of view of the taxpayers, that is something that is just about as impossible as expecting us to pay for the capital costs of the hospital and expecting somebody else to pay the operating costs of the hospital.

We look forward to working with the CAMR in a co-operative way. We expect less friction in the years ahead and we hope that, together, we can do something reasonable. As far as the locations are concerned and, because of the cost indications which the member rightly refers to, it is very important that they sit down with us and discuss the matter of location and how we're going to proceed. Co-operation has got to be the name of the game. I know what the member is saying. It is so easy for organizations to go out and try to raise funds for capital and then come to the government to pick up the operating capital. There are other examples besides community residences with that problem.

MR. SHERMAN: There are other examples all right, Mr. Chairman, but they haven't received as much publicity perhaps, as this example. I don't personally know of any similar examples in the hospital field to which the Honourable Minister referred, but perhaps even by mentioning it I am inviting that kind of a proposal from somebody, which would be regrettable, because then we would be into an area where, simply in terms of scale, the costs are so great that government would have a very difficult time, much more difficult that is even the case in this field of community residences.

Mr. Chairman, what's the change in the approved per-diem rate that will be contemplated for '82-'83? It would vary, I know, depending on the type of residences, but there is a currently approved medium per diem that applies to those residences that are already in existence, and is ranged somewhere between \$12 and, in the case of most of the conventional residences, \$16 or \$17, with some exceptions such as the DASH Residence in southwest Winnipeg which, of course, caters specifically to multiply handicapped and severely retarded citizens, and its per-diem rate is much higher than the standard conventional rates prevailing. But given the conventional range of \$12 to \$17, what is the projection for '82-'83 in terms of an increase on that base?

MR. EVANS: I would guess about the cost-of-living increase, if it's about 12 percent. The Consumer Price Index is going up about 12 percent. I think that would be a fair indication of the more or less across the board, or of an average rate increase.

MR. SHERMAN: We are still on Financial Assistance to Clients, Mr. Chairman. There are, of course, a major number of other programs that provide financial assistance to clients over and above the Com-

munity Residence Program. I'd like to touch base with the Minister on a few of those. There is a program that, in the past couple of years, has been funded approximately in the neighborhood of \$28,000 to \$30,000 called Maintenance of Mentally Retarded in the Community.

The program is aimed at, as I understand it, providing some financial support to those parents who keep their severely handicapped relatives — in most cases it's children — keep their severely handicapped or severely retarded children at home, look after them at home instead of putting them into institutions and depending on the province to support them through institutional care. I wonder if the Minister could give us an update on this maintenance program.

It seems to me that if there are additional funds available, and the Minister has made fairly wide-ranging reference to the increase in his spending Estimates to the fact that there was underspending in one of the income security programs the CRISP Program, so there are additional dollars that have been supplied to some of these programs in other areas that the department has a responsibility for, it might be prudent and certainly justifiable to be looking at the expansion of this maintenance program to support those parents who do take on that burden of care at home. Is that the case in the coming year? Is there expansion contemplated in that area?

MR. EVANS: Yes, there's two points I'd like to make. There is a program that helps parents provide stimulating developmental activities and training for their own handicapped children and particularly the children in the vital pre-school years. So there is a program to assist handicapped children to enter day care and school services that facilitate mainstreaming.

MR. SHERMAN: That's the Infant and Child Development Program, right?

MR. EVANS: Yes. So that's going up from \$79,500 to \$112,400, quite a substantial increase, that's \$33,000, it's about a 40 percent increase? Yes, here it is, \$25,000 is for expansion and \$7,900 for inflation. This is because there is increased case loads and there's a possibility for assisting more severely handicapped children, allowing them to enter the day care and special education programs.

This is parallel to the recent Respite Program which the member talks of and which I've had some interest in — I think he may recall I had a delegation from my own constituency about four or five years ago on respite care shortly after the Member for Fort Garry had been appointed Minister of Health I believe — and I too share his concern about this program and the fantastic value it does have.

I might give him the information that in 1981-'82 this Respite Care Program helped over 350 families by providing continuing care for the mentally retarded family members — I don't have to explain the various details of it — but we are increasing the amount from \$95,000 to \$144,500 which is a very substantial and deserving increase. As the member has indicated this is really saving the taxpayers of Manitoba money as well as adding to the family life of those particular families affected. So we're looking at an increase of

about 50 percent over last year.

MR. SHERMAN: I agree with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the Respite Care Program is an excellent program. I know he's had some interest in it and as he acknowledges, so have I and I'm happy to see that expansion.

However, the Respite Care Program essentially either provides care in the home for a handicapped person so that the parents can get away for a little break, or else provides care for that handicapped person in a facility temporarily — oftentimes in rural centres it's in the community hospital — so that the parents of that handicapped child or relative can get a little break right in their own homes.

The maintenance of mentally retarded in the community is a different program. While I certainly welcome the increases to which the Minister had referred in the Respite Care Program and in the Infant and Child Development Program, I'm also wondering what is contemplated in the maintenance in the community program? This is a program that in fact provides financial subsidies to parents and relatives to help defray the costs which are directly attributable to keeping their handicapped persons in their homes. As the Minister knows oftentimes there are structural changes that have to be made in the home.

There is special equipment that has to be purchased or constructed. There are sometimes assistants, persons, who have to be brought in an assistanceship capacity to help the family look after that relative. There are frequently special pieces of equipment necessary for feeding, personal habits and personal care, all of which cost money. This program is aimed at helping to defray some of those costs and subsidize those parents against the heavy cost of doing that.

I wonder if the Minister could comment on the status of that program at this point in time the closing few weeks of '81-'82 and the intended status for it in '82-'83?

MR. EVANS: The '81-'82 Budget was \$28,500 for this program. It was somewhat underspent so therefore we've only provided for a relatively small increase in '82-'83, it will go up to \$31,400.00.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister advises us that program was underspent in '81-'82, Mr. Chairman. Is there any particular reason for that? Was it simply a case that a number of parents didn't know about it and never took it up, or that parents who had been caring for their profoundly retarded at home were turning to institutions for their care? Can the Minister attribute that underspending to anything in particular?

MR. EVANS: I'm advised that this is an older program that's been in existence for some years. I'm advised that the other programs are picking up, such as the Respite Care Program, others like Supervised Apartment Living and day activity centres and so on. That this is taking some pressure off of this older existing program. This is the best explanation I can give the member for this but nevertheless monies remain here, they are perhaps of a general nature to meet special needs as they arise.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister advise us where the Day Activity Centres Program sits in '82-'83?

MR. EVANS: The amount allocated is \$102,500 which compares with \$93,200 last year.

MR. SHERMAN: What was the '82-'83 figure?

MR. EVANS: '82-'83 is \$102,500.00.

MR. SHERMAN: \$102,500, that would not reflect much in the way of expansion, \$102,500 as against \$93,000.00. Probably it's just the inflationary increase.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Just an explanation. This program wasn't fully operational in '81-'82. We didn't have a full year of operation in '81-'82, but looking at it, it is felt that this would be an inadequate amount.

It's going up by about 10 percent, but given the fact that we have a series of programs, training in resident-supervised apartment living, infant and child development programs, respite care, and so on, you have to look at these programs as a package, I understand. As a package they've gone up a fair amount. This one has not gone up to the same extent.

The other point I would make is this one uses a lot of volunteers so there's not the same pressure.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm aware, Mr. Chairman, that as the Minister points out, this is a program that relies heavily on volunteers. He has advised the Committee that it wasn't operating at full scale in '81-'82. I assume by his remarks that the intention is to have it operating at the scheduled full level in '82-'83 and I would ask him whether the supply of volunteers seems reasonably assured?

There was a time not long ago when the department entered into an arrangement with the Volunteer Bureau of Winnipeg to fund a pilot project, I think, on a three-year basis to train volunteer co-ordinators and make them available to various social programs of this kind in the community. What is the status of that enterprise at the moment? Is that project still in place? Have volunteer co-ordinators been produced as a result of it? Has it delivered with the degree of success that certainly was hoped for at the time that it was introduced? And will the volunteer co-ordinators coming out of that pilot project be responsible, in part, for recruiting, training and supplying volunteers for these day-activity centres?

MR. EVANS: The Volunteer Bureau, as I understand, was to scout around and identify and recruit volunteers essentially in rural Manitoba, but not necessarily for mental retardation. It was very broad in the area of social work generally, so that it has no bearing. As a matter of fact, we've covered that; there's some monies for that organization. That program was covered under an earlier item on the regional operations 3.(b).

MR. SHERMAN: Under Regional Personal Services?

MR. EVANS: That would be under 3.(b) General Purpose Grants.

But, regardless, that is the answer that the Day

Activity Centres are not provided with volunteers from the Volunteer Bureau as such.

I might also take the opportunity to point out that, because we're talking about a number of programs to assist the mentally retarded in the community; the Supervised Apartment Living Program which provides funds for supervision of moderately retarded adults moving from community residences, group homes and institutions or their own homes to more independent community living, essentially in apartments that we have provided for a large increase from \$100,000 to \$185,000. So, I think, the member should welcome that.

The program was initially funded through the Federal and the Marathon funds in Portage la Prairie and then, subsequently, in other centres. So, we're expecting that we'll provide supervision and training service for approximately 100 clients to allow them to be involved in independent community living. That 100 was last year so there'll be substantial increase in the coming year.

MR. SHERMAN: And it's going to \$185,000 this year?

MR. EVANS: That's right; from \$100,000 to \$185,000. They looked after 100 clients last year. We've allowed \$10,000 for inflation and then \$75,000 for program expansion. It's difficult to say that we're going to take on 75 more clients. I don't think that we can make that simple statement.

MR. SHERMAN: Where do Focus One and Focus Two come in, under supervised apartment living? And where does Ten Ten Sinclair come in, under supervised apartment living?

MR. EVANS: Focus One and Two are programs that are in the Department of Health and 1010 Sinclair, that's in the Home Care Program.

MR. SHERMAN: That's in the Home Care Program. So, the supervised apartment lifestyle that we're talking about here, is supervised living in existing apartment blocks or apartment complexes, not in specifically designated facilities like Focus and 1010 Sinclair. Is that right?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, these are people that could live in any apartment unit which is deemed suitable for their purposes.

MR. SHERMAN: On the matter of foster-home rates and increases or upgrading of foster home rates, am I correct in assuming that no longer is dealt with under this appropriation, that it now is dealt with under the Social Allowances section of the Estimates?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you're talking about the disabled; the whole category, the disabled, even the mentally retarded, people with mental illness, do receive Social Allowances and this is the way we can help them and do help them.

MR. SHERMAN: Any change in those rates, though? I don't know precisely where they existed in this department but at one point in time, they existed in

this division I'm sure, under Rehabilitative Services. I just wanted to confirm for myself and the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that they had been transferred to Social Allowances and that's where they appear. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes, that is correct. We increased the Social Allowance rates. We're going to get to them but I'd just like to mention that, we announced it last December, we increased Social Allowance rates generally by 16.5, that's on average for food, clothing and personal needs, that category, that discretionary part of the Social Allowance assistance. So, that was increased, taking together an average of 16.5 percent.

In addition to that, we're providing another \$600,000 to assist the mentally retarded in community living, but we can discuss that when we come to the Social Allowance category.

MR. SHERMAN: I see. There is one other program under this appropriation and that's the training in residences program. Is that still in place and does it contemplate a budgetary change in 1982-83?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's still in place, the increase is \$16,600 from \$166,300 to \$182,900 and that's essentially a price increase provision.

MR. SHERMAN: Will that figure take into account the additional residences that will be coming on stream after the Minister has made his determination with the Manitoba Marathon people, the additional 75 beds approximately, that will be provided by the \$600,000 funding he referred to earlier?

MR. EVANS: Well, these monies are monies for training people to live in their own residences and you don't have to presumably continually retrain the same individuals. So the money is available to accommodate the training of a flow of people as they go through to the community residence. So it's not necessary, even though we have more community residence facilities, it is not necessary to increase this amount beyond inflation because we are coping with a flow of people each year, a steady flow.

MR. SPEAKER: 5.(a)(4) pass; 5.(a)(5). External Agencies

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I think there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that one of the major external agencies is this field is the CAMR - Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded; whether or not that statement would be true from a financial support point of view is perhaps arguable, but certainly from the point of view of relevancy and involvement that would be the main external agency.

In the past there have been some changes in methods of funding and amounts of funding supplied by the province to the association purely as an association. Funding that goes to the CAMR under this appropriation is essentially funding support just for the central office operation, and is, of course, quite independent from the millions of dollars that are spent through the agencies, through the institutions,

through the group homes, that provide the care that the mentally retarded receive; and also for the many hundreds of thousands of dollars that are expended through the programs that the Minister has just discussed with us, ranging from respite care to supervised apartment living.

I think that perhaps there have been, in the past, some difficulties in communication and some misunderstandings between CAMR and the province on that point; that what we're talking about in this appropriation is simply funding support for the central office and it's not really designed as support for advocacy either, it is simply support for the central office operations. There have been disagreements, it would be fair to say perhaps mild, but disagreements nonetheless, in the past as to whether that funding provided for the CAMR should go entirely and exclusively to the Manitoba division headquarters or whether it should be divided up among the CAMR branches throughout the province. At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to inform us in the Committee as to the approach being taken towards the funding of CAMR in 1982-83, the budgeted amount, and whether it is going to be provided in the familiar way that has been provided in the past or if there is any change contemplated as a result of some of the individual requests that have come in from individual community branches of the association in various towns and other centres throughout the province.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the grant for the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded is going up more or less at the rate of inflation from \$90,100 to \$99,100.00.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the funding arrangement the same as in the past, that is a direct grant to the divisional headquarters to supervise and administer as they see fit, or has there been any change in that?

MR. EVANS: No change, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the Steinbach Development Centre, Mr. Chairman, the same as the Steinbach residence for the severely retarded?

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman, the Steinbach Development Centre is a day program. I presume the member is knowledgeable of it, in general, and it's sponsored by the Steinbach Branch of the CAMR. So to that extent we are helping an agency of CAMR. The funding goes from \$64,500 to \$72,100 which again is a price increase.

MR. SHERMAN: How many clients, on average, does the Steinbach Development Centre serve?

MR. EVANS: Twelve clients, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: And these are what? severely or profoundly retarded persons who are served on a day hospital basis through activity programs or work programs. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: The activities provided five-days a week for the severely and profoundly retarded and multiply

handicapped persons. Generally the program is to provide a little relief for the family and to provide some developmental training in self-help skills, it allows for socialization, behaviour modification, some communication and perceptual motor training.

MR. SHERMAN: Do they live at home with their families?

MR. EVANS: Yes, this is a day program so I understand that they do live with their families.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a) — pass. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: What's happening to the North Winnipeg YMCA Summer Day Program, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: It's going up from \$6,800 to \$7,500.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a). The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: From \$6,800 to \$7,500.00.? Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Another external agency has been the Special Education Program for School Aged Children who are severely retarded that's been conducted through Montcalm and Gordon Bell Schools. That whole program, I know, has been moved over to Gordon Bell as a single site program. There have been some problems in the past with respect to the high level of highly qualified staffing required in this program. Can the Minister advise the Committee as to the status of that program and its prospects for 1982-83?

MR. EVANS: The program is continuing as in the past. The increase is again for inflation, a \$10,800 increase over last year bringing the '82-'83 level to \$119,100.00. It goes from \$108,300 to \$119,100.00.

MR. SHERMAN: Are there any special programs that would qualify under the External Agencies categorical line in '82-'83, Mr. Chairman? The Minister will recall that in '81-'82 there was special provision in support of the International Year for The Disabled. There was special provision in support of the Manitoba Special Olympics. Neither of those, I assume, is in existence in '82-'83. Are there other programs of that kind that will qualify in this category?

MR. EVANS: Yes, there are two new programs, if you will; \$40,000 for Day Activity Centres, namely the HOPE Centre and the Montgomery Centre. These are for mentally retarded adults and it's an extension of the support policy as approved for work activity centres for '81-'82 so that's a Day Activity Centre Program.

The other is Winnserv Incorporated. This is an organization that operates six community residences for adult mentally retarded persons. The programs have become too large we are told by that organization, to be manned by a volunteer board of directors and it has been necessary for the agency to hire staff. So we are providing \$35,000 to assist that organiza-

tion with its program and overhead support costs.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister just recap that Winnserv situation, Mr. Chairman? I missed his remarks about the numbers, either of residences or of persons who are involved. Did he say that Winnserv operates six residences?

MR. EVANS: Yes, the Winnserv residences are all in Winnipeg at six different locations and of the six that I mentioned, three are new and they were taken from Mrs. Steinkopf, as you know, who has done a lot of work in this area and she has to be relieved of some of this work. So the arrangement was for Winnserv to take on three of those residences formerly under Mrs. Steinkopf's direction. This amount of money, \$35,000, helps to accommodate that transfer of responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(5) — pass. 5.(b) Institutional Mental Retardation Services. 5.(b)(l) Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the total number of staff man years in this branch, Institutional Mental Retardation Services, was 745 in 1981-82 and the list for 1982-83 that the Minister has given me also calls for 745 staff man years. If there is no contemplated increase in staff I would ask him whether the institutions, and particularly the Manitoba School for the Retarded at Portage, is up to complement. I believe normally that institution operates at about a 3 to 5 percent vacancy rate. What is the existing situation at the school?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised there is practically a nil vacancy rate at the present time.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague, the Honorable Member for Portage la Prairie had some questions that he wanted to pursue a little further with the Minister on the recreational complex proposed for the Manitoba School. I'm not sure whether it should be dealt with under the Salaries line or further down but it certainly would qualify under this particular branch of these divisional Estimates. Does the Minister want, perhaps, to deal with it at this juncture or would he prefer that it be dealt with on a different line in this particular Estimates grouping?

MR. EVANS: It doesn't make any difference, whatever you wish.

MR. SHERMAN: Perhaps we could have a look at it now, Mr. Chairman. I know the question came up in Question Period the other day but at that point in time the Minister was answering on the basis of his knowledge of the situation up to that date — a few days have transpired since that time — and I want to yield the floor to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, because I think he'd like to pursue that question for a moment or two with the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. It was on March 3 or March 4 that I questioned you as to the possibility of the two-pool system being undertaken this year in Portage la Prairie. As you are aware, it was announced by the then Premier of the Province, The Honourable Sterling Lyon, that this undertaking would be given to tender early in March. However, in questioning you I feel now that there is doubt that this may come to be and I'm very concerned of the possible position that your government will be taking, if that is the case, that you will be denying those some 400 patients of the Manitoba School for Retardates, you will be denying that much needed facility. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that you are aware of the fact that there is, if not all the 400, most of them will be patients of that school for their entire life.

With that, Mr. Minister, I'll go back to the question that I put to you on Thursday, March 4. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that does give me the answer I'm looking for, however, I have a supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell this House whether any officials or building contractors in Portage have been advised by his department, or by Government Services that the design is to be changed? Now, Mr. Chairman, there is talk that this may be the case. I believe that the Mayor of the City of Portage la Prairie and the residents of Portage la Prairie are very concerned about the rumours that are flying about in Portage la Prairie.

First, my concern is that the patients of that school be treated in a manner that is most deserving to these people, but I am also concerned that, with the announcement that was made by the previous Premier of our province, that the City of Portage la Prairie would be given the opportunity to have, in conjunction with that pool, a swimming pool, a regulation size pool; a pool that has been the desire of the residents of that area for as long as I can remember that they've been in need of a pool. I'm not being selfish when I say this, I'm sure, but, Mr. Chairman, when you look around the rest of the balance of the province, you take Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg has received millions of dollars grant on projects. I think of the Winnipeg Enterprises. There again, Mr. Chairman, I can't say what percentage of these grants were federal or provincial, but however, the millions of dollars that have been given to the City of Winnipeg to promote recreation facilities that the residents of this big capital city of ours is in need of.

Then we go to Brandon, who the Honourable Minister represents, they too have had millions of dollars given to their communities in form of grants to provide them with facilities that most communities would like to have. This past week they just hosted the big annual curling event of Canada; they hosted that with facilities that were given largely by grant and aid by the people of the Province of Manitoba and of Canada, taxpayers.

Now, I was hoping and praying that Portage la Prairie would get just a few dollars given their way to give them something that is much needed to serve that community at this time but also to look forward to in the years ahead of us. Portage la Prairie today is the processing centre for Manitoba in agricultural foods; it is the capital processing centre in the province right today. It is growing, Mr. Chairman, that industry is

growing. So in order to take and encourage further industry to the City of Portage la Prairie we need that facility. With this in mind, Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the Minister will take and give every consideration possible to fulfilling the wishes of the City of Portage la Prairie and the residents of the Manitoba School.

I am anxious now to go back to the answer that he gave to my question on March 4 when Mr. Evans stated "Mr. Speaker, I think the preceding answer should be also applied, but let me take this matter as notice. The member asked some details and I would suggest that I'll take this as notice and advise the member in the future."

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if tonight the Honourable Minister could not enlighten my mind and also the minds of the citizens of Portage la Prairie and those who are working with the residents of the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage la Prairie. I'm asking if he can tonight ease our minds as to where we stand on that project. Are we back to Phase 1 or is he and his government going to fulfill the obligation of the people of Manitoba to the City of Portage la Prairie and the residents of Manitoba School?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can advise the member that no final decision has been made. We are reviewing the entire matter; there are arguments on both sides of the coin. There are some people, such as The Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, who would not wish us to spend one dollar of the taxpayers money on any large institution, including the Portage School, in any way, shape or form. Their objective is for us to eventually close down the Portage School and to remove every single resident there to a community type of facility. I'm not suggesting that I agree with them, I'm only mentioning this as one factor. The fact is that the major organization for the mentally retarded in Manitoba have a view which is totally opposite to the good people of Portage la Prairie, it seems in this regard at least as far as I can understand.

There are other considerations. I do appreciate the fact that the previous government and the Premier did make a commitment to the City of Portage regarding a joint pool — and the idea has some merit — I believe there was some suggestion that it might be cheaper than two separate pools. In other words, a large community pool plus a small pool or whatever size pool that's required for the residences at the Portage School, if you add up the cost of each of these pools, it would come to a greater number than a joint pool. That was the argument.

There are other considerations as well. There's the consideration of whether some people would argue that the Portage people should have a large community pool as other large centres do and that the Province of Manitoba should help the community and that perhaps there should be no pool whatsoever at the school and that the residences there who are able to participate in the pool activities, could be transported out of the residence into the pool and to partake of the facilities of the community pool. So there are different options.

I share the member's concern that we should insure that we have adequate recreation facilities for the

residents of the Manitoba School and I want to tell you that this certainly will come to pass. At some point we will improve the recreational facilities at the school. But whether we will go for a joint facility as indicated by the previous government or not, is something that has yet to be decided.

Having said that, I'm very cognizant of the need for a community pool, a pool that will serve the whole community, I'm very cognizant of that need. I'm not so sure though that that need should be met by this particular department. I recall several years ago, 10-12 years ago, when we had the Keystone Centre and the idea in the planning stage, that was financed through the Department of Agriculture because it was deemed to be an agricultural complex as well as a recreational complex and the government of the day, the Schreyer administration, decided that the government would help the City of Brandon finance the Keystone Centre — which doesn't include a pool but nevertheless is a comparable community type facility and it was financed through that department.

The City of Brandon now has a community pool because of the Canada Winter Games being held there, again that was a separate program. The Winter Games is a federally financed program with some provincial input.

So the short answer is that there has been no decision made. There has been no formal instructions given to anyone to change the design. We've met with the Mayor and a delegation from the City of Portage la Prairie and I've had communications from other people generally interested. About all I can tell you is we have not made a decision so we're not going to proceed quickly in this area. We will have to make a decision one day and a decision will be made one day.

But whatever happens, I would hope that the — and I may be speaking out of turn — because I as one member of the government can't speak for the whole government — I can just express a desire for the good City of Portage to have a facility. But whether the ideal is to have that joint pool as envisaged up until now, whether that's the best way to go or whether the better way to go is to have a dual facility, one for the community and one designed strictly for the residences, that's a bridge we'll have to cross but we're coming to the bridge. I can't tell you how soon we're going to cross it.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for what information he has passed on at this time but I want to once again — he probably is aware of this I'm not sure — but at the present time it is my understanding that there are facilities made available to the Manitoba School for the Retardate Patients at the present Canadian Forces Base, Southport, and it is my understanding — now I'm not just too firm on this — but I do believe that they are at the present time using those facilities to assist these patients with their much needed facility. I certainly do hope that the Minister and the government will give every consideration to this proposal that was made.

You mentioned about the cost factor of whether it would be cheaper to have two separate pools rather than one large unit. It is my understanding that was the reasoning that was taken by our government, the Minister of the day and his Cabinet, that it would be

much cheaper to be able to make these necessary facilities available to the residents of the Manitoba School and of the city by providing that through this one complex, where the operation of the pool would be a joint operation as to the upkeep and such. I was of the opinion that was agreed that it would be much cheaper than to go into two different buildings. However, I will personally be very pleased to hear in the near future of some permanent government position on that particular enterprise.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure that the Member for Fort Garry will be following this up with further questions on this tonight.

MR. EVANS: Just one small addition to my previous remarks and that is one dimension of the matter is the absolute cost, the construction cost that the Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned.

The other factor you have to consider is the utilization. Where will the greatest utilization occur on a facility? In the City of Winnipeg one of the problems I understand, is the very very low utilization rates during the day, people are at work, they're at school and so on. So one consideration has to be, where do you get the maximum use of the facility? It could be that there will be greater use of a community pool, who knows, downtown someplace as opposed to the School for Retardates.

So what I'm suggesting is, that is a legitimate concern of the people of Portage and I would like to help them as an individual, as one member of this Legislature at least and yet as the Minister of Community Services, we have another concern and that is providing adequate recreational facilities for the residents there. I am just adding that comment, Mr. Chairman, because it is not a simple matter of saying, "Well this joint one is cheaper." The question is, will you get more utilization of a joint facility?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister cites as a legitimate concern is certainly a legitimate concern, but it was also examined and explored pretty carefully by the community itself, at the time leading up to the period last year when the original decision was made. If it's still a legitimate concern then that's perfectly acceptable. But if this is the result of some pressures that are being brought to bear by one school of thought in the mental retardation field against another, then I think that it is nowhere near as acceptable; in fact it may be unacceptable.

There is no question that there has been a long-standing debate between the Auxiliary of the Manitoba School, the parents of residents of the Manitoba School, and the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, as such. It's no news to anybody in this Chamber to remind ourselves that the CAMR has pursued a course legitimately and conscientiously for years of de-institutionalization. There are many people in the CAMR who believe that everybody who suffers from mental handicap is perfectly capable of living in the community. They may be right, but they have not won the support for that argument on a universal basis that they have been seeking to win. They certainly are given argument by many people in the field, including the parents who belong to the Auxiliary of the Manitoba School, including many

other experts in the field, including many who have been long associated with the Manitoba School, who say with regret, that there are mentally handicapped persons among us who cannot be properly cared for other than in an institution, who cannot be expected to function in the community in a community residence. I must say, that on the basis of my own experience as Minister of Community Services, between 1977 and 1979, during which time I made a number of visits to the Manitoba School, and even before that, when I was in Opposition and when I was working in the private sector in the news media I made several visits to that school, and I'm not convinced at all, Mr. Chairman, that everybody could be moved out of the Manitoba School into a community residence. I believe that there will always be a certain number among us, regrettably, who will require that kind of a facility. That being the case, and that's as valid an argument as the other one is, I'm not sure which side is right but I think both arguments are valid; if that is an acceptable argument then there should be no effort spared to make living conditions at the school as compatible and as happy as possible for those residents, and this is what my colleague, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, is talking about.

If, because of different philosophies, and different pressures, we're going to get into another year or two of debates on this subject, and throughout that period the residents of the Manitoba School are going to be denied the fun and happiness of activities associated with a swimming pool, then I think that, Sir, is highly regrettable, and I think that this is the point at issue that the Minister would be advised to take home to bed with him and think about. If the concerns that he has cited are legitimate then that's a different matter, but I thought all those concerns about utilization and location had been resolved long ago and that the present impasse is a result of a resurgence of the competition between the schools of thought. I would hope that he doesn't get himself caught in a long and tedious and difficult-to-resolve dispute between those two schools of thought, because those two schools of thought have been there as long as mental retardation has been there and I venture to suggest that they will be here and with us as long as mental retardation is with us. So let us not make the residents of the Manitoba School pawns and unwitting victims in that kind of small "p" politics.

If I may digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman; I haven't had a chance to compare notes with the Minister on time and distance for the course today. I don't know how long he wants to go tonight. I would like to suggest that we could complete the Institutional Mental Retardation Services Branch, that is item (b) and all its subsections that we're dealing with at the present time and consider adjourning at that juncture, but he may want to go further than that and I haven't had a chance to discuss that with him. Certainly, I see no difficulty in completing the Institutional Mental Retardation Services item tonight. I think if we intend to go on further than that, we might be looking at some prolongation of the evening sitting of the Committee because the next item is Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled and there would be some questions that we would want to ask in that area which we could proceed with tomorrow afternoon. But I'll just

plant that thought in his mind and let him think about it for a few moments.

I want to come back to the staffing at the Manitoba School. The Minister has confirmed that the SMY complement for '82-83 is 745 which is the same as it was in '81-82, and I would just like to know how he plans to get away with it. I'm not advocating unnecessary staffing or unnecessary expenditure but I go back again, Sir, to the fact that he has made considerable, and I think with justification, of the increased spending available in certain areas of his Estimates. I know that the Manitoba School asked for a considerable addition of SMYs for '82-83. That's no secret to the Opposition in view of the fact that we were government just a few months ago and I'm wondering how the Minister is getting away with 745 SMYs, in other words, the status quo.

At one point in time the Manitoba School, in the past year, was asking for 91 additional staff, ranging through psychiatric nursing assistants and clinical psychologists to behavioral psychologists, activity instructors and speech and communications instructors, and other classifications. Subsequently, that request was scaled down from 91 to 10, which is a substantial reduction, I must admit, but still it seemed, up until very very recently, that an addition of 10 SMY's was certainly required; and certainly, from the point of view of those making the request, it appeared to be supportable.

The Minister says 1982-'83 is a status quo, fine, but I'd like to know how he plans to get away with it. The school itself, and the division, had asked for those increases in order to carry out the responsibilities of certain functions that fall under their spectrum of duties, particularly in the area of assessment and evaluation. So, I'd be interested in the Minister's rationale for retaining the status quo, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: I believe there were 15 staff positions added last year and I believe they've asked for 90 this year and we obtained another 45, or 49; roughly 50 new positions in the department and we are allocating those positions on the basis of the priorities that we see fit. If we accommodated every division of the department I think we would probably have to come in for another 400 or 500 SMY's and, of course, that's not acceptable. It was felt that, given the limited amount of increase that we were authorized by the Treasury Board, it was felt that we would just have to hold the line in this institution this year. Again, I don't agree with the rather extreme position taken by the CAMR but their position, as I said earlier, is not one more dollar, not one more staff person for that school, just get everybody out there as soon as you can. The population of the institution isn't growing; it is constant.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I would agree, Mr. Chairman, that the request for 90 or 91 additional staff was probably somewhat inflated and certainly required exhaustive scrutiny, and received exhaustive scrutiny. As I say, that request was scaled down to 10, but when you get down to 10 you're cutting things fairly finely and I just had some concern that even that 10 had been cut out and we were sticking at 745. For example, the request for a couple of the staff increases

had to do with the Speech and Communications Program at the school. There are some 15 residents at the school who are classified as having severe to profound hearing impairment, and among the 10 SMY's being requested, were two Speech and Communications Activity instructors. I presume the elimination of that potential 10 SMY's means that that service will now not be provided or, if there was any expansion contemplated in it, no expansion can be provided. Can the Minister advise the Committee whether there is a capability at the school at the present time for providing speech and communication instruction to the hearing-impaired residents at the school?

MR. EVANS: It can be a case of "ask and you shall receive," and admittedly there may be areas for staffing improvements and so on, but we are constrained by budget limitations and we have to set our priorities, and we're setting our priorities. There are many other things we would like to have done in Community Services and Corrections, in general; but given the hard times that we seem to live in these days as governments and as taxpayers we can't always accommodate the wishes and desires of well-meaning people in the system who want to provide a higher level of care.

We would like to see better care for the mentally retarded but we are constrained as the other governments of this country are constrained.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is a nice fellow and he is approaching his job with a spirit of goodwill and charity and love and far be it from me to try to derail him from that course. I just caution him that, although protestations of goodwill and charity and understanding are all fine, that he may be running the risk of putting himself in a position, with respect to some of these services, and particularly with respect to the Manitoba School where he may find himself categorized as a skinflint, which I think is a term that he himself has applied to some other governments in past years.

Mr. Chairman, I presume that Pelican Lake and St. Amant don't qualify under this category for consideration. This category deals, I think, only with the Manitoba School. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: That's correct, Mr. Sherman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1) to 5.(b)(3) were read and passed. 5.(b)(4) External Agencies.

Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, where does the residence operated by the Sisters of St. Joseph's come in? Does it come in under these External Agencies or would it be under a different line in the Estimates?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it is a Group Home under the Child Welfare Appropriation. It is under Child Welfare; it is not included here. The only two that would be included here would be St. Amant and the Pelican Lake Training Centre.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there anything here that has to do with the Rehabilitation Centre for Children, the former

Shriners Crippled Children's Hospital, which I believe either has or was being considered for having a day program for retarded children?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's under (c), Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there were some activities and initiatives at St. Amant Centre that were under way in the past year. I wonder if the Minister could just give us a recap of the situation at St. Amant?

MR. EVANS: Is the member referring to the possibility of an expansion of that facility?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry, I'm wondering if the Minister would mind repeating.

MR. EVANS: I was just asking for clarification of the concern of the member. Are you referring to the possibility of an expansion of that facility?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have met with the staff and members of the board. I met with the auxiliary or the Friends of St. Amant — the concerned parents at St. Amant, excuse me — and we appreciate the fact that they have raised several hundreds of thousands of dollars for an addition to the facility. Again we have some problem of difference of philosophy. Again the CAMR is pointing out that there should be no expansion of institutional facilities as such and that rather there should be more community residences provided for the retarded.

To make a long story short, the matter is now under review. We're in the process of setting up an independent review of the proposal and I believe we have the agreement of the Board of Directors of St. Amant to conduct a review with the assistance of some people, not only within the department, but people outside of the department and to examine the costs involved in going for expansion of the St. Amant facility as opposed to the cost of providing two, three, four or whatever number of community residences. The possibility is that some persons could be moved out of St. Amant into community residences and others could be accommodated within the existing building.

It's a rather complicated matter. It involves philosophy of housing and caring for the mentally retarded and also involves the amount of funding that would be required for one type of facility, namely a community residence, as opposed to another type, namely the institutional setting. I believe that we are on the road to resolving sort of an impasse. We've got the co-operation as I've said, of several of the St. Amant people and they're willing to work with us and some outside disinterested persons who can take an independent, hopefully, view of this particular matter.

MR. SHERMAN: What's the Budget requested for St. Amant Centre, the provincial support for St. Amant Centre in '82-83, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Last year it was a shade over \$7 million; '82-83 we've got \$8.9 million in there. Now, the reason for this, there was a shortfall in last year's Budget of about \$600,000 due to a salary negotiation I believe, for the nursing staff. It was a rather rich settlement and we had to pay the bill. There is a considerable amount of inflation increase, price increase here of \$1.2 million. Then there are some other miscellaneous items but those are the two large ones: the shortfall of \$600,000 plus a large provision for inflation. They had requested spaces for 32 more beds and this has been now scaled down to 24.

MR. SHERMAN: Are there any other staff contracts, settlements that come up for negotiation in '82-83 where the St. Amant staff is concerned?

MR. EVANS: There was a two-year contract negotiated, so we don't expect any major change this coming year. It's a two-year contract and this is why there is such a large inflationary increase; it's 17 percent, but that's because of the impact of the two-year contract. So, it was negotiated last year, effected last year and it's affecting this coming year. Fortunately we have very little, if any, control over that.

MR. SHERMAN: Who was that with? Was that with the IEU? It wasn't with the MARN.

MR. EVANS: I understand that St. Amant largely follows the St. Boniface Hospital negotiations and that there were four different unions involved, and there are four different unions involved here.

MR. SHERMAN: And that existing contract runs through fiscal '82-83?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: There was some structural work being done at St. Amant, has that been completed or are there ongoing costs included in this year's Budget?

MR. EVANS: It was a small nonrecurring cost upgrading plumbing and water connections. We've provided for \$47,000 in this year's Budget.

MR. SHERMAN: There was work being done at the Pelican Lake Training Centre, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could advise of the Budget for '82-83 for Pelican Lake as compared to '81-82, and whether that physical work that was being done on the site has been completed. It involved some improvements to existing facilities and also the demolition of one of the buildings on the site.

MR. EVANS: What we provided for this year, Mr. Chairman, is \$107,700 as a nonrecurring item to complete the work that was done last year, the demolition that was started last year. This apparently will be completed plus some upgrading of the parking lot, \$107,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(4)—pass; 5.(c)(1) Salaries. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister advise the Committee the reasons for the requested staffing increase in this branch, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: It's a staff increase of two, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: These two people will do what, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: I can't give the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, the exact occupational category but it would be part of the Central Directorate which is responsible for administering funds and purchasing services, establishing programs, standards, monitoring program delivery, developing and supervising regional staff, co-ordinating government and private agency programs and maintaining a central registry of disabled people. Besides the Director there is a psychologist, a program consultant, volunteer co-ordinators and various support staff, so it would be the intention to strengthen this particular Central Directorate.

MR. SHERMAN: There was a request for some additional program trainers for workshops, would it be likely that the requested increases are in that area?

MR. EVANS: I haven't got that specific data but I'm going to suggest that's probably the area but we may have to take this as notice.

MR. SHERMAN: There were some shortfalls apparently in 1981-82 in this branch insofar as some of the agencies receiving financial assistance were concerned and what I am wondering is whether the budget request for 1982-83 is designed to compensate for shortfalls in the budgets of some of the centres that have been supported through this branch, or whether those were simply underspent amounts and were still working on the base that appears in print for 1982?

MR. EVANS: Yes, are we on (c)(3) Financial Assistance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're still on 5.(c)(1).

MR. EVANS: You're still on Salaries? The increase in salaries are basically for the increase of two staff. We are advised that they are classified as trainers, people who are program trainers. They actually do the training in the occupational activity centres.

MR. SHERMAN: Okay, thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass; 5.(c)(3) Financial Assistance - clients.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it's in here, in this area, Mr. Chairman, that there appear to have been some shortfalls in 1981-82; the Waso Centre in East Kildonan which, for example, was not originally in the 1981-82 budget, as I understand it, is now presumably in the budget. I wonder if the Minister could give us a run-down of the clients that receive the financial assis-

tance specified here in his particular line.

MR. EVANS: Okay, the breakdown of the \$3,495,700.00. The largest item is the purchase of the services in the Occupational Activity Centres \$1,429,200; this compares with \$1,247,700 last year; purchase of vocational training services \$730,600, which compares with \$469,100 last year; transportation of participants \$636,900, compared to \$431,500 last year; and incidental living allowances for the participants \$399,000, compared to \$362,700 last year. So that adds up to the \$3.195 million.

Just going on, the Member for Fort Garry asked about the shortfall. There is indeed a shortfall in the OAC Training Program. The anticipated overexpenditure is \$75,000.00. The over-expenditure of Waso Centre, an expenditure there that wasn't included in the 1981-82 budgets is a shortfall of \$19,800 and then there is some overexpenditure in the transportation of the OAC participants of \$122,300.00. I guess that's attributed to the high cost of gasoline, but those are the shortfall items.

I can just go on the other increase, as I've said we've gone from 2.5 to 3.195. The other portion of that increase is accounted for by inflation and we're ranging between 10 and 15 percent for inflation to the various components, transportation, living allowances, etc. We've got the Waso Centre; we've got full-year costs, I guess we didn't have that included in the '81-82 budget, so we've now got it included for a full year, \$21,800. We're going to add two contract staff for intensive client training; this is another \$33,400.00. Purchase of increased spaces in the employment-orientation courses for alcoholic clients, another \$17,100. And an estimated \$81,600. for an increased case load and service demand resulting from the awareness caused by the Year of the Disabled. And then there's the last item, there's some expansion, \$13,100 for additional spaces and occupational activity centres. And that, Mr. Chairman, accounts for the increase as I said from the 2.5 to the 3.195.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(3)—pass; 5.(c)(4) External Agencies.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: That was a fairly healthy increase in the appropriation being sought for External Agencies, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us the highlights of that increase. The External Agencies in this area would include facilities, like Ten Ten Sinclair and the Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the like.

MR. EVANS: I'll give the honourable member a complete breakdown of External Agencies if he likes. Would he like the '81-82 compared with '82-83, or just the '82-83?

MR. SHERMAN: The comparison would be very helpful, thanks.

MR. EVANS: Okay, starting with ARM Industries in Brandon, which again I'm sure the member is familiar with; there's an increase from 228,600 last year to 329,900 this year. This increase is not only for infla-

tion, but for some additional staff to serve an increasing number of clients. We want to assist them with certain overhead costs applicable to the nonproductive assessment and training portion of the operation.

The Canadian National Institute for the Blind is being increased from 697,700 to 847,000, quite a substantial increase. The agency is restructuring its service delivery and we've endorsed that. At any rate I think the member is familiar with the great work that the CNIB does, assisting approximately 1,600 blind citizens in this province. Skills Unlimited was 325,600 last year, and this year it's 316,800. The Skills Unlimited therefore shows a decrease but the explanation for that is rather straightforward. Last year they were recipient of a one-time \$50,000 grant to cover the costs from a fire I understand. So, if you took the \$50,000 out of there you'd see a reasonable increase in the funding of that organization.

The other major agency, probably the largest of the whole group is the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, will be increased from \$2,728,400 to \$3,502,600.00. This increase is related to higher costs for maintaining services, in other words, inflation, and there is an increasing pre-school program enrolment, and there is an additional \$300,000 thrown into that increase that I've just quoted to cover continuing workload increase to provide for an electronic technician for wheel-chair repairs and additional counselling services for the Deaf Program and also the Brandon office. The Employment Preparation Centre goes from 235,700 last year to 284,100 this year; Ten Ten Sinclair, from 457,000 to 549,500 in '82-83.

Really, there's no program change here it's really; we're being confronted with much higher costs of maintaining the present service level. Then there administrative grants to occupational centres. We're increasing the grant to 24 centres from 5,000 to 10,000; this is a basic administrative grant, so therefore you have an increase in total from \$105,000 to \$240,000.00. These are the occupational activity centres for the mentally retarded. Then a relatively small grant, Manitoba Council of Rehabilitation Workshops, goes up from 22,000 last year to 24,200 this year. And the last item which is an item the honourable member referred to a few moments ago, the the former Shriners Hospital which I guess we can refer to as a childrens rehabilitation centre; there's a special program in this former hospital providing physiotherapy, occupational therapy, life skills, and self-care training to the severely retarded and multiply handicapped children. There are 12 cases here, and the amount provided for is \$30,000.00. That completes the breakdown of this item referred to as External Agencies of \$6,124,100.00.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman. Are the occupational activity centres the same in number as they have been in the past, or is there any expansion in the number of OACs, or is there any expansion contemplated in '82-83.

MR. EVANS: There was one opened up last year and there is one being planned for this year I believe, in the St. James area. Just as another piece of information on the Shriners Hospital facility, the childrens centre there, the 30,000 is our contribution, apparently

there's another 100,000 out of the Department of Health for that program.

MR. SHERMAN: For this program?

MR. EVANS: For the Shriners.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, but for this day program for the retarded?

MR. EVANS: Yes, the Children's Rehabilitation Centre.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, but are you talking about a health program to the Children's Rehabilitation Centre, or this Day Program for retarded children?

MR. EVANS: Well, it's part of the hospital budget over there and what we're saying is that we've added \$30,000 because they are providing service to severely retarded and multiply handicapped children.

MR. SHERMAN: Do those two occupational activity centres that the Minister just referred to mean that there are 26 occupational activity centres or 25 or 26 roughly, whether we may be out by one on that count, but am I correct in my recollection that there were approximately two dozen occupational activity centres and that now with one or two more there will obviously be 25 or 26?

MR. EVANS: As I understand it from the staff, there were 23 and there will be 24 in '82-83, thus the breakdown itemized as I said would be \$240,000 because each gets a \$10,000 grant.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the client load at the occupational activity centres and particularly at the external agencies such as Skills Unlimited and the Employment Preparation Centre, etc., increasing or does it continue fairly stable?

MR. EVANS: Yes, they've been fairly steady over the last year but there's some anticipation I believe in our Ministry.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister is also suggesting that the awareness created by the World Congress on Rehabilitation and by the International Year for the Disabled has produced some build up in that client volume, correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes, particularly on the Society for Crippled Children and Adults. This is where the International Year for the Disabled has created an increased awareness and has caused an increased demand for the services that this particular agency can offer.

MR. SHERMAN: Where do we cope with needs such as needs for speech therapists and teacher aids and deaf teachers for the handicapped, particularly in the category of preschool children? Are those needs met through this branch of Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled or through External Agencies funded by this branch?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I understand this is one of the main functions of the Society for Crippled Children and Adults. This falls into their domain. They have an extensive preschool program for the mentally retarded and the deaf and other physically handicapped children. They provide services to over 8,000 persons — this is adults and children — including counseling, psychological assessment, medical diagnosis and assessment, vocational assessment training and job placement. But these other services that the member refers to is essentially provided by the Society for Crippled Children.

MR. SHERMAN: With the increase in the appropriation for the Society for Crippled Children and Adults to which the Minister referred a few moments ago be going in part to fund additional specialists, additional SMYs at the Society or would the Minister have any way of knowing that?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they're for funding additional staff. As I mentioned, \$200,000 has been earmarked as related to the costs of serving a heavily increased preschool program.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(4)—pass. 5.(d) Employment Services, 5.(d)(1) Salaries.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: An increase in the appropriation for salaries and Employment Services, Mr. Chairman, obviously related to the normal incremental increases and cost price increases but also to a small increase in staff. I believe the office is asking for two additional SMYs, is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Two additional counselor positions are included in the '82-83 Estimates before you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass. 5.(d)(2) Other Expenditures.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the increased appropriation being sought for Other Expenditures seem somewhat higher in this category than has been normally the case in most of the other branches and divisions we've dealt with up to this point in time. Could the Minister explain that? Obviously there is a cost price increase, an inflation increase, but it also seems to go beyond those anticipated parameters.

MR. EVANS: Part of the reason, Mr. Chairman, for the increase is that transfer of funds from Social Security, a small amount that should have been allocated in this area. There's been a small transfer within the department from Social Security to this branch, so that's part of the reason.

The other part is inflation and then of course having added two persons — as we've discussed under the Salaries item — there's some operating costs that go along with the individuals — travel and other costs that are incurred because we do have additional staff.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could I just ask the Minister again. I know he gave me the information, but it slipped by amid all the other exchanges. The two additional staff are vocational counselors, is that what the Minister said?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Are they designated for any specific region or regions in the province? Well, obviously they'd be designated for a specific region or regions. What are those regions?

MR. EVANS: One is designated for the Interlake and the other is for Central Plains, I think Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(2)—pass. 5.(d)(3) Financial Assistance - clients.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, what clients are encompassed in this appropriation? Are these for example, Mothers' Allowance recipients who are taking courses in employment skills, that sort of thing?

MR. EVANS: Primarily younger people entering the work activity projects and Mothers' Allowance clients, yes. There is some funding to allow work experience, work exposure, for some Mothers' Allowance clients. They'll be placed in actual work place situations working alongside existing staff gaining, hopefully, firsthand work experience and technical skills.

MR. SHERMAN: Would there be a significant number of Mother's Allowance recipients involved in these programs?

MR. EVANS: I don't know. I understand we can probably involve quite a few persons; I should add that this is a new program. Of this amount \$125,000 is designated as an Employment Skills Program for Mothers' Allowance clientele, so it's a new thrust and we think it's deserving of support and we're going to monitor it very closely. I'm not sure how many clientele we'll be servicing from this. There'll be 25 recipients of Mothers' Allowance, this is not the same 25, but there'll be an ongoing flowthrough of about 25 people gaining work experience under this new program.

MR. SHERMAN: This is a program that puts them into a job under a supervised situation, almost like an internship, in a work place?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's allowing the people to have a work experience in a so-called normal work place in a factory, in an office, in a shop, wherever and we anticipate the length of the work experience placements to be between four to six months in an actual work place.

MR. SHERMAN: This is a new program, as the Minister says, so it may be too early to ask the question as to whether there has been a gratifying take-up or response, on the part of Mother's Allowance recipients, to this opportunity.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the member is right on. We haven't started the program yet. This is money for 1982-83 and we have no information to pass on to you. Hopefully, by next year we'll have an idea of how successful it has been.

MR. SHERMAN: But, is there no system in place at the moment for making perspective clients aware of this opportunity and recruiting them to the opportunity and developing some kind of understanding and some kind of estimate of what kind of response you're going to get?

MR. EVANS: We're just beginning now. I would say that we're beginning to set up the arrangements and so on, but there's no difficulty in identifying Mother's Allowance recipients, at least; we have the list of who are recipients of Mother's Allowance and we have some idea of the people involved. So it's not as though we have to go out cold looking for people, we have a fair idea of the Mother's Allowance recipients. We have 6,200 on the lists, so certainly not all will, or can, or should even be in this program, but certainly we won't have any difficulty placing this number. I think it's a rather modest amount, but I think we should start on a small scale to see how we proceed.

MR. SHERMAN: The people referred to as clients, who are the targets for financial assistance in this line, are essentially then young people coming into or out of work activity projects and into the work force, hopefully for the first time and the Mother's Allowance recipients who would be in this program. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(3)—pass; 5.(b)(4) Work Activity Projects.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: There have been some changes in the past years, very recent past years, Mr. Chairman, in the number and complement and location of Work Activity Projects in Manitoba. There are one or two that were either closed or phased out or relocated. There were one or two satellite Work Activity Projects that, I think, perhaps were either phased out or relocated. Could the Minister give the Committee a picture of the Work Activity Project spectrum at the present time?

MR. EVANS: There are five projects in operation at the present time; the Westbran in Brandon; WHIP, the Winnipeg Housing Initiatives Program in Winnipeg; the Central Work Activity Project in Portage and there is a change, the Activity Centre in Amaranth was moved into Portage, so that's the one change; and MANWAP is at Dauphin. There were a couple of nearby rural communities phased out and, therefore, everything from that area has been centralized in Dauphin and the fifth Work Activity Project is in the Interlake, located at Gimli.

Of the five centres I've mentioned the largest, in terms of participant activity, is in Winnipeg. We have 85 participant capacity, pardon me, 65 at Brandon, 32 at Portage, 20 at Dauphin and 20 at Gimli for a total of 222. Now, that's the participant capacity.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the most significant change included in here is that we are now providing funding to start a project at The Pas. We hope to facilitate 25 participants at The Pas with six staff. There are also monies in here to allow for a substantial increase in participant allowances to keep pace with living costs.

MR. SHERMAN: The appropriation for 1982-83 is approximately \$600,000 more than 1981-82; would that be fairly evenly distributed among those six Work Activity Projects?

MR. EVANS: Yes, as I was just saying, perhaps the member didn't hear me. \$328,000 of that is for a new project at The Pas as I indicated, perhaps the member didn't hear me, a few minutes ago. We are setting up a new project at The Pas and that accounts for \$328,000 of that increase. So, that is where the significant change is.

MR. SHERMAN: The others would all be increased somewhat and fairly even.

MR. EVANS: Yes, that's right.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the through-put time in the Work Activity Projects about the same as it always has been? Am I correct in my recollection that it was approximately eight to ten months or is that high?

MR. EVANS: I am advised that the average assessment of participant is there between six and eight months. There has been substantially no change so it is pretty well the same situation as it was a year or so ago.

MR. SHERMAN: What kind of placement success is the program having in terms of location of permanent or ongoing employment opportunities for clients and graduates of the projects? Can the Minister give the Committee a boxcar estimate of the results in that respect? He has advised the Committee that there are some 225 clients in the Work Activity Project stream at any given time, so over a period of six to eight months there would be approximately potentially 225 graduates. How many of those 225, on average, are having success in finding employment in the regular work force?

MR. EVANS: During '81, during the year the intake into the program was 386, mind you there were some in the project as of January 1, 1981 but new entrants were 386. Those who completed the program and were placed in employment, or went on to some kind of further useful training, perhaps at a community college, were 138.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's pretty good. One last question on this item, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the trainers or counsellors. There are two being added which will increase the total number of counsellors, vocational counsellors in the program to how many, and how are they distributed among the individual projects themselves?

MR. EVANS: The two more staff years were going into Employment Services in placing people, not in the Work Activity Projects. In the Work Activity Projects in '81 we had 46 staff positions.

MR. SHERMAN: Will the inception of the new project at The Pas involve an expansion in that number of staff positions?

MR. EVANS: Yes, The Pas project will involve six staff, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(4)—pass. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I am prepared to pass this item, Mr. Chairman, but just before doing so I just wanted to thank the Minister for his information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(4)—pass. That completes the items.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: At this point may the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$45,095,800 for Community Services and Corrections Rehabilitative Services for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1982—pass.

MR. SHERMAN: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise