

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 1 June, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. MACKLING introduced, by leave, Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur.

HON. E. KOSTYRA introduced, by leave, Bill No. 51, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1987, Loi de 1987 modifiant la législation relative à la fiscalité (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor); and, by leave, Bill No. 52, An Act to Amend The Energy Rate Stabilization Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la stabilisation des emprunts d'Hydro-Manitoba à l'étranger (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor); and, by leave, Bill No. 53, The Oil and Gas Production Tax Act, Loi de la taxe sur la production de pétrole et de gaz (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 8 students from Grade 11 from the Somerset Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. George Adams. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

We have 42 students and 10 parents of students Grades 2 to 4 from the Happy Thought School, under the direction of Miss D. Machnee. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We have 20 students from Grades 5 and 6 from the Earl Grey School, under the direction of Mr. Mel Hanna. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Community Services.

And we have 20 students from the Red River Community College, an exchange group from Montreal, under the direction of Mr. Jim Timlick. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Meech Lake Accord - tabling of amendment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

Tomorrow the Premier will be joining his other fellow First Ministers at a meeting in Ottawa to put the finishing touches, presumably, on the final wording for the constitutional amendment that will be arrived at to involve Quebec in the Constitution.

I understand from the weekend that the Premier has indicated that he has concerns about the wording of some aspects of that agreement, particularly the wording limiting federal spending power and authority. I wonder if the Premier could indicate, given that it has been said that he is going to be presenting an amendment to that section, if the Premier could table the amendment as to the proposed wording change that he is going to present to that meeting tomorrow.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to, again, reaffirm the position that I took immediately upon my return April 30 from Meech Lake in which I indicated that the principles of Meech Lake were acceptable to us, but that the wording was a matter of concern to ensure there'd be precision.

I do not like the suggestions we hear from some quarters that even if the wording is not clear we can leave it to the courts. The courts are the last place that I'd like to leave wording or intention to. I would sooner that we do the job properly, Madam Speaker, even if it takes a little longer, so that insofar as the spending power provision, I would like to see the Prime Minister tomorrow propose that the spending power relate to that program, as enacted by the Parliament of Canada.

I don't want to see the definition of the national objectives being defined by 10 individual provinces or the courts; I would like to see the Federal Government define the national objectives when such a program is implemented. I believe that is very, very important. I am worried, Madam Speaker, that we not leave the wording so imprecise that future generations will be burdened with uncertainty, and the lawyers of this country will make a fortune in attempting to obtain interpretations.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Premier's statement is very reminiscent of statements that were made by former Premier Lyon, as I recall, in the whole constitutional discussions some years ago.

My question for the Premier is: Given that he wants to have precise and clear wording on that section to do with federal spending powers - and I presume that he has that precise and clear wording worked out by his officials - I wonder if he would consider tabling that so that all Manitobans and members on this side of the House would be aware of what that wording is that he is proposing at tomorrow's meeting.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The wording is along the lines that I've indicated. It's tomorrow, Madam Speaker, that the

discussions and negotiations do take place. I'm attempting probably to be much more open than is in fact the case anywhere else in the country, insofar as indicating clearly our position. This position has already been advanced by officials of the Province of Manitoba, including some other areas that I believe must be more clearly defined and protected, including the aboriginal rights, in which there have been some very serious legal opinions that I don't believe we can shrug off, that require us to ensure that the protection of aboriginal rights not be affected. And, as well, there are some further concerns arising from proposals in the last couple of days from the Province of Quebec - change in wording that they're proposing vis-a-vis "the distinctive society."

MR. G. FILMON: Given that nation-building and constitution amending should not take place in secret, will the Premier then put forward the precise wording that he intends to put forward at tomorrow's meeting of First Ministers so that all Manitobans will know and understand Manitoba's position on this important issue?

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is repetitious.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could indicate why he is unwilling to put forward the precise wording if, indeed, that wording is going to be put forward by his delegation tomorrow.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I believe I did put forward the precise wording just a few moments ago in that program, as enacted by the Parliament of Canada.

Madam Speaker, let me just talk about openness. I'll be urging tomorrow that there be public hearings across Canada, not just in the Province of Manitoba, so there can be a proper discussion. There can be adequate submissions by groups and individuals throughout Canada, not just in the Province of Manitoba. I find it unfortunate, Madam Speaker, that at this point it appears the only hearings that will take place will be right here in Manitoba and nowhere else.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I am delighted that the Premier has adopted the position that we forced upon him . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . during the French language debate some years ago.

Madam Speaker, the Premier has indicated - (Interjection)-

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: The Premier has indicated that he is willing to share the precise wording of Manitoba's amendment, I wonder if he's able to table it then at this particular time.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the wording is already recorded for Hansard; and let me just return to the question of public hearings. This government did not have public hearings forced upon it. The Attorney-General and myself very early, contrary to the rewriting of history that honourable members would like to draw, supported public hearings from 1984 right on . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Answers to questions should deal with the matter raised and not provoke debate.

Bill No. 47 - free vote in caucus

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker, on another matter.

On Friday, Bill 47, The Human Rights Code, was introduced in this Legislature and, given, Madam Speaker, that those amendments to our human rights legislation in this province, particularly those that involve the so-called gay rights amendment, are matters that involve matters of religious and moral principle, will the Premier be allowing a free vote in his caucus on that particular matter when it comes to a vote in the Legislature?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, that's not an appropriate question as to what the Opposition caucus decides, or what the government caucus determines.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Premier indicating that it has not yet been decided whether or not members of the government will have a free vote on Bill 47?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it is a government bill and has been dealt with as all other government bills. It does not warrant a particular discussion as to whether or not government caucus or the Opposition caucus, it's a matter of internal discussion; but this is a government bill.

Madam Speaker, I would like to just remind the Leader of the Opposition, when he talked about public hearings earlier, that there were no public hearings in 1981 when we dealt with the Constitution as a whole when his former leader . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Premier obviously doesn't recall, but I sat in on public hearings on those constitutional amendments in 1981. Indeed, there were.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

Order please.

Gay Rights amendment - religious organizations exempt from provisions

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker, a second question.

Over the weekend the Minister of Natural Resources has indicated that he favours an exemption for religious groups on the matter of the Gay Rights amendment. Is it the intention, Madam Speaker, of the government to exempt the Roman Catholic Church or other religious organizations from the provisions of the Gay Rights amendment in the Human Rights code?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, that is a matter that the Minister introducing the legislation will be dealing with by way of discussion, by way of the debate in this Chamber.

Bill No. 47 - additional amendments to acts re employee benefit plans

MR. G. FILMON: Given that the spokesman for the gay community, also a provincial civil servant, has indicated that the legislation will enable his spouse to be covered by his employee benefit plans, will this require additional legislative amendments to either The Civil Service Act, The Pension Act, or any other provincial legislation?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, as you are well aware and, as should be the Leader of the Opposition, when the Legislature has seized itself of an issue such as this by way of legislation, then questions which are addressed to that legislation during the question period are out of order.

I may just take a moment to remind members opposite, because I know they don't always accept my word or my interpretation on the rules on these matters, as to something that the Honourable Member for St. Norbert said on July 4, 1980, in this House, when speaking to the same issue. I would quote, Madam Speaker. It's page 5319 of Hansard.

The Member for St. Norbert: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I raise this matter. There seems to be a tendency in this direction of asking questions about bills that are before the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these kinds of questions are out of order. These bills are before the Legislature. They are appointed for debate. Questions and matters pertaining to them can be raised in that debate on second reading, in committee, etc., Mr. Speaker, and I think they should be ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker."

They, in fact, were ruled out of order. Mr. Speaker, several comments later, saying, "On that basis, I would have to rule the honourable member's question out of order."

I think if it was good enough for the Honourable Opposition House Leader, when he was Government House Leader, to make that point, he should be making that point directly to his Leader when he is Opposition House Leader and we'd certainly reinforce it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, clearly, if the Government House Leader had listened, I was asking about the government's intent to bring in other legislation as a result of comments made with respect to the ambit and the coverage of this gay rights amendment. I asked whether or not it would involve additional legislative amendments to The Civil Service Act, The Pension Act, or any other legislation. That has naught to do with the existing bill, but whether there would be an intention to bring in amendments to other legislation.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
May I remind all members of Beauchesne Citation 359.(12), which says "Questions should not anticipate a debate scheduled for the day, but should be reserved for the debate."

I've been listening very carefully to the honourable member's question, and while they are on the general topic, they are not specifically within the parameter of that particular Beauchesne Citation. I do urge that all members watch for that citation very carefully.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I thank you for that interpretation and ruling.

I would ask if the Premier would then respond to my question?

HON. H. PAWLEY: So there is no misunderstanding and we can deal with the precise nature of the question, would the Leader of the Opposition repeat his question?

Bill No. 47 - additional amendments to acts re employee benefit plans

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that the head of the gay rights movement, who also happens to be a provincial civil servant, has indicated that he expects now that his spouse will be covered by the legislation under Bill 47, I wonder if it is now the intention of the government to bring in additional legislation to amend The Civil Service Act, The Pension Act, or any other provincial legislation as a result of that provision.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The answer is no, Madam Speaker. Just to supplement that, we are not bound by anybody else's interpretation of a bill, which has not yet been introduced for Second Reading or debated. If, during the course of that debate or committee hearing, points arise, then they will be dealt with at that time.

Affirmative Action Target Groups - makeup of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

A number of job bulletins specify that "Affirmative Action Target Group members are encouraged to apply." My question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission is: What is currently the makeup of those Affirmative Action Target Groups?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

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

They are the same as has existed for a number of years now and that which are contained in a Memorandum of Understanding between the government and the Government Employees' Association, that being women, Native people, physically handicapped, and visible minorities.

Affirmative Action Target Group - to include homosexual community

MR. D. ORCHARD: With the passage of Bill 47, and its sexual orientation amendment, will the homosexual community become an Affirmative Action Target Group?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is hypothetical.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Allow me to rephrase my question. Given that the Affirmative Action Target Group separates out certain minorities in society for preferential hiring status, will the homosexual community become part of that? Will it be the government's policy to include the homosexual community as an Affirmative Action Target Group?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There are no plans by the government to change the present Affirmative Action policies of the government.

Bill No. 47 - discussion with the Executive of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs discuss with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the elected people at the grassroots level Bill 47 and the addition of gay rights in that bill, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The Executive of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, as well as any other group of Manitobans, will have the opportunity to speak on this bill at the appropriate time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs be discussing this bill and the sexual orientation portion of it at the municipal meetings which are being held very shortly, beginning next week, Madam Speaker? Will the Minister be explaining it to them and asking them for their support?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Madam Speaker. During the seven or eight district meetings that will be held throughout the province within the next couple of weeks, I am prepared to discuss any legislation that this government has introduced in the past years or has under consideration at the present time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I'm asking him if he will discuss with them and ask them what their position is and report back to this Legislature on this government's moral bankrupt issues.

Meech Lake Accord - not sign unless free and open discussion

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

First of all, I'd like to congratulate him for taking the kind of statesmanship position that he is taking and encouraging all Canadians to debate Meech Lake. In fact, if this agreement is indeed a valid one, it will withstand the test of time.

My question is: Will the First Minister agree to not sign the accord tomorrow unless there are provisions within it for free and open discussion throughout the whole of this country?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I will be certainly putting forth that position tomorrow, that there should be public hearings across Canada by a committee of the Parliament of Canada. My decision tomorrow, as a result of the discussions that will take place, attempts to ensure more precise wording, would dictate whether or not I sign.

Meech Lake Accord - some reference to aboriginal peoples

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Yes, a supplementary question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Would the Premier tell us if he will insist tomorrow that before he signs that there is some reference to the aboriginal peoples of this country?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I must say this is an example where we do require the opportunity to thoroughly analyze, because certainly we've been assured and then reassured that aboriginal rights would not be diminished. There now appears to be considerable concern in that respect. I have asked my representatives at the official meeting, which took place on Friday and Saturday, to suggest changes that could provide protection as far as aboriginal rights are concerned. I intend to pursue that as well tomorrow at the conference that will take place, and we'll have to await the response, Madam Speaker, I receive from other First Ministers.

Meech Lake Accord - insist phrase, "national objectives set by Parliament," be included

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, my final supplementary to the Premier.

It was reported in the media that his phrase is, "national objectives set by Parliament," an objective certainly with which I can fully concur. Will he insist that that phrase be included in the Meech Lake accord before Manitoba becomes a signatory?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I will be making, certainly as I indicated earlier, a proposal that the words be clearly outlined, national objectives in that program is enacted by Parliament.

I am going to the conference tomorrow, Madam Speaker, not wishing to issue ultimatums or fixed pre-conditions, but I'm hopeful, by way of persuasion and the weight of persuasion, we can obtain the kind of changes that we would want in the Province of Manitoba. I'd prefer, Madam Speaker, certainly not to be proceeding to Ottawa tomorrow with the issuance of ultimatums.

Manitoba Small Business Growth Fund - establishment of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Acting Minister of Business Development.

A news service report of March 20 said that in cooperation with the Winnipeg Business Development Corporation the Manitoba Government will establish the Manitoba Small Business Growth Fund. Has this small business growth fund been established?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

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

I will take that question on behalf of the Minister, but I believe the Minister has already indicated on previous occasions that the terms and references dealing with a number of initiatives announced in the Budget are under way and I expect announcements to be forthcoming.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, this does raise a concern, to the same Minister.

It raises a concern because on April 29, in a Swan River newspaper, the Minister of Natural Resources said that they . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the honourable member that reading extracts from newspapers as an opening to an Oral Question is an abuse of the Rules of the House.

Manitoba Small Business Growth Fund - is it only through NDP MLA's

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Minister of Natural Resources has said to his community that the program is in place and those people wishing to participate should phone a Winnipeg phone number. Madam Speaker, I did phone that Winnipeg phone number and I asked them if the program had been released and they said no, but that it was being released through the MLA's. Is it now only the NDP MLA's who are announcing to their constituencies this program is now in place, or are they going to announce it for all of Manitobans, so they can all have an equal opportunity? That is in the Swan River newspaper of April 29, Madam Speaker.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I don't know where the Member for Portage la Prairie has been. The decision to proceed with small business bonds, a program to support small business in the province, was announced in the Throne Speech.

The Minister responsible, Madam Speaker, has indicated that the details of the programming will be forthcoming and, as is normal in these kinds of situations, there will be sufficient and necessary public communications to make sure that everybody is informed. I can assure the member that will not be solely at the discretion of MLA's on either side of the House, but will in fact be a public communications policy which includes information in newspapers and other public forums to make sure that Manitobans, and particularly those interested in creating opportunities, are aware of the particulars of that program.

Manitoba Small Business Growth Fund - tabling of information re

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, he didn't know on my first question. Will the Minister now assure us that tomorrow he will bring the details of this program to the House and explain it to the House or at least table it so that we all know? Madam Speaker, the program is out, the Deputy Minister doesn't know, but other people do know. We want that program tabled in the House so that all business people in Manitoba have an opportunity for this program.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I think I've indicated to the member that yes, in fact, the public will be informed by the usual means by which governments announce programs, provide information. Madam Speaker, I can't comment on the particular conversation the member had on the phone; unfortunately, he didn't phone me and make me party to it.

I can indicate that this program, like any other government program, will be advertised and made public through the normal course of events, which includes press releases, which includes advertising in daily and weekly papers, which includes production of pamphlets, will include a whole range of means to get the message out across the province. It's the normal course of events. And, no, Madam Speaker, I cannot say that I will bring the details of the program to the House tomorrow until those details are finalized, until there is a communications approach put in place by the department and the Minister responsible.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, I would just ask the Minister if he would come across after the question

period and I'll show him where it says in this article, people wishing to participate to contact Ted George in Winnipeg at 1-944 . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

1987 agriculture deficiency payment - federal-provincial sharing of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, farm leaders met in Ottawa last week to talk about the agricultural trade situation and a 1987 deficiency payment. We all know that the farm community has financial problems right now and they're going to need short-term support until the long-term problem of agricultural trade is negotiated at the GATT level, Madam Speaker. The Premier, a couple of weeks ago, announced that he felt Western Canada needed a \$2 billion deficiency payment. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he's been in discussion with officials of the Federal Government to talk about a federal-provincial sharing of the financing of the 1987 deficiency payment.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, this issue of sharing of deficiency payments was raised in August of 1986 at the federal-provincial Ministers' meeting in Vancouver on agriculture, wherein the Federal Government indicated that, first of all, there was no need for a payment. When they were finally convinced by provincial Ministers that the crisis in the grain industry was accelerating, they in fact indicated that they would hope Provincial Governments would in fact be shanghaied into paying for part of the support. Madam Speaker, this type of a proposal that appears to have been supported by the Conservative Opposition here in this province, to say that provinces like Manitoba should in fact put out massive amounts of money to support a federal policy of offloading flies in the face of fairness in this country. This is precisely the area that we, as a government, have fought against in health care and education and we will continue to fight for fairness in terms of national programming of income support in this country.

1987 agriculture deficiency payment - Manitoba farmers allowed to participate

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, given that this Minister and his government have offloaded education costs on the municipalities and farmers of Manitoba, will this Minister allow other provinces to participate in such a program so that Manitoba is no longer on a level playing field with the western farmers?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Could the honourable member rephrase that question so that it's within the Minister's jurisdiction.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, if other provinces in Western Canada participate in such a program, will this Minister allow Manitoba farmers to again be discriminated against?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I think my honourable friend, as usual, is confused about the offloading of costs in education and health care. It's provinces like Saskatchewan and Alberta who have been cutting into the provision of services for their rural residents and residents of their provinces. It is not this government who has continually provided a consistent increase in budgetary support for the farmers, for all residents of Manitoba; and that's what we intend to continue to do, Madam Speaker.

1987 agriculture deficiency payment - method of payment

MR. G. FINDLAY: Given that if you participate financially in such a program, you will have the opportunity to determine the method of payment, Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister what method of payment he proposes?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, first of all, I reject the assertion that we will be . . . Madam Speaker, the assumption in the member's question is that there will be a federal program on the condition that provinces will have to now participate financially. Madam Speaker, that would be a total abrogation of federal responsibility to agriculture in this country and we reject that assertion.

Madam Speaker, the Premier of this province at the Humboldt Conference clearly articulated our preference in terms of the payment of any funds, that they should be targeted, that there should be a cap. They really should be in line with farm income, not commodity income. Madam Speaker, that position is supported in documentation presented by the Government of Saskatchewan, as well, at that meeting.

AIDS - Dr. Fast aware of infected prostitutes - results of discussion

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

In question period on Friday, the Minister of Health indicated that he was going to consult and discuss with Dr. Fast regarding the prostitutes with AIDS who were still working the streets. What were the results of these discussions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Madam Speaker. I have some information for the House.

There was a meeting with Dr. Fast, and the Chief of Police, and legal and health officials of the city to discuss prostitutes and AIDS on April 6, 1987.

At that time, there was a name given of a female prostitute apparently who had been infected. Now that person was tested and proved negative. Then you remember last week, there were allegations of a male and a female prostitute who were operating without any interference from anyone and we could never get the names.

Finally, on the 29th, which was last Friday - (Interjection)- I'll write you a letter. Then, on Friday, May 29, while we were discussing this, there was a meeting with Dr. Fast also and the city officials, and at that time, for the first time, identified the male and the female, supposedly prostitutes. The female was the same one who had been declared negative earlier in March. The male, for the first time, realized that they were referring, that the city was referring, to somebody, a youngster who had been at the Remand Centre; that there is no proof, no indication that he engaged as a prostitute at all.

Immediately, I instructed Dr. Fast and Dr. MacDonald to make sure that they talk to the youngster, and he has been placed on 24-hour surveillance for the time being. He had been on eight hours and nine hours - there had been discussion, there had been no proof, no indication that he had been engaged in prostitution, although he's had friends who concerned us, he had one friend especially. That is being looked at at this time, and he's under 24-hour supervision and surveillance.

Male prostitute denied admission to Seven Oaks Hospital

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Was this male prostitute that you're referring to recently denied admission to Seven Oaks Hospital and, as a result, provided accommodation by this Provincial Government previous to this week?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

It is the duty of a member to ascertain the truth of any statement before they bring it to the attention of the House.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: First of all, Madam Speaker, I did not refer to him as a prostitute. I took the trouble to tell you that as far as we were concerned he was not a prostitute. If you're talking about the same individual, I have no indication that he was refused admittance to any hospitals.

I can tell my honourable friend - and we talked about legislation also - that at no time did I say that we could put people in jail, at no time, and it was a direct question of my same honourable friend who referred to The Public Health Act, not to the Criminal Code. There is nothing in the Criminal Code that anybody, including the Minister of Health, can do to put people in jail.

The Public Health Act talked about detaining people for treatment, for a maximum, a quarantine. And I said, yes, under that act we can, for a short period of time, detain people if there's any doubt or any danger, and that we could treat them and so on.

I also stated that the City of Winnipeg Medical Officer had exactly the same rights as we did, under the same act. I also said that this act was brought in long before

anybody knew anything about AIDS, and it was a different situation, where you were detaining people that you can cure, people with communicable diseases that you can have by touching, breathing or coughing and so on, and this is not the case with AIDS.

The best information that we have is that this is - (Interjection)- Well, if you don't want the information, I can very easily sit down and not give you this information. I thought it was important enough that you should know.- (Interjection)- Well, all right, then that's fine with me.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Male juvenile under previous supervision

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the same Minister.

Was this juvenile male then, that the Minister has referred to, who he says has been put on 24-hour supervision as of Friday, when he was made aware - I believe that the Minister in his answer, just previously, indicated that that same juvenile had been under surveillance or some supervision for eight-hour periods previous to that, indicates to me somehow that the Department of Health was aware, previous to Friday, that this juvenile was an AIDS carrier and still out on the loose, so to speak.

Was the province providing supervision, or did they provide a room in this city for this male juvenile previous to this Friday because he couldn't receive accommodation elsewhere?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Certainly we were aware of this youngster, but the point is that it was only Friday that the name was given to us that we were told that this is the youngster that they were accusing of being a prostitute, and that's the difference. It was only then and, yes, he was under supervision.

I want to make it quite clear, Madam Speaker, that we do not intend to put everybody in jail. We haven't got the right, and there's something that should be done, then they should change the Criminal Code. We have a situation now of people, who might be negative, can transmit the virus. We have people where it is just as easy to contact the virus from somebody who has the virus than it is from somebody who has AIDS.

If you think we're in the business of trying to protect those who want to be promiscuous by making darn sure that all the prostitutes who are running around are safe, that is not our job. This is a different contagious disease that you get through sex; and we say to the people, all right, have a steady, sure partner, or take your precautions, but it is your responsibility. We are not intending to put . . . Well, we're talking about deinstitutionalizing, I'm darned sure we're not going to put everybody who is suspected of having AIDS in an institution.

The only way that we can protect the people, as I've said many times, is not through panic. It is through proper education, and they must take -(Interjection)- I beg your pardon?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Why don't you make it reportable?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is reportable. What are you going to do once you know that these people have the contact? You inform the people and the best way, the safest way, is not to be promiscuous and to protect yourself.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
Question period is not a time for debate.

Male juvenile under supervision - for what reason

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East with a supplementary question.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, with a final supplementary to the Minister.

For what reason was this juvenile under supervision by the province prior to Friday, on May 29, and under whose authority?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It was discussions between the Department of Community Affairs and our Dr. Fast. It was while he was detained that they found out that he tested positive, and he was a youngster and they wanted to make sure that he was under some kind of a program. It was only on Friday that we heard that this was the one; nobody had been given that name, nobody had accused him of being a prostitute before that. It was on Friday that we found out it was the same one that everyone was trying to find out that the councillor had given a name, and then it was I who instructed our staff to make sure that until this thing was clear, until we made sure, that he should be under surveillance for 24 hours.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Can the Minister tell me, plainly and simply, why was he under supervision prior to Friday and how was he under supervision when you say you didn't know his name, or you didn't know why was he under supervision?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What the hell do you think I've been doing?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
As the Minister well knows, he's not to use unparliamentary language. Would he please withdraw that remark?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I withdraw that statement.
What in the name of heaven do you want me to do? There was a youngster in detention; they found out that he was positive; they did what they should do, what they will continue to do. They try to work with him, consult with him, and have a program where he would be supervised, and we would do the same thing, period. Everybody knew; that was reported in the news media months ago.

On Friday, last Friday, it was determined, when we were given the name, that lo and behold, that youngster was the one who was supposed to be a prostitute, a

male prostitute. That was something new that we didn't have before. All right, immediately I instructed staff, when I was given this information, to make sure that he was under surveillance for 24 hours until we straighten this thing out. Staff then reported to me that there was no indication, no proof, that that person was a prostitute. In other words, there were rumours and, as far as we were concerned, there were false accusations. That is the difference between what we did, what we ordered to do for the weekend, and what had been done before.

There are other people who are known to have this disease; they are not under surveillance for 24 hours a day. We are working with them and they are not all in institutions, and they won't be, and they won't be in jail. That is the difference.

If somebody makes an accusation, as I said to my honourable friend last week, that a certain person is a prostitute and purposely trying to go out to contaminate people - and if you remember that was the statement - we said that then we would take advantage of The Public Health Act to stop them for awhile, and then to make sure that this is correct, and that's what we did.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask leave to make a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you.

Yesterday at the Highlander Rink and across North America there was a fund-raising event for Children's Pediatric Research, the Children's Miracle Telethon. I had the honour and pleasure to attend and be a volunteer, along with the Member for River Heights, and the Member for River East.

I think we would all like to join in congratulating the success for the many volunteers and the entertainers who raised, my understanding is, almost \$600,000 this year in pledges, which is almost double the \$324,000 they raised last year.

I think they should all be congratulated and I would like everyone in this House to go on record to thank these many hundreds of volunteers and entertainers who gave of themselves, their time and their energy for this very worthy cause.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

I believe there is a disposition on the part of members to forego Private Members' Hour today, by leave, and continue on with the consideration of Estimates.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

HON. J. COWAN: I therefore move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do leave the Chair and the House now resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation; and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: Committee, please come to order.

When we adjourned the other day, I think we were on Environmental Management, 2.(a)(1) and 2.(a)(2). Are there any further discussions on those two items or are you prepared to pass?

The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: I was reading the Minister's statement and he said, "My department will be heading the province's 10-year, \$10 million urban renewal program for the Red and Assiniboine Rivers." Could he elaborate a little bit on how far down the rivers is it? Is it the total length of the river in Manitoba, within the cities or, if it is just within cities, what cities? Could we get an elaboration on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have to make sure there is no misunderstanding. When the Member for Portage says, "The Minister's statement says . . .," the member means that my statement last year, I believe, stated that I said that. Since then, I no longer have the responsibility for that dossier. On the other hand, of course, our department would be certainly very closely involved.

The Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister responsible for that dossier, on the other hand, as I say - and I want to repeat - we would be of course very much involved as part of that.

As far as answering, in terms of the details, the member would have to ask the Minister of Natural Resources as to where we've progressed since that time. I would suspect - and maybe I shouldn't even risk saying I would suspect - that discussions are still ongoing in terms of finalizing the specifics of the program. There will be some expenditures in the course of this year, but I don't think that at this point in time

I could say, nor could he probably, how far upstream or downstream it will cover.

On the other hand, we do want to start with the river here, in the Assiniboine and the Red here in Winnipeg, but of course the program is intended to cover much beyond that. I think I'd stated last year already, and the intent hasn't changed.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is the intent then for riverbank clean-up or is it going to be a combination of riverbank clean-up and sewage, of those kinds of problems?

HON. G. LECUYER: It's meant to address the multiple potential usage of water, but first and foremost, to address water quality.

MR. E. CONNERY: Mr. Chairman, I can accept better if it's work on water quality. I've said in other speeches and at other times that I would be very concerned if we were devoting any significant amount of money to riverbank clean-up. That was more of an aesthetic thing, to beautify the riverbanks when we have significant other problems in the environment and in natural resources in other areas, such as drainage and whatever. There are many more important aspects that we need to examine. So if it is for chemical clean-up, I can accept it. Would one of the items be the quality of water leaving Winnipeg and going to Selkirk? Would that be the kind of investigation?

HON. G. LECUYER: Before I address that last part of the commentary, I revert to the first part of the member's comments.

Like him, I would also be concerned if it was to be only riverbanks; but unlike him, I would be concerned if that wouldn't be included. I think you can only deal or improve riverbank conditions if you have water that's of a quality that is such that it's worth even coming close to the water bank. But aside from that, deterioration of the water bank can significantly destroy, if the banks themselves are in such a condition that you could lose soil, you could lose trees and you could cause erosion and flooding, etc., so that we have to be concerned about that issue.

But having said that, of course we want to address the quality of the water, not from a purely chemical standpoint but from all aspects of that quality, chemical included, waste water. It would, of course, include addressing the quality of the water of the Red downstream from Winnipeg; that would be part of it.

MR. E. CONNERY: One of the others that was in - and I've seen it several places - regulations governing livestock production and operative, both the technical and land use. It seems to be rising or raising its head in several areas. Is there a targeting at the livestock industry or what are they doing in looking at, in this particular way?

HON. G. LECUYER: I think we addressed that question last week. Perhaps the member wasn't here at the time. Certainly we addressed it last year. It's an issue - too bad for the member who perhaps wasn't here last week when we were talking about that particular issue - that came up a number of times while we were in the process of consultation on The Environment Act.

I think it's fairly well known in the broader community out there that this department has a process whereby we do carry out extensive consultation before any changes occur in regulations. But having said that, we also stated that the new Environment Act, as such, did not impact on farming operations per se. Much of that is currently either covered under existing legislation or other acts, or existing regulations, and those all will be rolled over under the new act. That is not to say that in time we will not wish to review any of the existing regulations, and I explained that the other day, that some regulations need to be reviewed. In fact every regulation needs to be reviewed after a number of years, otherwise it becomes outdated. The way you carry on an activity that's covered by regulation now versus the way it's going to be done 10 years from now would impose, in some cases, impossible requirements if we did not review regulations.

So we do that in accordance with our resources; we do it if we were to hear, for instance, a great deal of complaints about a specific regulation. We might up it in the order where it sits amongst our regulations, but generally if that were not to occur, it would occur automatically anyway because it's part of a cycle wherein we would review the regulations.

But having said that, I want to assure the member that they would fit - any regulation we might review - would fit as part of that overall consultation process, wherein anybody who feels that they might be impacted, either positively or negatively by the proposed change, would have an opportunity to comment and to give us the benefit of his opinion in terms of what it should be or should not be.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, I guess all the way through, having received The Environment Act and things that are being said as far as the environment goes, that my concern is, is business, is the farming community and so forth going to be impacted ridiculously, and I have some real reservations that this could happen. We saw what happened with The Water Rights Act and some of the regulations that are in place with it. So the regulations can be very severe and make it almost impossible for business or farming communities to come to Manitoba or to stay in Manitoba, so I do want to register that concern with the Minister.

We want to be very careful what we're doing, and sure, we want to protect the environment; I can't disagree with that. But we get some environmentalists that get carried away at just about any little thing and, as the Minister says, regulations can change from year to year. So I guess I'm concerned about the livestock industry and of somebody moving out to the country who wants country living and then all of a sudden decides they've built somewhere too close to a feedlot operation of some kind and doesn't like the smell. Maybe the Minister should be investigating a right-to-farm legislation also to protect the farmers, that make sure that people don't carry out ridiculous concerns.

It's like people building next to an airport. The airport's been there for 20 years and they build next to it and then they're unhappy about the noise. You know, these things happen.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I addressed those very same concerns and questions raised by the

Member for Virden last week, and I can assure the member that the changes proposed to the act do not create that kind of a concern. I do not, having said that, wish to be interpreted as saying that whatever goes on out there doesn't impose any concern environmentally at all. There are of course existing land-use conflicts and there will continue to be. A member just gave an example of one, and of course though our mechanisms propose to try and address some of those and, hopefully, mechanisms in place will help prevent others from occurring, I think that people have found out in time that the wide open spaces, the greater amount perhaps of land, or the fact that they might be a little further away from their neighbours, to be out in the open air, etc., is not perhaps always what it is made to be, that there are indeed some benefits, but there are also some problems associated with that. And indeed, of course, if you want to place yourself next to an airport, you have to expect that you will have some noise.

In the same manner, if you want to build a community, municipalities have a role to play in authorizing those developments. Of course, you have to have someone who is prepared to do it and he has to be authorized by the municipality to do it. And when problems arise, of course, we can say, well, just a minute here, maybe you've made a wrong choice; and you have to now accept that some of those problems that are associated with the activities that you chose to install yourself beside will have to go on.

Now, that its not to say that if it is possible to improve on the noise that an airport creates or odours that a farming operation creates, if there's a way of improving upon those, that we shouldn't look at that either. I suppose it is fair to say that because environmental concerns have been raised in the past, significant improvements were put in place in regard to many operations, and hopefully that will continue down the road, that we'll find new approaches. In some cases it's very, very simple measures that can be put in place and in other instances it's costly technology; and of course common sense has to be used in that respect as well.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is the Minister aware of the problem we have at Portage with the lagoon and the odour from it and, if he is, is he working with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to come to a resolution of the problem that we have in Portage?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I can go into that if the member wants, but I think we discussed that one at length last year.

MR. E. CONNERY: I hope that there is some ongoing encouragement to come to a resolve on it because it is a pretty tough situation in Portage when you get south and southeast winds. Everybody knows where Portage is when they travel down the Trans-Canada Highway.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is true. We have problems, similar problems right here in the City of Winnipeg. Our sewage treatment plants, no matter even if you have the most modern technology

in place, will sometimes provide whiffs of something we'd rather not smell. Not me - as I said before, I don't have that problem. My critic knows about that because it is already on the record, I don't smell. So I don't have a problem in that regard although, on the other hand, 99 percent of the people do. But the member for Niakwa invariably raises the question of some of the less rosy smelling operations I have in my own constituency. We have to try to do what we can to avoid that, but it's not always easy to do.

Now regarding Portage La Prairie, the member knows that there are problems with the landfill, and there are questions in regard to the lagoon. There's a feasibility study that is going on in Portage La Prairie and it's almost completed. Pretty soon we should know about the direction and the timing in which the changes or recommendations will go in regard to Portage La Prairie but I haven't got that in hand yet. It's ongoing and it's taking place at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

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

I was very disappointed when the Minister advised that he doesn't have the responsibility of the riverbank clean-up any more. I did hear him say that he doesn't have the responsibility of the riverbank clean-up . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: The River Renewal Program.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I'm awfully sorry that he had to relate that to us because that's just another responsibility that has been taken away from the Minister inasmuch as there's Worker's Compensation, this other one, and - well, we won't dwell on it.

Before I proceed, I just want to ask the Minister, when we're talking the very last item, the Worker Advisor Office - and this is just for clarification before we proceed - the Worker Advisor Office, that's the worker advisors who advise the people who are having problems with Workers Compensation?

HON. G. LECUYER: That is correct.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Fair enough - then we will discuss that later, because I thought that everything had been taken away and now I see that there are still some responsibilities for Workers Compensation. I was going to ask some questions on it later.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, I won't touch on that. I just want to clarify that, yes indeed, and repeat that, yes, that is still within my responsibility; but also to add that in terms of the River Renewal Program, I think I should perhaps clarify that, of the time we were talking about this last year, that no Minister had been assigned that particular responsibility at that time. We were at the preliminary discussions, and the Minister of the Environment, I think just assumed the responsibility.

An interdepartmental committee had been formed and I had assumed that perhaps I would have that responsibility, but following the interdepartmental committee's report, eventually the Premier assigned the responsibility to the Minister responsible for Natural Resources. The interdepartmental committee will

continue. As I said before, my department will be very much indeed involved as part of that activity.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Not to prolong the debate on this, I thought the Minister was doing a heck of a good job inasmuch as I saw his picture in the paper with wading boots in the Seine River and picking up the garbage that comes down the Seine, and I thought, when it comes to picking up garbage and things of that nature, he was doing an awfully good job and I'm just sorry that they had to find another Minister to replace him.

I'd like to proceed a little bit further. When we talk about safety in the workplace, I think this department, the Environmental Management Department, prevents environmental health hazards in places where people live, work or engage in their leisure time.

I'd like to bring to the Minister's attention, and maybe we talked about it last year, but I'd like to extend on what we discussed last year and I'd like to discuss about some of the hazards that the police go through. Not just the hazards of fighting criminals who carry weapons, but some of the hazards that the police have to encounter in working in a healthy workplace, inasmuch as they are going to encounter some criminals with diseases that could cause permanent damage - particularly, we make reference to AIDS.

I am not saying that all criminals have AIDS, but I think that we have to be aware that the police department does have to go into areas where they do have that problem and I think that there has to be some protection for the police force. I know that the Minister has passed legislation where people do not have to work in an unsafe workplace. I was wondering whether any direction has been given to the police department that they do not have to answer calls, or work in a workplace where there's a danger of coming into contact with AIDS.

I think that I would go on a little bit further and let the Minister answer altogether.

Now, we made reference to the police department, and let's make reference to the fire department whereas we have some dangers of the fire department going into areas where there are chemical reactions and actions of fire and chemicals that are cancer-causing which we never thought of years back. I don't know what precautions were taken to protect these people when they first joined the fire department.

I lost a very good friend from cancer, who was with the fire department, just in the last couple of years; and I don't know whether there's been any corrective measures or whether in fact the fire department or the firemen have a choice of going into an area where there's a fire. I know it's a very dangerous job, but do they have any protection in going into an area that they're not sure of what dangers other than fire are in those areas? Can they just refuse to go into these particular locations.

I had suggested to the Minister - I guess it was just last year - if you're going into places where chemicals are used and are coming by pipes, that the pipes be colour coded. That was not thought to be too practical, but I still think it's kind of practical so that firemen going in to fight a fire would have a better idea of what type of chemicals and reactions they have to fight.

I think that we would go just a little bit further when it comes to nurses that are working in hospitals. The

Minister made some reference in his opening remarks about anesthetic gases in hospital operating rooms, and can nurses refuse to go into these locations because of the danger in the workplace, danger to their health, and what is being done to correct the situation? These are situations that we never contemplated in the past, and we thought that there might be some dangers, but we didn't know.

Now it appears that there are these dangers that are more prevalent each day because, as we become more knowledgeable, we become more aware of the dangers that we didn't know in the past, but we do know of now. What actions are being taken to correct these types of situations?

I've only picked three parties there - the Police Department, the Fire Department and the nursing profession - but there are many other associated-types of professions that go with these - not to say that these are more important than others - but I think if the Minister could just start off in saying what we're doing to protect these people now, I think that we can proceed a little bit further later on.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will attempt to answer all the questions the member has just raised, but since we are moving in the Workplace Safety and Health side, do we adopt the - I think we're moving out of the Environmental Management Section, or perhaps we should . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I could ask the Committee if it's their wish to adopt Environmental Management, Item No. 2 (a)(1) and (a)(2).

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would prefer not. My leader is planning on coming in very shortly, and it will be on Environmental Management; and what will happen is that we will be passing all of these different lines almost without any hesitation or pause of when we get to the very end. The only things that I was really planning on leaving out, until we got to it, would be the Clean Environment Commission, the Manitoba Environmental Council and Worker Advisor Office, and the rest of the stuff I thought we'd lump into one big chunk.

HON. G. LECUYER: Okay, I have no problem with that. It's perhaps a little more difficult to find the various subject areas in the records afterwards, but I have no problem with that.

In regard to some of the hazards that the member raises in a number of occupational areas, specifically, as raised about the police, fire department and nurses, I think that they are indeed exposed not only to chemicals and criminal activity in some cases, in regard to police and guards. As well, the member raises the question of biological hazards.

First of all, let me say in regard to the issue under the AIDS label, that I'm asking the current Advisory Council on Workplace Safety and Health to look at this issue and will, somewhere down the line, be expecting a report from them. I might say that this request to the advisory council has just been put in by myself to the advisory council; and I asked them also to include consideration of the scientific and technical facts, as well as the social impact of prevention measures on the workplace.

As the member knows, there is within The Workplace Safety and Health Act the provision where the member who perceives that his health or safety might be at risk, whereby he can refuse to work under those conditions, and that has happened already in regard to AIDS, where that has occurred; and the matter has been resolved in the workplace and people who have refused have been provided with that guarantee.

We need, of course, a great deal more information to be able to fully understand and appreciate whether it was indeed a matter of proper refusal. At this point in time, all of these have been entertained as serious. There would be certain occupations where it would be more hazardous than others, and of course this is just one of many hazards that can be found in the workplace.

Interestingly, the member might be interested to know that we often view the policing occupation as one which presents unusual hazards, but primarily due to criminal elements - this is just another one. Hazardous substances is of course one for the fire department. Over the weekend I was reading, and it might interest the member to know, that it's far from being the most hazardous occupation.

From an occupational health standpoint, figures given, death from an occupational standpoint, the police is 3.1 per 100,000 in the policing population, whereas even in the agricultural sector from an occupational standpoint, it's 6.5 per 100,000 of population. In the mining sector, it's 11.1 per 100,000 of population. So it's true that they deserve all the protection that we can provide to them, but it's incorrect to think that it is one of the higher hazard occupations.

In terms of both the police and the firefighters, both groups will have already, in certain instances, received training under The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act to deal and cope with hazardous substances. We talked about that, the member will remember, last year. We adopted that legislation two years ago.

Under that legislation, there's provision for that within the Estimates that we are presently looking at for funding to train people from police departments and fire departments to assist in the process of recognizing hazardous substances and knowing how to cope with these. Fire departments and police departments are already fairly knowledgeable of this, and with this additional training will be able to play a very valuable role in assisting my department and, as well, in taking the proper protective measures to protect their own health.

The matter the member raised in terms of colour coding of pipes, that is also a measure which was raised last year and the year before, I believe. I think I've already told the member that it is a matter for which there is provision under the Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System, or the WHIMIS system, as we call it for short, which was been - oh, I don't know when now - approximately approved last fall? It's been in the working stage now between all levels of government, including the federal and provincial levels of government, labour and industry, for years in the working. It finally was approved some months ago and is about to be implemented.

I know the Federal Minister has indicated he would introduce legislation during the current Session. We are ready to proceed here in Manitoba to introduce a

regulation to put that in place here in Manitoba, as well as put in place the workplace health regulation, both pieces which would go hand in hand to protect workers in the workplace.

There would be a certain number of requirements whereby the employer and workers would have to take joint responsibility in identifying the hazardous substances in the workplace, carrying out inventories, providing the proper training so that the workers who might be exposed to these substances would take the proper protection for their health.

In regard to nurses in the hospitals, of course, the AIDS virus is just an additional substance. There are many other biological substances or hazards present in the workplace, other viruses of course; perhaps this is one of the more critical one. There are also many chemical hazards that are present in their working environment and it's very important that they know what measures to take to protect themselves.

Quite recently we carried out a study of some eight hospitals to determine the degree of exposure and the degree of proper handling of anesthetic gases in the hospital when we of course were appraised of some places where there were problems. In those cases there were written improvement orders made by staff of my department, and I know that some of these measures are in the process of being implemented and will be in place in the short term.

Other measures will take a little bit longer, because we're talking in certain instances of having to put in place, especially in the recovery rooms, ventilation systems which were not there at all. In the meantime, we're requiring that they abide by certain restrictive measures so that the nurses are not exposed to the same level of anesthetic gases that they were exposed at the time that we carried out these analyses. So there are certain measures that can be taken to protect them in the meantime while these other measures are in the process of being put in place.

I think I'll stop here and the member will probably want to ask more specific questions.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Some of the dangers that we didn't even take into consideration years back - I've known a doctor, Dr. Cham, who used to administer anesthetics at the hospital. You know, that was his job and he's been involved with it for so many years without even knowing what the danger is. What about people like himself who have been exposed to this danger over the years and now knowing that it was a danger?

What about the people who worked in mines? I was just reading the other day about people up in Flin Flon who have worked in the mines and now find out that they have a higher degree of cancer than average people. What is being done to put these people's minds at ease? When they walked into the job originally they didn't know that there was a danger. I'm not saying that the danger did come about in Flin Flon particularly because of working in the mine; that still has to be proven. But we have to give these people some sort of protection and peace of mind so they know if there is any danger like that, it's not the ones who are going to be gone, it's the one who we leave behind.

What kind of protection are we giving them today so that there will be protection somewhere in the future?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the member touches on a point which is a very valid one and that is why I say we have to err on the side of caution. There are so many more things or hazards we know of today that can affect health or can affect the safety of a worker in the workplace. Because of that, measures have been taken or products have been removed from the market - you know, DDT wasn't known to be a problem, PCB wasn't known to be a problem sometime in the past, and we probably could name a long list of products of which we knew not the negative impact. While we didn't know about those, perhaps we were being, I suppose, negligent in their handling.

At least today if we don't know what the full impacts of it are, I think we would be strongly advising that the utmost precautions be taken in its use and if, of course, we know that there will be negative impacts, then we will want to either eliminate the product or make sure that the proper measures are used to protect the workers.

Now to get on to the specifics that the member refers to in terms of, for instance, risks to doctors in the workplace, or problems that we know of today that we didn't know in the past, we couldn't very well perhaps take the proper precautions until we knew what the problems were. But I have to add that the doctors are at minimum of exposures compared to nurses in the workplace, or to other workers in the hospital, for instance, or clinical environment, because they are in and out; they see patients in their office for lengthy periods of time; they're only short periods of time in the hospitals. So they're not as exposed as their other colleagues in providing medical services.

As far as the mining sector is concerned in reference to the recent articles in regard, for instance, to Flin Flon, I think it's indicated. The statistical data doesn't show that there is a large discrepancy between them and other occupational areas, but there is statistically a significant difference that would show that, for instance, their health would have been impaired in being exposed to some of the substances in their workplace. That is why we do carry out and we have a program that looks after that sector perhaps - not perhaps, but certainly it is under a great deal more scrutiny than other occupational sectors.

For instance, I might add that in the inspections and Mines, for instance, there are a total of 1,653 in 1986, almost double what there were in the year before that, and there were more in the year 1985 than there were in 1984. We carried out some 122 environmental surveys. There were 1,288 improvement orders given to the mining sector; there were some 21 stop-work orders, etc. There were a large number of investigations that were carried on, and there were some 49 training and education sessions provided to that particular sector, because we certainly view it as one in which there are higher risks.

Of course, a number of new measures have been implemented in areas such as Flin Flon, for instance, and we're looking at new technology, for instance, to reduce the emissions so that they will be at less risks in the future.

MR. A. KOVNATS: This technology in reducing the emissions, can the Minister advise whether there is a

policy of the government, his department, particularly or the government right now, whether the cost of converting will be solely to the company? In this case, the big company, we don't have to worry about that much, although you have to give them some consideration. Sometimes it happens with a smaller company and the cost of converting to control the emission is just prohibitive enough so that they're out of business. Do we just let them go out of business or do we give them time to do it, or do we give them some financial help? What is the policy of the government in that regard?

HON. G. LECUYER: Is the member speaking specifically here of the . . . ?

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I say small business, in comparison, altogether.

HON. G. LECUYER: As the member knows, we've talked about it enough times that I suppose the member could chastise and say - and this is one time I would have expected he would have said - stop talking about it and go ahead and do it; and we are about to implement the . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Stop talking about it and go ahead and do it.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . workplace health regulation here in Manitoba which is going to certainly be a significant step forward. But as part of that implementation process, we are conducting a survey or study to try and understand before we proceed that road. As I mentioned the other day, there were a number of reasons for the delay in implementation of the workplace health regulations and the WHIMIS, particularly the fact that the national committee hadn't completed or there were a number of difficult points that had to be resolved before we could proceed to implementation.

These gave rise to a number of quick meetings last fall between the various provinces and the Federal Minister and finally we were able to resolve all of the outstanding issues. As I said, we will be proceeding, and that's going to enable us to implement the workplace health regulation as part of that process.

We are conducting a study to determine what impact it will have, for instance, on small business because, as the member said, they are perhaps at a certain disadvantage in implementing and putting in place the requirements of a proper occupational health program. So we want to assist them inasmuch as we can.

Now, having said that, the responsibility to protect the health of workers under The Workplace Safety and Health Act belongs to the employer. There are compromises sometimes that have to be arrived at. That's what we did, for instance, as part of the implementation of the Hearing Loss and Noise Regulation so that we would give them a chance to come up to speed. We said here it will become effective X number of months down the road. In the meantime, we will assist you upon request and, as much as we can, we will provide you with the equipment. We will not be, in that interval of time, passing orders, such

as stop-work orders because of that new regulation we are implementing.

We will phase it in; we will assist. Of course, in implementing the regulation there is a provision here which says "wherever it's feasible." There are parts of that regulation which says that they are to resort to engineering controls as a first corrective rather than having to say the first solution you seek is to wear the hearing protectors. We say you have to resort first and foremost to hearing controls, because wearing hearing protectors doesn't reduce the noise. If these don't fit properly, or if they are not worn properly, there could be still hearing loss incurred.

So the best approach is to reduce the level of the noise. "Wherever it is feasible," the regulation says, so we're not saying, no matter what, you have to come up with that answer in the regulations. We understand that in some cases it may not be possible. We try in that sense to be, with the regulation, rational.

On the other hand, if we know that there is imminent risk to health, we're not going to take that kind of a chance and say, well, it's going to impose an undue financial burden. We cannot allow an activity to go on when we know, for instance, that it's the life of the worker that's at risk.

Though our problem, and the member knows and I'll use that as an example, problems associated, for instance, that have occurred in certain industries that deal with recycling of products and have put large amounts of lead into the air and workers, for instance, were diagnosed as having lead poisoning, you cannot, just because an industry like that, for instance - I'm not saying that is the case; I'm saying as an example - if they were to say, well, we don't really have another alternative right now, so give us six months, a year or two years, or just let us go on doing as we do, because to do otherwise would impair, for instance, our operation, or put at risk our operation, in situations like that, we would have to say, unfortunately, if that's the case, well be it as it may, the operation will have to shut down. They will have to stop and we would have to put in place a stop-work order because the alternative means that you would have workers' health so impaired that indeed they could die from it.

So between one extreme and the other there has to be, of course, some proper measure of good sense and taking into account the realities of each particular situation, but part of the enforcement, the staff in the department are there to see that the industry there is not just there to comply in an ad hoc way.

When these regulations are adopted and when the legislation is adopted, it's after extensive consultation, as I've said, so it may mean that it imposes certain hardships; but, generally speaking, when it was adopted it was seen as something that made eminent sense, something that was necessary to protect the health of workers and therefore everybody would be able to live with it.

Even in certain cases, they would have to make certain adjustments, realizing that in the long haul everybody would benefit because the health of the workers, in being protected, certainly, they would be there on the job rather than ill at home, representing more and more costs from a compensation standpoint. I don't want to talk too long on that point; I don't have that responsibility anymore. But the fact remains that

that's also part of the reality, and when you have that kind of a problem in the workplace, you also have retraining costs for new employees when former employees, for instance, their health is so impaired they cannot come back to the job. You have damaged equipment very often. You have loss of morale, etc. So the industry benefits in terms of better production when you have healthy, happier employees and, of course, the workers themselves are certainly going to be happier if they can feel confident that the job they are doing doesn't present long-term risks to their health.

So there's no question about it. There has sometimes to be some give and take, but there are situations where that cannot apply.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would thank the Minister. Looking after this department isn't all peaches and cream.

I know that a special judgment is required because nobody wants to see any worker in the workplace come away with anything other than his salary at the end of the week. I think we do have to protect their health, and I would say that this special judgment is required because, you know, rather than close up his employment, because that's their future, and if there is a danger, then sometimes you have to do that; but I think that you really do have to have a very special judgment as to whether you have to assist financially, whether you have to close up the workplace until it's corrected, or whether it's going to be closed up forever. These things all have to be taken into consideration, and I respect the Minister for the remarks.

But I would also like to thank the Minister for his statement where he said that there were more inspections of mines this year than there were over the previous year. If nothing else that has come about from my bringing to the Minister's attention about the selection of mines inspectors, I think that possibly I, with my questions of last year concerning mines inspections and inspectors over other mines inspectors has probably brought about a greater number of mines inspections.

I would like to ask the Minister - he made mention about lead in air levels just in his last remarks - do we have a department that can do that, or do we have to rely on Atomic Energy of Canada to come in with their equipment to advise us as to correcting these types of situations? Can our department here in the province look after everything, or do we have to bring in help from other locations? Are we self-sufficient?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, indeed, Mr. Chairman, other than the Workplace Safety and Health Program dealing with the Safety and Health officers and the industrial hygiene staff, they can carry on a study of lead in air in the Workplace Safety and Health. As well, of course, these samples, an analysis can be done by the departmental laboratory, W.M. Ward Laboratory on Logan. I don't have the numbers specifically of incidents strictly having to do with lead, but I know the issue came up a number of times during the year and perhaps staff can find me some specifics on lead.

There were, I might say, under the Workplace Safety and Health, and that is the Inspectorate Branch, separate from the mines - perhaps this would be of interest to the member - and while I mention the word

"mines," I might indicate that the number of fatalities is down, the number of reported accidents in mines were down, the number of complaints were down as well. So it is an encouraging indication.

Now in terms of the inspections in Workplace Safety and Health, there were almost 6,000 inspections carried out - 5,913 to be precise. There were some 4,967 improvement orders issued. There were 163 stop-work orders; 243 stop-work warnings. There were 632 complaints investigated; 1,068 accidents investigated.

I'm sorry, I got that wrong; I want to correct that. There were 632 training and education sections; 1,068 complaints investigated; 304 accidents investigated; and 3 fatalities for the department. A total of 15 prosecutions were laid and 8 of those went to Labour Board appeal.

That gives you the whole statistical breakdown in terms of the activities which were under the responsibility of the Safety and Health officers and hygienist in the Department of Safety and Health.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't want to dwell on it.

HON. G. LECUYER: Okay. I wanted to add one thing and I didn't have the figures on it, and I can give it here to the member.

I don't have the figures for a specific day for 1986, but I have the figures in terms of lead analysis total. There 1,609 in 1985, and that's the total analysis - 1,026 of those were blood, 574 air, and 7 of those were urine. So the breakdown of the total numbers is what I've given.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Minister advise whether - he's got a bill going through on nuclear waste, and I'm not going to touch on that, but what do we do to back up this bill or our regulations now? Who does the inspections? Do we have to go to the Atomic Energy of Canada to do inspections for us, or are we going to be self-sufficient? The regulations seem to be pointed at them particularly. Are we going to use them to correct any problems we have?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, we do carry out our own inspections of the search that is being done in regard to nuclear waste research. As far as the member is asking in regard to the actual AECL activities in Pinawa, that is under federal jurisdiction. But the research that is done in terms of nuclear waste falls under, as well, our jurisdiction and we do carry out inspections of their operation.

Just recently Environment Canada invited us to join with them as part of the monitoring of the radiation waste, nuclear waste research, and we'll probably take part with them in that monitoring. But, as I say, those are two very different matters. When you're talking about radiation, something totally different than from lead in terms of a hazard in the workplace.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I know that the Provincial Government owns the land that has been leased to Atomic Energy for the experimentation, and I'm not

sure about where they're actual operation is, but is there regular inspections done by terms of the lease, or is it by the Department of Environment?

HON. G. LECUYER: Both Environment Canada and ourselves would be involved in the ongoing monitoring of those activities as part of the actual underground research laboratory. I believe there are three reports already that have been published on that. Three reports on the monitoring done there have been published and there is ongoing activity.

As part of their aboveground, for instance, testing with hydrology, bore holes, they have to also abide by certain conditions that are clearly outlined in the permit. Therefore, we simply would monitor to ensure that they live by those specific requirements of the permit.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Have the asbestos problems, particularly in the schools, been corrected? Can the Minister bring us up to date on our previous problems with asbestos?

HON. G. LECUYER: My answer to that, Mr. Chairman, would be wherever there are problems known to exist, as far as I know, they have been corrected. That does not mean to say that there's no longer any asbestos anywhere. There are public and private buildings that have asbestos in them, and a number used in a number of ways. Where this asbestos is covered or is in good condition, it is the most safe way of dealing with it. Too frequently, there have been more problems associated, or more health problems associated, with the removal of asbestos because it was not done properly or than there are with asbestos being left alone if it presents no problems. If it's in good order, then it should be left the way it is.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Minister bring us up to date on what's happening with the protecting of the taxicab drivers, the protection of the taxicab drivers in the workplace with the shields that were off again, on again?

HON. G. LECUYER: In the reply to that, I might add, as far as asbestos is concerned, we have been working on developing a code of practice in that regard, that it should soon be ready to adopt as well. So there will be also a code of practice in regard to asbestos.

In regard to that taxicab security question, as the member has said, not at all facetiously, because it's true, that was on again, off again, on again. A committee of the Advisory Council on Safety and Health was formed under the chairmanship of the chairman of the advisory council and came forth with some recommendations, some of which are mandatory, among those the shield. I believe there are five mandatory recommendations. An implementation committee was struck to proceed. We accepted as a government the report of the advisory council and will proceed to implement those provisions which were recommended to us.

Now, some of the recommendations will be easier to implement; others will take a little more time. Specifically, when we're dealing with regard to the shield, we have to make sure that the shield meets

certain standards. Those standards are in the process of being developed. I can't state exactly for the member when we will be ready to proceed with the shield, but as we have already advised the industry and made it known publicly by way of a press release, it is a mandatory requirement that will be put in place.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

In the meantime, that same committee dealt with a number of recommendations - training to be provided for drivers, because we believe that oftentimes problems arise as a result of improper training to be taxi drivers. As well, another one of the mandatory requirements was that there be a light on the dome of the taxicab to signal when the taxi driver was in difficulty.

I don't remember offhand all of the provisions. I mentioned already the driver training for professional development to be provided as part of that, the training program; the passenger information that has to be provided on a decal or a sign that would be in the car, and there were other recommendations that were not mandatory but carried with it a strong recommendation of the committee. We're hoping that those can all be put in place as well.

Now the committee of the advisory council is also looking - and that was part of their mandate - whether there are requirements that might fit or perhaps should be applied into areas, such as, for instance, as Brandon, or Thompson in the North. So they're looking at that as a separate issue and they haven't completed the report on that one and I don't expect they will be completed for some length of time.

MR. A. KOVNATS: It might seem like I'm jumping around a little bit, but it all comes under the Minister's department, who seems to be - and I'm not trying to catch him - able to answer the questions that I posed to him, so I'm satisfied if he is.

I would like to just make a remark that a little earlier and I proceed this opening with a preamble because I think it's important. I don't want to be accused of being discriminatory or a bigot, but I had been accused because of some particular actions of being insensitive to Natives. That is not the truth because I do have a special feeling towards Natives.

In the training program that has gone up in Northern Manitoba for the hiring of Natives for Limestone, I had made some remarks about how we were taking people out of an environment and putting them into another environment. With that in mind, I thought that there would be some dangers that existed to these people that had never existed before.

Can the Minister advise whether the training program that has been in existence for the Natives in Northern Manitoba, particularly for the Limestone development, has given us any cause for concern, whether it's more accidents, more Workers Compensation claims, because they aren't used to the environment, or have we put them into the environment to the same degree that other people go into the environment?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, if the member probably will recall, I did indicate last year that as part of that training program that was being provided for Native people in the North, especially or specifically

aimed at providing job opportunities under the Limestone project, there were some 88 training sessions provided specifically aimed at these people, so that they would have a better understanding and better appreciation of risks that can present themselves in that type of occupation, so that they can better handle themselves and better protect their own safety and health. There were some 88 training sessions aimed specifically at Native people to potentially work under the Limestone project.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Minister give us any instances, any statistics as to the results of these training programs?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I could get that information in terms of the accident risks, for instance, - not accident risks, but the number of accidents - for which compensation might have been claimed under the Limestone project overall. But I don't have that information at the moment, and even if I were to get it, I wouldn't have that kind of breakdown in terms of knowing who was injured. It would be total figures. I couldn't give you any breakdown in terms of Native versus non-Native, or Northerners versus Southerners. I couldn't give you that kind of a breakdown.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm sure that the Minister understands. Instead of a personal concern, I ask these questions for no ulterior motives except for the safety and well-being of the Natives.

Can I get back to something that we had mentioned before, and the Minister had given me an answer, but it wasn't quite a complete answer. Let's talk about these soft drink cans. I noticed out at the park, I guess it was yesterday, in the paper this morning some young fellow was carrying a couple of big bags of empty soft drink cans. I meant to look to see if there were any beer cans in there. I didn't see any empty beer cans, but I could identify quite a few soft drink cans.

Can the Minister advise the ratio of input into the environment of soft drink cans as to taking out and recycling of the environment? I know that a decision will not be made until, I guess, another six months, because the industry is sort of on a one-year trial period. I want it to be successful, because I want it to correct the situation. But if it's not successful, I think that we'd better start looking at some alternatives.

What are the figures, the input against output of soft drink cans?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Soft Drink Recycling, MSDR - Manitoba Recycling, that's what it's called - has been in operation for less than a year, and indeed the member would be right in saying that there were no beer cans in that bag, I would venture to say. Probably, I would venture to say, there was not a single one. I think they all would have been soft drink cans.

Under that program, there have been a million-plus soft drink cans returned. The program was slated to come into place some time in the summer of last year and it did not in actual fact quite get off the ground at the time that it was supposed to because they had to get their publicity materials ready and a number of

other technical aspects of their operations and they were not ready to proceed. So they probably have been fully operating in Southern Manitoba now for approximately six months, I suppose, and are in the process of trying to establish their foothold in the North, hoping that they can open some depots where these products can be taken so that they can do a regular collection.

Presently they operate at 16 shopping centres in Winnipeg on a bi-weekly basis. They operate between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays and from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. I understand that they are in the process of expanding to Brandon, Portage, Morden, Winkler, Dauphin and Steinbach in July of this year and propose to have two depots, as I said, in the North to purchase aluminum and, as well, hopefully, non-returnable glass and will start to accept plastic containers this summer. They are in the process of developing plans to deal with that.

As far as giving the member a ratio of how much of the cans are being returned, I haven't got a number on that, and hopefully I will get a number on that that I can give him once the year is up. As I say, I can say only that there are a million cans less out there than there would have otherwise been. I can also add this, that is only a small amount or a small percentage, certainly I would say probably less than 5 percent of the total annual outlay of aluminum cans of soft drinks in a year. Hopefully, when their operation is fully operational, we can achieve a level of return which comes close to the experience under the same program in Minnesota where the return under that system was as good as the returns that are experienced in other localities in Canada where they have a mandatory deposit.

Having said that, I repeat what I said in the past. Certainly, if it doesn't work, we will have to look at alternatives. And they know that; I've told them that. In the meantime, I do not want to be out there harassing them on an ongoing basis because we have said we'd like to give them a chance, probably a little longer chance than I had originally said, in that they were not able to start until a fair bit later than had originally been anticipated. So it wouldn't be until sometime late in the fall that we would be able to say your year is up and let's see what's happened.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I, too, am sympathetic towards the soft drink industry and I want to give them a chance.

The only thing that I was bringing to the Minister's attention was that I think that this is really the one time that the Minister had the opportunity of saying that we are monitoring the situation, and I would have agreed with it. I would hope that he would be monitoring this particular situation.

The terminology where he used "soft drink," I'm a little bit confused because I have used "soft drink" in the past but it seems to me that the Americans particularly - and I guess we have in Canada - we've always talked about the ones that come in the bottle as "pop" as an alternate name to soft drink, because when you take an opener and you flip up the top you get a pop sound. I was just wondering whether, instead of calling these "soft drinks" in tins, whether they would be called "click-pfft" to identify the type of soft drinks that we have.

And I know it's going to give Hansard an awful headache trying to figure out how to spell "pfft," but whatever they do would be completely satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put it down on a piece of paper, will you?

MR. A. KOVNATS: I wouldn't know how to spell it.

I just wanted to bring that to the Minister's attention that I am a friend of the soft drink industry inasmuch as I enjoy soft drinks ever since I wasn't able to drink beer or wines because of the trouble I have with my stomach, and I think the Minister might take into consideration a word of warning also that soft drinks are okay, but maybe some of the other beverages should be crossed right off the list.

Can we get down to the spraying of herbicides and pesticides? I don't want to get into great detail, but I just want to bring up the comfort of the people of, well, not just all of the Province of Manitoba but Winnipeg particularly, wherein we have to spray for mosquitoes, particularly, coming up very shortly, I would think, because I have seen some incidences of mosquitoes now. I'm not going to cause any panic - nobody listens to these committees anyway except you or I - but somewhere in the future, we might have to make reference here. I don't know, and I'm not going to cause any panic about how the transfer of blood from one person to another through mosquitoes and how diseases are spread. That would probably add to my argument on spraying for mosquitoes.

But has the Minister done anything more to relieve the limitations that he has put on the spreading of pesticides to relieve of mosquitoes for the City of Winnipeg, any additional limitations, or is he about to lift the restrictions and allow mosquitoes when the problem gets that bad not only for the sake of health but for the sake of comfort?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the member is referring to the pesticide permit regulation and I'll try to limit my comments as close as possible to the questions or concerns of the member.

The member knows darn well that I like to talk about this issue and I would like to go at it for a lengthy period of time because I don't believe this to be the problem that so many others seem to view it.

I would like to mention for the member that in 1986 there were some 239 permits issued and some of the restrictions placed on these permits had to do with the fact that we required that there be no aerial applications over residences. Personally, I feel and I would hope that we have no aerial applications at all over residential areas - and I'm putting down on the record - here in the City of Winnipeg and over other cities where it's impossible to control the drift of that kind of spray from going a bit astray.

We require that there be no spraying of schoolgrounds while children are in school; that there be no spraying of parks, ball diamonds, etc., while the public is present; that there be a 100-metre buffer zone established around residences of those who object to residential fogging.

They already have to register, in writing, to indicate that they are opposed; and, of course, we have indicated

in the past - I should say on the basis of last year's experience, and that was the first full year of operating under the pesticide permit regulation - we experienced no major problems as a result of this.

Having said that, personally, I feel that the misquitoes are generally a nuisance and have to be viewed that way, and a municipal responsibility, and I certainly would prefer that increasingly we try to control that problem through larviciding rather than using chemicals as an adult-deciding program. I think that the indications are, certainly as far as the City of Winnipeg is concerned, that a greater effort is being made in that direction, and I don't know if it has anything to do with it, but so far certainly this year, we haven't experienced any problem in that regard.

I have to add, on the other hand, that last year when they could have carried out their fogging program until the summer, for one reason or another, because of the wind conditions or raining conditions or because they were late in starting, we never experienced that large of a problem and yet they never did proceed to carry out one full fogging cycle in the City of Winnipeg. In fact, they only did it one night, I believe, in the St. Vital area.

The member knows, if we want to go into further detail, what I think about the value of fogging in terms of what I would say we could better do with our taxpayers' money.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I've only got one more question on this, and my colleague, the Member for Virden, would like to pursue something on a similar vein.

So if the Minister is saying that he is offering his services to come over and swat the mosquitoes over at my place sometime over the summer, I'd be happy to entertain that kind of an offer because, really, it does get very, very uncomfortable and we don't have any real concrete proof of the detrimental effect fogging has towards health.

I know that my wife, who has trouble with asthma, does have some very great discomfort problems when it comes to the spraying, and I know people with pets that leave them outside, they have to bring them in for a short time, but I think if you warn them in advance that it lessens the problem.

When it affects the comfort of so many people to the discomfort of such a few, I think there shouldn't be the restrictions that the Minister has put on to the spraying and the fogging.

HON. G. LECUYER: First, let me begin by saying I'll do my own exercise and the Member for Niakwa can do his as well.

I can say that the best approach is to use personal protection or repellents that work reasonably well. In fact, all indications are that they work much better than all of the fogging that can be done.

The member is forcing me to go into a little bit of detail and I did put out a very lengthy letter last year which I think I gave him and I distributed to a lot of people. I think that we have no concrete or conclusive proof that the fogging is in any way successful or brings about results in terms of reduction of mosquitoes. In fact, some of the monitoring of that which has been done has shown that some of the areas which were

fogged the day before were more infested the next day than some of the areas which were not.

I mean, we have nothing conclusive to show that indeed it produces beneficial results therefore. On the other hand, the member knows, and I dealt with that - and I think he liked to hear that awhile ago - in regard to the other substances, I said that when we don't know, we better err on the side of caution. Remember I said that just a little while ago, and certainly that applies to chemicals when we don't know what might be the full impact of the use of such chemicals indiscriminately in the environment.

We know for a fact that some people do suffer from various respiratory ailments who are significantly detrimentally affected by various chemicals.

We don't know that it's successful, but we know that it can be detrimental. So therefore, unless we have better results, I think we have to err on the side of caution. I say that, and I say it again, in order for fogging to be successful in the City of Winnipeg, it needs about two weeks at least of good weather so that they can spray almost on a nightly basis to cover or blanket the whole city.

There is no way you can teach those little pesky mosquitoes not to go into that area you sprayed the day before. Therefore, you're likely to find them in as numerous an amount in the area you sprayed the night before, especially if the wind happened to be in that direction and if they happen to be hiding under a leaf at the time the spray passes by, it's just like playing tag - they got away.

So for all those reasons, I have I suppose very strong biases on this, because I think we are taking undue risks and especially we would simply be wasting money - throwing it to the wind - and I certainly feel that we can achieve better results by putting a little more dollars in the larviciding program and that's where I think the city should put its dollars.

Of course, even if you were to control it totally in the City of Winnipeg, what does that do for the rest of the Province of Manitoba? I'm sure the Member for Virden is going to say, "What's that going to do for me in Virden? - Nothing."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You were talking about permits for pesticide application and I'd like to just ask the Minister if you have any jurisdiction over farmers applying any pesticide on their own land, whether insecticide or herbicide, by land or by air, or with regard to contamination of any part of the environment. If he says "no" at this time, do you have any intention of having any jurisdiction in this area in the near future?

HON. G. LECUYER: The answer is "no" - no on all accounts.

The reason for that is that first of all it wouldn't be enforceable. Secondly, the pesticides they use are pesticides that we don't have the jurisdiction to approve these pesticides. I suppose we could ban their use in the Province of Manitoba. Having done that, in certain cases I know that there are a number of concerns that were raised, and flags that were raised in regard to 2,4-D. I received a number of letters from a number

of farmers saying, hey, please do not ban the 2,4-D. I didn't have enough information to go by.

We discussed this with my colleagues, other Ministers from other provinces. I don't know if it would be correct to say every jurisdiction - I would think that is pretty well the case. Every jurisdiction has accepted that we will take the attitude of, we'll watch and see what the results are of the analysis that are currently being carried out by Agriculture Canada; it's by Health and Welfare.

In the meantime, we'll allow its use, advising people to, on the other hand make sure they use all the proper precautionary measures, such as gloves, goggles, and the throw-away type of respiratory or mask, so that they do not put themselves at undue risk when using a substance about which we suspect there might be problems.

So therefore we haven't touched upon it, and we have not touched on any of the other chemicals that have been registered with Agriculture Canada that they have approved for use here currently in Canada, and we have no intention of, at the present time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The Minister mentions 2,4-D, and myself, from past experience, I know that any chemical, any substance, can be administered to some form of animal that would eventually show a carcinogen if you give it in large enough doses or under certain kinds of condition of the animal, like say, during pregnancy or whatever. And 2,4-D, Mr. Minister, is definitely a biodegradable chemical and it's a very cheap chemical, very valuable to the farm community, and has been for a lot of years in terms of effectiveness, relative to cost.

I would certainly urge you in any time that you're in communication with other people in your capacity, in other provinces, and especially with the Federal Government, to be sure that any analysis of 2,4-D or any presently used agricultural chemical is given very careful scrutiny with regard to common sense in how the testing is done.

Because as I say, Mr. Minister, salt can be shown to be a carcinogen given a sufficient dose. So 2,4-D has a very good track record, I believe, in terms of its ability to do a good job of controlling weeds that farmers have to contend with every year. I believe the odd environmentalist here and there can certainly create a case history for 2,4-D that farmers have a tough time fighting. I don't think farmers can afford the cost of having to fight it if the analysis or the testing is done on an unrealistic basis, which I sometimes fear can be done.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, we had asked - and by "we," I mean the Environmental Ministers - at our annual meeting - it's almost two years ago - for a meeting of the Environmental Ministers with the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health and Welfare and the Minister responsible for Oceans and Fisheries. I don't know that they were all there. I believe the Minister of Agriculture was there, the Minister of Health was there and the Federal Minister of Environment. We did have that meeting not that long ago and, as a result, a committee was struck so that we perhaps can, in the future, have a system whereby there's better information provided so that we take

proper measures to also review periodically the chemicals that have been authorized.

And I can assure the member that these analysis of chemicals, such as the one that's being carried out on 2,4-D presently, are not just minor reviews. They're a very extensive process that probably will take a year or more just to review that particular chemical, so it's something that's taken very seriously and it's going to be done properly.

So if following that study they were to come forth with concrete evidence that it does cause cancer and we have no evidence of that now; but we know that on the basis of something that occurred in the United States - and I'm not sure which state - but that's where the . . .

A MEMBER: Kansas, I think.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . Kansas, yes, I believe that's correct. That's where the concerns arise, and I believe there it was shown to be cancerous in animals, and we don't know in what proportion or what it is that was used, but it gives enough concern that it was perhaps time that that chemical be reviewed, and that's what's happening now.

So as I said before, we're not proposing to do anything until we have the results of that study because we have really nothing concrete to go by. If we had had sufficient concerns that we would have thought that, for instance, any numbers or something like that, that would have dictated that we proceed that route even though it would have caused certainly some hardships because it's been on the market for a long time; and therefore, in terms of other chemicals, it's viewed to be fairly effective and cheap. If we'd had strong evidence, we would have had to take that kind of decision. That wasn't the case; so we'll await the results of that study.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I'd like to get on another topic now, the nuisance grounds. The Minister and his deputy certainly know that we've had a little bit of trouble with relocating the nuisance ground in the Virden area. His department had classed the existing dump as being one that should be closed and a new site be found, and this decision was made three or four years ago, and the town and the R.M. were then faced with the responsibility of finding an alternate site. It wasn't all that difficult for them to designate an alternative site, but once people started to become aware that this particular area was being designated, both the town and the R.M. council, and the citizens of the Virden and surrounding areas have gone through a tremendous hassle as to whether the site should be closed, whether the new site is environmentally acceptable.

I guess I'd like to just have a little discussion with the Minister as to on what basis was the original site closed, and what measurements are made to determine that they should be closed; and is there enough evidence, or does the staff in his department have enough evidence that the same problems that exist in the present site won't reoccur in the new site?

HON. G. LECUYER: As the member knows, there was, over a period of a number of years, a study made. It

was a cost-shared study with the Government of Canada of active landfill sites in Manitoba. It was also being done as part of the background gathering of data for our setting up as this waste management system in Manitoba, and a number of, something like - I don't know how many land fill sites there are in Manitoba - that are being studied; I believe something in the order of 738. A number of these sites were then selected or held aside for a further study, and some after that for further study yet, because problems were a part of that study. Obviously, we, as a department, were not carrying on these studies; these were contracted out to firms who have special expertise.

A number of the landfill sites were found to be either almost at capacity use or had presented certain problems, certain chemicals or poisons that were a risk, affecting the water table, as a result of leaching.

I think that we mentioned in a previous departmental review which sites were involved - and the member knows that Virden was one of them - and the department, as a result of the studies, had recommended very strongly to the R.M., to the Town of Virden, to find another landfill site because they were already experiencing problems that could of course get worse. They gave them, of course, a significant amount of time to proceed to find a new site, which I believe it's already about three years ago that these discussions were opened with the Town of Virden. The town is then responsible for selecting a site and for having the proper studies conducted to determine whether it will meet the requirements of the regulation as a landfill site.

These studies were done and I believe that they were done at separate times by separate firms because there were indeed concerns. Test drilling conducted on three different occasions by three different groups confirm in this particular case the initial appraisal. This test drilling was done on June 20, 1985 by our branch, in January of 1986 by Paddock Drilling, hired by the town, and in October '86, also, by the town, in which case two test bits were installed.

So the town is responsible for finding sites that might be suitable. We are responsible, as a department, to see whether the sites so selected is in accordance with the requirements of the regulation, and in this case it did.

As the member knows, I met with people who were concerned about the site selected and we had discussions. I can understand their concerns; I can understand that it always gives rise to concern when we're talking about a landfill site. I think it points increasingly that we have to seek other alternatives down the road. Even with those other alternatives, there will be landfilling required, but at least before we put in their landfill, we may have treated the waste that we put therein.

In the City of Winnipeg, the member may have noticed there were a number of articles in the newspapers a couple of weeks ago whereby they're looking at . . . They have problems too with landfills. More recently, we saw articles in the international newspapers showing this barge travelling back and forth the whole section of the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, trying to find a country or a state that would accept some 3,000 tonnes of waste on this huge barge and nobody wants to take it. In fact, as far as I know, it still hasn't

been unloaded but at least it's going back where it originally came from. You can imagine, after all that expense of loading this barge, and it'll have to be unloaded, but there's an injunction presently preventing it from being unloaded because they want to conduct an analysis to determine what if hazardous products or substances are on that barge.

It points out the problem that's occurring in some parts of the world of having no longer any sites available for landfilling, and there is a tremendous amount of costs associated with that.

The City of Winnipeg is starting to find that it's starting to have problems with that. And yet we're a young city, we're not a huge population, and we have wide open spaces surrounding us, but it's an expensive proposition, there's no doubt. We're going to have to start looking at - as a society generally - whether there's not other alternatives that enable us to use, for instance, some of the energy that we could produce therefrom. We're going to have to start looking at removing from what now goes into our wastes all of these products that could be recycled, and there are problems associated with that.

There are monumental challenges that we have to try and solve in that regard, and in my department we have staff working on that. It's perhaps not as easy as it is in other localities where you have higher densities of population, shorter distances to transport and higher volumes of the product in the first place that you can recycle, but still, that is not to say that we have to give up.

Everyday we can read about very sound, economic new ventures that spring up on the basis of recycling of products - a new plant in Alberta for recycling plastics. The demand is such that they cannot keep up with it. Maybe we'll find a source for some of our own waste plastics. I know that there's a plant just on the other of the border that's starting up to recycle rubber. These new ventures are just starting at the present time.

I think that's what makes it difficult in places like Virden. Although some of the people were proposing that there be incineration, perhaps we haven't reached a point where it's a viable alternative because of the high costs associated with that, but there are larger communities where that certainly is something that needs to be considered.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Just to get a better handle on why a site would be closed, you mentioned leaching. What precisely does it measure? Is it metallines or pollutants, bacteria? What are some of the offending factors that has caused sites like Virden to be considered unsafe?

I guess the follow-up to that is what do we have in place with lucites that prevents those sorts of contaminants from becoming a problem in the short term?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I guess it boils down to what we know today and didn't know in the past, to a certain extent, because in the landfill regulation there are certain requirements in terms of the type of soil that has to be there to prevent leaching. I think that perhaps in the past we weren't being as - I might use the word as fussy - in terms of requirements for

a landfill site; and perhaps we're not requiring that the same type of impermeable layer be provided under the landfill site.

I don't have the details of what specific problem had to do with Virden here and we can provide that information to the member. I know that in some instances, for instance, and I'm not saying that this was the case with the Virden landfill site, but I know it was the case with some of them that they had arsenic or other substances - who knows how they got there, perhaps - or other hazardous substances that were at one time or another dumped in those landfills. I know that in some cases arsenic was used to control the rat infestation in those landfill sites and perhaps it arose as a result of that.

But anyway we know that in the past in many of our landfills a lot of the hazardous waste substances found their way there. In some cases they found their way in the sewers and that's unfortunate, but that gave rise to some of these leaching problems that were unveiled as part of that study.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay, that's sufficient for me for now, but you said you would supply me with the information that came from Virden that caused the closing. I'd like to have that in the future, if you wouldn't mind.

One other area I would like to ask a question or two on is you have inspectors, your department has inspectors that go around to - a case situation I became aware of was a machinery dealership inspecting a shop in the way his equipment was set up and whether it met certain safety standards - you have people that do that? And what are they looking for and what authority do they have at these local dealerships?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I presume the member is referring to Safety and Health inspectors who may have gone and do go into repair shops, garages, especially if there have been complaints or if they have reason to believe, or if it's a new shop for that matter where they might want to inspect the way work is carried about is done according to the proper practices to ensure the safety of workers. You know as well as I do that, for instance, we've had a number of incidents with repairing of tires, a particular type of rim - it's called a split rim. We've had problems with regard to hydraulic lifts, etc. So their purpose in going there is to see that the proper equipment and the proper practices are applied in regard to the use of that equipment.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You mentioned that they would inspect it if they had reason to believe something was wrong or had a complaint. But can they just stop at a dealership and just inspect whatever they feel like when they arrive, without any authorization whatsoever?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they can.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The situation that was brought to my attention was, they arrived at a dealership, started looking around and he saw that the safety shield was off of a grinder. One of the reasons it's off the grinder is because that's the only way you can get the pieces

that you want to grind close enough to the grinding wheel to work on them. And everybody in the dealership, the owner and the employees, are quite happy to use it that way and everybody's concerned with their own safety and they were quite aware of how to use the instrument, the grinder. And once the shield was in place, it actually prevented them from using it properly, made it more difficult to grind a shaft or whatever they were grinding and, effectively, they felt that the imposition of the shield created more of a hazard than having it off.

It upset the workers, it upset the owner, with the authority that this person came in with; and he told them what he was getting per hour and he had a car and all these expenses paid, and there was a bad feeling when he left there. Mr. Minister, these people are employed by the taxpayers of Manitoba, and I think they have a responsibility to conduct themselves in a reasonably congenial atmosphere when they go around and try to use some common sense, I would hope, in the way they implement their guidelines and what not; and I encountered a very upset owner at that point in time and some upset employees. It was a very minor item and he didn't find anything else wrong in the shop where there was about 12 people working, and it was a very minor item and it didn't require the imposition of authority that he put upon them that day.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the member can see me later and apprise me of the details of the particular situation. I certainly agree that the staff who carry on these activities do it in a very professional manner and I know they do, and I very, very seldomly get complaints.

If a staff person carries on an inspection, an impromptu inspection, they will obviously find situations; or if they do find situations that don't comply with the regular safety measures I think they have a responsibility to draw this to attention. They should do so in a professional way and indeed I agree with the comments raised that it's not a time to raise issues that are not relevant and to raise the ire of the workers or the employers. I know that is certainly not a general practice. As I say, if the member is kind enough to give me the details, we will look into the matter.

Just to comment now on the fact that there is no shield on the grinder, now even if it's a grinder that's used for a specific purpose, where a shield would not make that operation possible, I think one has to keep in mind those shields are there generally for their protection. I would hope that they would at least raise the issue when they see a situation where there isn't. Maybe there's a good explanation, or maybe there are other precautionary measures that are taken. I would hope that one of those would automatically be goggles and I would hope that there would be other non-inflammables around and they would have considered, if it was possible, to put other kinds of protection in place. I don't know the particulars and I cannot go into it any more than that.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I'll give the Minister more detail when I'm finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The Member for Tuxedo would like to ask some questions at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

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

To begin with, I wonder if I could ask the Minister whether he is familiar with information that has been shared with him with respect to hazards of radon levels in homes in Winnipeg, and whether or not he has any staff present who are prepared to engage in discussion on the issue.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll begin by quoting from an article which I know has been sent to various government officials and Ministers called "The Indoor Radon Story." It says, among other things, and I quote: "The public often focuses on nuclear power and weapons as the major sources of environmental radiation. The scientific community has recently come to realize that the largest dose of radiation that most of us receive comes from the air in our own homes. Significant amounts of radon, a natural radioactive gas, accumulates in our houses simply because we tend to build them on the largest source of radioactivity around the ground. The risk from indoor radon is typically, thousands of times larger than that from other more notorious environmental pollutants."

Recently, the University of California's Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory did some testing and found that an energy-efficient house in Maryland where a group had found radon concentrations 20 times greater than normal, these levels are the radiation equivalent of having a Three Mile Island accident occur in the neighbourhood once a week.

Given the Minister's recent action on legislation with respect to nuclear waste, I wonder what his reaction is to any program to control or to measure monitor radon levels in Manitoba homes.

The reason I ask is that I have, from Health and Welfare Canada, a survey that indicates that Winnipeg, of approximately 19 major cities in the country, has the highest average level of radon in its houses. In fact, 16 percent of Winnipeg homes have radon levels that are higher than the United States Environmental Protection Agency's action level.

This is considered by many scientists to be a very serious problem, a problem of greater consequences than the UFFI problem which was acted upon by both levels of government in the early part of this decade. I have seen no information from the Minister that his department is aware of it, concerned about it, or prepared to take action on it.

HON. G. LECUYER: Let me begin by assuring the Leader of the Opposition that I'm aware of it and concerned about it. I've been following the issue now ever since it surfaced. I have, for the member's information, an extensive file of the issue and I have read the materials in there. I'm aware as he is that recently there were a series of articles that appeared as well in the Globe and Mail, in fact, just this last week or so, with significant information on that.

He also stated that there is not general agreement among scientists on this particular issue, but having said that, the information that we have from a great variety of sources is that more is being made of it than there is.

I should also state that, yes, indeed there was a study made in Canada of some 563 homes, which included I believe some 563 homes in Winnipeg, showed that it was higher than some of the cities, not by any significant degree because, as I say, we have indeed detailed information of the number of cities and the number of homes surveyed in each. We don't have the detailed amount or the working level, because the exposure is measured in working levels for each one of those homes. We don't know that, but we have the mean level for the total number of these homes and, in Winnipeg, there were a total of five homes that were above that working level and two of those have no basement; they were just on ground or soil floor. So we have to take into consideration the number of factors.

The Department of National Health and Welfare is currently conducting a lung cancer radon epidemiology study which is expected to take another three years to complete. The member fully knows these are lengthy proposals. There is, as I said, significant disagreement among scientists on that particular issue.

There is, as well, a federal-provincial working group chaired by the Department of National Welfare, which has prepared a draft guideline for radon levels in homes, about which remedial action is recommended and, at the present time, this is being reviewed by a federal-provincial Advisory Committee on Occupational and Environmental Health.

I know there's a gentlemen, Mr. Yuill, from Winnipeg, who feels that the federal-provincial committee is going to set the standard much higher than it should be and is conducting his own lobby campaign. I do believe that he feels genuinely concerned on this issue. On the other hand, remedial measures are estimated to cost anywhere from some few thousands of dollars to some \$20,000, depending on who you talk to and there's a need for greater and more information than we have at the present time.

The information that I have is, there was a meeting here in Manitoba following the publicity around this issue in 1985. The Manitoba Health and Environment Advisory Committee on Radiation met with officials of Health and Welfare Canada in April of 1985, which included the general director, Dr. Letourneau. At that meeting, Dr. Warner, who chaired the meeting, represented the province along with Dr. Weeks. Present at that meeting was also Dr. Sourkes and Dr. Jan Mueller who was referencing these articles that the member probably has seen, as myself.

Having said that, we're not sure that some people perhaps might not be taken advantage of if they were to panic or follow the path that was followed when the UFFI issue was very much in vogue here in Manitoba as well as elsewhere in Canada.

No houses in Manitoba, I'm told, were above the working level or the safe worker exposure; five were above the draft guideline of .1 working level. So having said that, we will certainly await some of the results of the studies and the efforts that are currently ongoing. We participate in those efforts and we'll continue to do so.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, therein lies the problem, is that the Minister is talking about things in terms of the suggested draft working level, which is five times - that's the Canadian suggested draft - higher than the USEPA action level. On that USEPA level, it has been said by one of the researchers who's most quoted on the issue, Richard Guimond, the head of the EPA's Radon Action group, that this limit is high, the U.S. level that's five times lower is high; but it was set high in spite of the higher risk because the magnitude of the problem is so great that they wanted to concentrate their initial efforts on the worst houses.

So he is suggesting that even the American level is much too high in terms of the risk that's involved, and I repeat that what he's talking about is that in many of these homes it's the equivalent to a Three Mile Island disaster occurring once a week.

So I'm wondering whether the Minister isn't underplaying the issue very substantially and I'll give him some further information that comes out of the office of Mr. Guimond. One is that radon causes more cancer deaths than all other indoor pollutants combined, except smoking.

He talks about the costs of mitigation and in fact the figures of 2,000 to 20,000 don't seem to be supportable by some of the experience that they have. National Research Council found for instance in 10 houses in Saskatoon that by sealing the floor drains alone they had a 46 percent average reduction in radon readings. The other people who are involved in it have achieved 81 percent reduction by three measures of vinyl floor cover, vinyl wall cover and sealing the floor drains. The investments in the U.S. programs for anti-radon measures were under \$1,000 per house, per new house.

Now, admittedly, there would be some perhaps costs in retrofits, but there are a number of things that have to be actioned, I think, fairly quickly.

One is that Manitoba should take a position on whether or not they think the suggested action level for Canada of 100 milli-working levels is adequate, or that Manitoba should investigate why it is five times higher than the American level, which is considered by their chief scientists to be too high as it is. I think Manitoba and the Minister should know what their position is on it and take a position on it.

Secondly, having done that, should then undertake a program of testing to either verify or deny the readings that were obtained by the Health and Welfare Canada Survey in Winnipeg homes. Although there are only five homes that are above the suggested maximum level under the federal policy, there would be over 90 homes that were above the American level, out of that 563 samples.

So that would be very serious, I would think, if one accepts the hazard that is being suggested is there. That hazard, as I repeat, is that radon causes more cancer deaths than all other indoor pollutants combined, except smoking, and that many people - and the Minister refers to Mr. Yuill. He has said about his own home, in which he received a reading of almost three times the U.S. level. He said, "My own family has been exposed to as much radiation over the past 18 years as if our next door neighbour had had a Three Mile accident every two weeks during that period."

He makes certain comparisons that he's obtained from international scientists in which the head of the

Radiation Nuclear Safety for Finland indicated that the radiation dose received by the Finnish population, as a result of the Chernobyl accident, was only 1 percent of what they received from radon. Then the same person in a similar position in The Netherlands indicated that the Chernobyl exposure that they received in The Netherlands was only 4 percent of what they received due to radon.

I repeat that the Minister is going so far as to be very strong about having denoted Manitoba as a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, having brought in legislation on nuclear waste, and seems to be ignoring an even larger, much larger, much more widespread radiation hazard in the form of radon in many, many homes in Winnipeg, and probably throughout the province. I'm surprised that he is taking it so lightly.

HON. G. LECUYER: I want to assure the member that I'm not disregarding this issue; on the other hand, I would be irresponsible to suggest that there is a major problem with radon gas in homes when there is no evidence at this point in time to suggest going that far or to support this claim. I think that it would be adopting the same reaction as was the case in regard to the urea-formaldehyde insulation. The present day evidence suggests that the health concern was much less serious than the original scare that was made of it. I know that there has been a standard developed for worker exposure in mines called the working level, and this level at which mine workers can be exposed to radon with minimum danger.

The federal-provincial working group is looking at a level which is lower than this as an action level for homes, and we're talking about .1 working level. The best estimates extrapolated from occupational exposure is that radon - and that's the information that I'm provided. I'm going by all of the information that the experts in Canada are providing me with at this point in time - may be a cause of some 5 percent of all lung cancers in the population. That contradicts some of the information that is being provided on this issue. I don't deny the fact that there are opposing arguments being made. The relative importance, and the member has mentioned that, of cigarettes as a cause of cancer, is a much greater risk than radon. He has indeed indicated that, except cigarettes. Although some claim that you can correct or reduce the radon levels by some quick and easy fix measures, the experts disagree with that. The federal studies don't support that. The figures that were quoted are between - I said a while ago 2,000 to 20,000. The figures I see quoted by federal authorities is in the order of 10,000 to 20,000.

Now, perhaps you can reduce the risk by taking such simple measures as sealing the basement drain, and we do advise people on how they can have the testing done. On the other hand, we don't have the authority to control the home environment.

The member may have seen among the information that is provided in the article that was shown there, even Saskatchewan which was high, just about the same level as the homes that were measured in Winnipeg, and by the way, it was four homes above that level, not five as I originally mentioned.

They proposed to setting up an interim guideline, setting up a level at .1 working levels. That would affect

public buildings and workplaces, but we'd have no authority or effect on private homes, even there. And as I said before, there is an epidemiological study being done. It doesn't currently, in the information we have, provide a link between radon in homes and cancer.

The U.S. Statistics quotas are based on a straight-line extrapolation of cancer data from miners exposed to very high radon levels, and there is a particular part in the United States where it was indeed established because of the rock formation that's called the Reading Prongs somewhere in the Pennsylvania region where there's indeed a high level of radons, and some further testing is going on in that particular part of the United States.

As far as we know as well, in the United States, the USEPA action level is not the actual level upon which action, in terms of building alterations, have been activated. So this particular article that is published, and in particularly in regard to the one up here in the Globe and Mail recently, it talks indeed to a few scientists or people who consider themselves experts - and they're not necessarily scientists. Some of them are in the business of doing work or repairing homes in regard to radon levels that might be there. Others are in the business of testing for that and I'm not questioning their motives at all because I know, having met one of them in particular, that he is genuinely concerned; but I think the issue is blown presently - until I have other evidence - way out of proportion.

And indeed, all of the information points to the fact that there is no such concern to be had at the present time.

MR. G. FILMON: But just so that the Minister and I are reading the same statistics, he says that we're not too far above the Regina, Saskatchewan reading. I'll repeat, we are the highest in the country and in fact we're 30 percent higher than the average level in Regina - Winnipeg's average level is 30 percent higher - and we have 65 percent more houses above the USEPA action level than Regina.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has indicated that too much was made of the urea-formaldehyde foam insulation scare and that new information says that we went too far, or we shouldn't have had to do all that and so on.

There is a good deal of concern being expressed by scientists on the matter and I want to know whether or not the department, under the Minister's jurisdiction, will be doing any testing in Manitoba then to try and verify the information that's contained in the Health and Welfare survey, or to assess whether or not these are serious levels that should be addressed.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me here an article which is entitled "Design and Interpretation of Large Surveys for Indoor Exposure to Radon Daughters," and I might point out that even on radon generally there's some disagreement. If anything, there is more widespread agreement among the experts that it's not the gas itself, but it's the radon daughters that cause the problem. The geometric mean or, yes, the homes tested in Winnipeg was 0.0058 working levels for 563 homes. For the 961 homes tested in Regina, the geometric level was 0.0044 working levels. On that

basis, as I said before, there were only four homes in Winnipeg and one in Brandon which were above the guideline in Winnipeg, so that leaves no strong data to go by.

I might, as well, indicate from the study which was done, an environmental study that was done, radiation-contamination in Port Hope, Ontario, and I have here the executive summary of that study. I provided it to the Member for Pembina as well with the full study and the appendices in January of 1985. But one of the things that it says is the analysis did not show - and we're talking about an area where the radiation generally is much higher than in Winnipeg - the analysis did not show a statistically significant increase risk of lung cancer from elevated alpha radiation levels in these homes. This was in Port Hope where there was a full-fledged study carried on because it was felt that if there were 100 homes identified with radon contamination, and based on that, the study was carried there, and it goes on to say: "It should be recognized that there were only four cases of lung cancer in contaminated homes and each was a cigarette smoker."

I say, on the basis of the potential cost associated versus the risk, I think that we would be putting our priorities in the wrong direction, if that was the area we were going to address at the present time as a priority issue in Manitoba. Indeed, we cannot disregard this as a matter of concern, and as I said, we are participating in a number of activities which hopefully in time will give us better information in terms of what the magnitude of the problem really is.

I'm not saying we should disregard it. I'm saying that the best information that we have doesn't in any way provide us with evidence that we should deal with the issue any differently than we have up till now.

MR. G. FILMON: And that is, Mr. Chairman, to do nothing about it? Is that what the Minister is suggesting?

HON. G. LECUYER: No, no, not at all. Mr. Chairman, I haven't said that. I said, Mr. Chairman, that we are participating in a number of activities. There's the epidemiological study that's taking place. There's that federal-provincial committee on which we sit which is reviewing the guidelines. So, we're not saying to disregard it, and we will continue to follow this issue very carefully and if there's indeed indications that we should devote to it more attention and the resources that we have at the present time, then we will do so.

MR. G. FILMON: Is Manitoba prepared to accept the federal suggested action limit of a .1 working levels which is five times as great as the suggested action level in the United States?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I said that we were on a committee that's right now reviewing that.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, what is Manitoba's position on that committee?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, until I have the benefit of the recommendations from that committee, I have no position.

MR. G. FILMON: What is the Minister's staff recommending, those who sit on that committee? Are

they suggesting that the action limit is sufficient or are they suggesting a lower limit?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I indicated before that we have our Chief Medical Officer, we have the benefit of the recommendations of a number of other experts, scientists. I mentioned their names here awhile ago who are involved in this issue. I benefit from their recommendations up to this point in time and the actions that we have taken are directly in line with the recommendations they have provided to us. We cannot, and I do not intend to dictate to the scientific community what recommendations they're going to make to me; and as far as the next step, which is the committee, the federal-provincial working group which is developing a guideline level about which the homeowner could be advised to take action, I will await that information.

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister, Mr. Chairman, is sitting back saying he'll await the action.

Has Manitoba looked into it to satisfy itself whether or not the federal action level or the federally suggested action level of .1 working levels is appropriate? There's a body of evidence that I know has been shared with him that suggests it's far too high. What's the Manitoba technical position on it? Are they saying that's far too high; we should be much lower than that; we should be closer to the USEPA level? Or are they saying nothing? In which case, what's the point of them participating in that committee?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I'm saying at this point in time - and again the member points to some of the disagreement that exists on that issue right now - and I point to the member the fact that there is no action taken in the United States at the level which they accept as a guideline. There is not a single home that is where at that level action is taken in the United States, so they could have a level which is lower than that of Manitoba, but they don't apply any action at that level at all. In fact, it has to be many times higher than that in the homes in the Reading Prongs region - as far as we know the only homes where action has been taken up till now.

The members of the committee or the experts who sit on that committee and are reviewing it will benefit as well from the findings of the epidemiological studies carried on in that particular issue. I certainly am not going to advise the members of the scientific community whether the American level that is in place is one that we need to put in place in Manitoba. I think that they will, as part of their findings, come forth with recommendations which I will use to guide our actions here in Manitoba.

As far as we are concerned here in Manitoba, we have taken the same action as the other provinces in Canada at this point in time. Now whether the problem eventually we are told is more serious than that, time will tell, but I suspect that if anything it will, based on the information I have been provided so far, will tell us that perhaps the type of note that is made in articles such as this one is perhaps too high, and as I say, here in Manitoba we certainly don't have the means of conducting a full-fledged epidemiological study,

especially when the levels vary from one locality in the province to another, but certainly they are not as high as they would be in a place such as Port Hope, where you have radiation present from activities that are conducted in that area that go beyond naturally occurring radiation levels.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, at what level do they take action in the United States?

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't have that information right now, but I'll see if we can find it.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister doesn't have a great deal of information and obviously isn't pursuing the matter. I know that he has been written to on a number of occasions, and I must indicate that I think he is neglecting a responsibility here when he's willing to place great emphasis on his commitment to controlling the nuclear threat in Manitoba through passage of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone resolution and legislation about nuclear waste, but isn't prepared to examine the real threat of radon in homes throughout Manitoba, then I say that he is abdicating his responsibility and is being irresponsible on this issue.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't see the two issues being one and the same. If the member doesn't know the difference, I think that he purposely wishes to disregard, for instance, and he knows full well what the potential effect and impact of high-level nuclear waste can be.

If the member says, well this is the same type of issue or it's the same issue, then there is a great deal he doesn't understand about that issue. Of course, I don't understand, I don't know what the level of radon is in all parts of the United States. I don't know what action they've taken in regard to all of these incidents. I know pertinently that we are not disregarding this issue in Canada. I know that we are participating in an ongoing way on the committee that I have indicated a while ago. I know there are studies that are taking place presently here in Canada.

If the problem - and I repeat - were to become an issue that merits more attention than we have given to it, we will certainly do that, but we'll have to have some sort of evidence that that is required. In order to have any type of evidence in regard to the potential impact of high-level nuclear waste, the evidence is there and it doesn't have to be made.

I repeat again, radon gas or radon daughters, we're not sure which one can cause the potential health risk. We're not sure what risk or what level of risk it can be. We know, and the member himself has stated, that it is a level which is lower than someone for instance who is smoking. When we have evidence to the contrary of that, then we'll know as well what type of action we should take.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says there's no evidence, and obviously he won't turn up any evidence if he's unwilling to look into it or do any investigation or testing; and, No. 2, I know full well the difference between the high level nuclear waste legislation and this. The difference is that, in a case

of radon, there may well be levels of radiation prevalent in hundreds if not thousands of homes that will be hazardous and will cause deaths, whereas there is no obligation on the part of this or any other government to accept a high level nuclear waste disposal facility in this province at the present time and his legislation doesn't change that.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, I'm not going to carry on. If the member insists on making this the nuclear waste issue, which it isn't, I guess I'll just let him make that issue. If the member knows the end results of studies that have been on radon, then I will accept the findings as he sends them to me. I have here a comment made by the Leader of the Opposition when he was the chairman of this department in 1981. He says, as I am sure the member can appreciate, and I'm quoting, "If I were to bring down all the departmental files on every topic that might possibly be addressed, I would have to bring a truck into this room. Even if I did that in regard to this issue, Mr. Chairman, I still wouldn't have all the answers because, as I say, they're not in yet." So I will say no more.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, firstly, I'm not asking about an obscure issue in which you'd have to bring down all the files. I firstly asked very politely whether the Minister was familiar with it. He said he was very knowledgeable about it and he had been dealing with it and so had his department. I happened to have copies of correspondence here that he's had on the issue dating back for at least a couple of years, so I'm not asking him about an obscure question on an obscure issue such as has been given to him in that Hansard reference by his special assistant. There's no question that I haven't done this out of the blue. I first asked if he wanted to talk about it and was prepared to. He is, but he's also not doing anything meaningful about it and I've established that. If that's the way he wants to leave it, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question that I'd like to ask the Minister, and maybe it has been asked by other members and maybe by the leader as well, but in regard to this formaldehyde insulation, all of the homes that this formaldehyde foam insulation was used on, has all of that been removed?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't give the member the exact figures on that. I know there are lots of homes that still have the formaldehyde insulation. The program of assistance for removing that type of insulation is also no longer in existence.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Well, my question to the Minister: Is it then now safe to leave it in the home?

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, I don't know that it is necessarily safe. If it's not in properly or if there are leaks, it may not necessarily be safe but it's no longer, on the other hand, viewed as being the same problem as it was originally. A lot of it was made on this issue, I would venture to say, by a lot of unscrupulous people

who made good money out of removing it. I think we have to put it on the record. It is also a fact that some of these people can no longer carry on those activities because the program is no longer in existence and are now actively seeking for another type of program that they can jump on. Perhaps radon gas might just be a wonderful substitute.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Well, my question initially to the Minister is - actually I think he is in the one sense almost answering it by stating that there was a lot of money being made possibly by removing it. So necessarily it maybe wasn't as unsafe as a lot of people tried to scare the public into that it actually was.

Are you testing any of these homes that have it today? Is it basically within the limits?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, it has been found that formaldehyde in the homes was not as serious a problem, in fact, as many other building materials that are present in the homes. The federal program of assistance has been discontinued. We, personally, the department, don't have an ongoing testing program for formaldehyde. If we were to test, for instance, a building on the basis of problems with complaints that occur as we sometimes do, we would then be able to establish that as part of a larger problem, perhaps, but we wouldn't be testing specifically for formaldehyde.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Can I ask the Minister; would he be willing to reveal how much money has been spent in the removal of this by the Province of Manitoba by the removal of this formaldehyde?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, this is not a provincial program. It was a federal program of assistance. I don't have the figures.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I wonder if I may jump to a different . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: All I can say, I suppose, to add to that, Mr. Chairman, is that it was certainly too much. If we had complaints or require people wanting testing to be done, we wouldn't be conducting it ourselves, but we would refer them to various firms that can do the work.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I'd like to go on to a different topic if I may, because I haven't been here right from the beginning. You were on chemicals before, and I would like to just ask the Minister.

I understand all chemical dealers are registered. Is that correct?

HON. G. LECUYER: They all register with the Provincial Agriculture Department.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Is there any control as to whom these people sell their chemicals to? I mean, is there any check? Why I'm asking this question is some of these chemicals there shall be no consumption of food or even, for that matter, use some of this chemical in respect to the animals that they're feeding some of this chemical, some of this insecticide is being used

on certain fresh vegetables. I know it states right on the can, "This shall not be consumed within 30 days of application." I'm actually quite concerned about some of this.

Can the Minister respond to me as to whether there's any follow-up in regard to some of this chemical, or whether there's testing being done in that respect to protect the general public? Just because a dealer is registered as a licensed seller, what's there to protect the public that somebody purchases it and will use this chemical in an unauthorized manner?

HON. G. LECUYER: As I indicated before, Mr. Chairman, the registering of a chemical product for sale or for putting on the market and the uses for which it can be used come under the jurisdiction of Agriculture Canada. Having said that, I don't know . . .

I'm told, Mr. Chairman, that the sale of chemicals classed as a commercial or a restricted is controlled, therefore it is not a product that is available indiscriminately to anybody.

On the other hand, the testing of food is routinely done by the Federal Food and Drug Act. I suppose that doesn't necessarily mean that, if somebody tries hard enough, you know, put his hands on one or the other of this type of substance and, if he were to do so and were to use it in complete disregard of the directions provided, he would certainly be putting his own health at risk or the health of somebody else at risk.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Well, just one final question in respect to the vegetables that are coming in, let's say, from across the line at the present time. Does the Province of Manitoba have the assurance that basically these vegetables are tested for not having a too high a level of chemical activity?

HON. G. LECUYER: There's an ongoing testing of vegetables. The market gardeners for instance would know which of these chemicals or, if they request or specify the use, certainly would not be sold some of these restrictive products, nor are these products available. Those that are classed as a restricted or that are controlled would not be available from the regular shelves in the store where you can buy various pesticides that you can use for your own personal garden or flowers, etc. They would not be of that type.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Has the Province of Manitoba conducted a program of spraying for cankerworms, for instance, like in the City of Winnipeg? Is that conducted by the Province of Manitoba?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm told that there's a very limited amount of spraying done under the auspices of government services in regard to government buildings or their surrounding properties. Other than that, there's no spraying for cankerworms specifically, but the City of Winnipeg carries a significant program in that regard - I don't know to what extent this year, but has in the past - and I know they certainly were proposing a program this year until the weather conditions were such that, and they came to realize that because of the dry conditions, they were no longer in the same

risk cycle or same part of the cycle as were the high incidence that we were in previous years. I do believe that they actually did not proceed to carry the program this year, although they had the program proposed. I don't know from there what other municipalities may have done in this regard. There may be others that have carried the program, but I cannot say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The Canada-Manitoba Mercury Agreement - no expenditure for this year, \$85,000 last year. Was the agreement beneficial to the Province of Manitoba and what were the results?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the program is completed. The report, I'm told, is at the printers and, therefore, as soon as it comes, we'll have a chance to see it and eventually will be made public. It's a report that was sponsored by both the Government of Manitoba and the Federal Government. Eventually it will be made a public report, but at this point in time I haven't seen it.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would believe the Minister. I don't think he's trying to hide anything with this important subject at this point, because there's been many other things that the government has hidden until after it was a fait accompli, but in this particular case I don't think anything is happening there.

Section (d), Dangerous Goods Inspectorate Training - the cost is much reduced this year from last year. Is it because we're training less inspectors?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, when I used that figure, and the figure that appeared in the Estimates last year was a figure that we had been verbally given but the agreement had not been finalized. When we got into the hard negotiating to finalize that agreement, the amount - we didn't get any funding for the program last year. I'm told we had provided for that money in the budget, but we never got any recoveries. I'm told the agreement, as far as this year, is before Treasury Board and we have expectations it will be finalized in the near future.

MR. A. KOVNATS: You can pass Resolution No. 64, if you wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Environmental Management, 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2); 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2)—pass; 2.(d)—pass.

Resolution No. 64: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,808,600 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Environmental Management, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

We're now in the section Clean Environment Commission, No. 3.(1)(a) Salaries - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: This was investigated pretty good last year and there's really not that much change. I would suggest that I have seen the Clean Environment Commission in action. I've followed them around and

they seem to be doing an adequate job at this point. I don't have any criticism or any investigation of them at this point. I know that the Minister has always been cooperative and, if I've ever got any questions or any information that I want, I know that it's always available. So I think we can pass this item off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) Salaries—pass; 3.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 65: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$312,200 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Clean Environment Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

No. 4., Manitoba Environmental Council: (a) Salaries - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: For the same reasons that we passed 65 without too much debate, I think we can pass 66 also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 66: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$62,700 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Manitoba Environmental Council, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

No. 5., Workplace and Worker Services, (a)(1) Salaries - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I want to thank the Minister for his cooperation in this regard and allowing us to ask questions sort of all around the farmyard, but I think that we accomplished what we wanted to. We were able to put our questions on and the Minister was able to supply the information in most cases that was requested.

So I think that we can proceed on to Section (b) Worker Advisor Office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2) . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, we've not completed yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, not completed, I'm sorry. You want the Worker Advisor Office, okay.

5.(b)(1) Worker Advisor Office: Salaries - the Member for Niakwa.

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

Salaries, \$328,500 this year and \$50,500 in Other Expenditures. I am almost astounded that this is part of the Minister's department inasmuch as all other aspects of Workers Compensation had been removed. I was feeling sorry for the Minister because I wasn't going to ask any questions on Workers Compensation, but I see where the Worker Advisor Office must be part of the Workers Compensation. If it's not, and it's into this department, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, who's paying the salaries?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the Worker Advisor Office, as well as a good portion of the program on the Workplace Safety and Health, is recovered from Workers Compensation, as has been the case in past years and as is the case in other jurisdictions. The cost

of operating the Worker Advisor Office is recoverable 100 percent from the Compensation Board as has been the case since the beginning and as is the case elsewhere.

MR. A. KOVNATS: As has been the case from the beginning, are the worker advisors hired from different union organizations for a short period and then sent back to the union to get involved during election campaigns, because that's what I remember originally when they were first brought out. I've never knocked them because they've done a half decent job. I was aware that's where they were originally chosen. They came as union representatives for a period of a year or so and then sent back in time for the last election.

HON. G. LECUYER: I think the member talks about two things. He talks about, first of all, the regular employees of the Worker Advisor Office in total including of the support staff of 9.33 staff years who were all hired as part of Civil Service competitions. Remember, also included in there, I suppose, a program which was established three years, which is the Worker Advisor Trainee Program, which has been established using the funds set aside as part of a \$10 million Jobs Fund with the agreement of MGEA upon the salary renegotiations of three years ago. These monies were to be used in consultation with MGEA and, as part of that, the Advisor Trainee Program was established. These people were to be from various affiliated unions etc., and were to come over a one-year basis, receive some training and gain a better understanding of the Workers Compensation system and go back after that year into their workplaces and assist either as members of the committees or as purely as regular employees in coping with their own, assisting their own fellow workers in dealing with their claims. That is the program perhaps that the member is referring to, but I have never seen one on an election campaign, certainly not in my particular area.

I would say, they were talking in 1987-'88 of carrying on with that program on a reduced level with three worker advisor trainees and one intake officer, which will assist in handling the cases that come directly into the office, or on the telephone, or are getting the files together for cases that will be handled by the trainees. There's one secretarial trainee support and a-half staff year for training and orientation support.

The comment that I should be asking the member is, did he get some assistance during his election campaign from any of these people? I'd like to know that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I guess the expression is "peut-être?" But I would just like to mention that the Minister didn't have need of any of this help in the last provincial election. I guess under redistribution, and I would think that maybe the area of Radisson and Niakwa might be combined and the Minister, I would suggest, will be requiring some assistance particularly from the Worker Advisor Office or from wherever else and I would think many, many more, but I don't think it's going to do the Minister any great deal of good anyway. It's not a threat or anything of that nature, but I would hope that the Minister has kept his list of workers and will have them available.

I would suggest that it's going to be a little bit of a closer battle and a much tighter encounter, particularly with such a well-known member as the Member for Niakwa. I would suggest that I just hope that everything remains well for the Minister. He's just got one little piece of the Workers Compensation organization still in the fold here. I would imagine that everything should change.

I would think that under, is it the King Recommendations, that there will be some changes I believe. I haven't seen the report, and I'm only guessing at this point, but with whatever changes are going to be made, if they are going to be made because this government says they're a government that listens to committees and reports.

Who from the Workers Compensation is representing this department here today? Usually you have somebody who is associated with - who is the Minister's staff that is his advisor in the Worker Advisor Office?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the Director of the Worker Advisor Office is with us today, the presence of Mr. John McNevin. I might add, as well, while I have the floor, for the member's information, that there is certainly no contradiction in retaining the Worker Advisor Office with the department. In fact, perhaps there is a greater rationale to have it under this office with Workplace Safety and Health.

In Workplace Safety and Health, we try, obviously, to prevent accidents or injuries to health from occurring in the workplace and it's the whole purpose of the program, the whole purpose of the legislation and enforcing of it. The members of the Worker Advisor Office are there to assist workers who have been rejected. It's an outside activity, the advocacy role they play in assisting the injured worker, through his review committee level or the appeals level, with their claim, to make sure they indeed have received a fair hearing.

It's going to be very difficult to expect or to ask that an employee of the board fulfill that role. There would be forever at least be a perception, if not the reality, that the board would deal with claimants in that category, keeping in mind that they were already rejected, would put them in a very difficult position to assist workers; and that's the reason why the Worker Advisor Office is being kept, should be kept, as far as I'm concerned. It's completely separate from the operation of the Compensation Board and even though I have or I was responsible for the Compensation Board in the past, the operation of the Worker Advisor Office was kept totally separate from the operation of the board even then.

So, in that sense, they function exactly as they functioned before. I have to also add before the member receives his next issue, that that is also the case in other jurisdictions where they have the Worker Advisor Office established.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Worker Advisor Office and the staff were fairly ineffective in regard to presenting and correcting claims that the Workers Compensation had rejected because it came to, I had asked about a court of last appeal and the worker advisor were given no special privileges once a decision was made, particularly if there was no

additional medical history that they could bring in, so if they were appealing a decision of the Workers Compensation Board, they were fairly ineffective, as most people were. I would hope that the way the situation is now that they would be more effective because there is a place for the worker advisor and it is to help those people that can't help themselves, and so I do suggest that they could be quite effective.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, their role is there to indeed assist the workers whose claims have been rejected and to assist workers who are under rehabilitation, to facilitate the system delivery of the board's decision. They are there on the other hand specifically to ensure that the injured worker gets as fair and equitable a treatment as he deserves and he should get. It doesn't mean that every case they handle has legitimate grounds. They will win some, they will not always win them all, but I think - as I said before - the claimant deserves a fair hearing, and on that basis maybe you should provide some of the figures in terms of cases or files handled in the course of . . .

Since the office opened in September 1982 they've had - it's just two figures - 3,643 files assigned to them, and 3,050 of those have been closed and currently of that total, 593 are still active files. Now that doesn't tell how many were successful versus how many weren't and I haven't got that type of information, but as I say, as long as they assist - and that's the purpose - the worker in getting a fair hearing and a fair treatment, that's the purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just on this matter, I attended a board hearing with one of the worker advisors a week ago Tuesday; the hearing went on for about three hours. I would like to point out that I was extremely impressed with the presentation made by the worker advisors, a young woman - I think her name was Margaret Ross, on the behalf of a Croatian woman who had been injured on a job who would have had language difficulty. It was a problem of misdiagnosis from one of the physicians who'd examined her and she was assisted all the way through in getting other opinions and having a decision - I think the Member for Niakwa is aware - is still up to the board and the appeal.

I attended the hearing for the entire three hours it took place and could not fault in any way the presentation made by the worker advisor, and I really do not believe that this woman would have had her case presented - even to the point where the board could have made a reasonable decision - without the assistance of the worker advisor. I have nothing but praise in this one anecdote, in the one situation I attended.

The fact is I would assume the woman will get a positive decision from the board, but if not, it's certainly not because of the lack of quality and expertise in the presentation by the worker advisor, and I'd just like to make the Member for Niakwa aware of it. I don't know if that is the usual situation, but certainly I was very impressed.

HON. G. LECUYER: I would hope, Mr. Chairman - and I have every confidence that is the case - the worker

advisors, those who've been with the program since the beginning are now well-versed in the area that they have to work in, well-versed in the procedures and policies in place, the act; and I think that they would have every reason to be confident that they can provide a very professional type of service for the injured workers.

I hope that is also reflected in the number of cases that they have as backlogged. Certainly that has been reduced, I'm told, from what it used to be; so hopefully that reflects also the professional manner in which they are doing their job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't want to go on record as being opposed to the Worker Advisor Office regardless of what little or what great amount of good that they do. They do some good and the only ones that will benefit are the injured workers, so how can you be critical of it? So after saying that, I would say we can pass this resolution.

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

Resolution No. 67: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,668,900 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Workplace and Worker Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Minister's Salary, page 69, Resolution No. 63, 1.(a) Minister's Salary, \$20,600—pass.

Resolution No. 63: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,419,900 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the Member for Niakwa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I call it six o'clock? (Agreed) Committee rise.

SUPPLY - CULTURE, HERITAGE AND RECREATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee of Supply, please come to order.

We are considering the budget Estimates of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. We are now on Item No. 4. Status of Women, Advisory Council on the Status of Women: 4.(a)(1) Salaries; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, if it meets with your approval, it's our understanding that the critic for the Opposition for Status of Women will be here very shortly. Given that situation, if we go directly to the line on Telecommunications, in which case the Minister responsible for that line will be here within seconds. If that meets with the approval of members opposite, that we go to Telecommunications, then to Status of Women.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed) We are starting then with Item No. 5. Telecommunications

Policy, 5.(a) Salaries, 5.(b) Other Expenditures, 5.(c) Grant Assistance - the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how big is the staff complement in this division that she has and is asking funding for?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'm waiting for the Minister responsible for Telecommunications to handle this series of questions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Surely in his absence, this Minister, who's asking us for the funds, the approval of the funds in her department, knows how many staff she's asking approval of Salaries for. I mean, that's why she's Minister responsible with that line in her Estimates. Does she not know how many staff are in this department?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I would be happy to answer that question very shortly. I'll be joined by my colleague, the Minister who is responsible for Telecommunications.

Mr. Chairperson, in answer to the member's question, there are three staff as part of this branch.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what are the staff positions? How are they titled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: One is the supervisor of the branch, a second is a professional and technical position, and the third is an administrative support position.

I might say that the major activity over the last year, Mr. Chairman, has been the federal-provincial negotiations dealing with the telecommunication policy in Canada. The second issue in the department for the branch is the whole area of the broadcast policy in Canada. In fact, there was a brief presented last week to the Parliamentary Task Force. The priority of that brief, I guess, from a Manitoba perspective, is the lack of regional services in this province, particularly when the Federal Government is considering new broadcast provisions in the future that the regional areas of the country, particularly Manitoba, be involved.

I just caught the tail end, Mr. Chairman, of some of the comments in terms of who answers for this department. It is a hybrid that the Minister of Culture and the Minister responsible for Telecommunications want to solve this year because it is - the best way to describe it - an awkward situation with having an expenditure in one department and having on other issues, on policy issues, another Minister answering for it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated two major areas that the staff have been working on. Are there position papers that the Minister can make available to the members of the Opposition on the government's position on various telecommunications issues and, if so, would he provide me with copies of those?

HON. G. DOER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to provide the brief we presented to the Parliamentary

Task Force last week to the member, and I'll take that as notice.

Secondly, the Federal Minister of Communications, the Honourable Flora MacDonald, was asked that negotiations, except for the communique, be maintained on a confidential basis in terms of trying to conclude the negotiations on Interconnect on long distance competitions and on jurisdictions to be maintained on a confidential basis until a final agreement is reached.

We did reach some tentative agreement on principles that I'd be willing to table with the Member for Pembina and I'd be willing to sit down privately, pursuant to her wish, to keep the negotiations confidential. I'd be willing to sit down with the Member for Pembina on some of the concerns we have or priorities we have, specifics I'm not allowed to table based on her request, but I would also table the copy of the communique that came out of the federal-provincial meeting at Edmonton, and a copy of the general six principles that were adopted by, not only the province's communications' Ministers, but also the Territories and the Federal Minister who I thought, by the way, Mr. Chairman, was trying to move us along in a very fair way with a very complicated issue.

Obviously our priorities, Mr. Chairman, are to the maintain long distance revenues in this province and, at the same time, we want to open up the Interconnect, that's why we're planning on doing it with Cantel and private radio operations, as I indicated in the Telephone Estimates and certain I'm using the Telecommunication Branches advisory on the technology so that we can go ahead rather than keep our finger in the proverbial technological dike in this province. But I would be willing to go to the private positions we've taken and go over some of the public communiques of the document tabled.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate receiving any public information the Minister can make available and from that pursue the options of a private discussion with the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned the Cantel Interconnect which is due primarily to cellular telephone as one of the areas of Interconnect. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding, in terms of Federal CRTC jurisdiction in Ontario and I believe Quebec that CRTC and hence the Federal Government's involvement dictated before there would be the offering of cellular telephone service in either Ontario or Quebec jurisdictions, that a competitor should be in a position to likewise market the service.

Their concern, as I understand it, CRTC's concern, was that in Ontario the giant telephone company, Bell Canada, Ontario, would not have an advantage in the marketplace over any and all newcomers, Cantel of course being one of them who received subsequent licensing. That was the reason behind the six-month delay before service is offered so that it would give private sector presumably non-telephone company entrance to the cellular telephone market: (a) an opportunity to negotiate with the telephone company in the resident jurisdiction, an Interconnect agreement; and (b) the opportunity to establish the physical plant required, make the capital investment, have it installed and up and working within a period of time, so that

they could indeed compete and not have cellular telephones offered exclusively by one company who may have a system in place, such as Bell Ontario. That was my general understanding of the six-month delay provision. Is that a correct interpretation as the Minister sees it?

HON. G. DOER: As I recall it - and I've got a briefing note here and I'll read the note after I give you the answer - the regulation, or the proposal, was originally made by Francis Fox, the Department of Communications; and secondly, it was the Department of Communications' decision that was reiterated by Marcel Masse. I've had written communication with Flora MacDonald.

You're absolutely right, there was a six-month lead time dealing with Bell in Ontario. It did provide - it wasn't just for purposes of the equipment etc., it did get them up and running much quicker than the monopoly telephone system in those two provinces. We are looking for a proposal that will allow Cantel and the Telephone System to begin together. I think that there's some comfort in the Public Utilities Board explanation of that last week, because it will require Public Utilities Board for approval for the rate of what the tariff will be to interconnect onto the system, I believe.

So, Mr. Chairman, in fact I've just had a phone call from an individual from Cantel who would like to meet. I've told the Telephone System to get ready and get their business plan ready; it's being reviewed. I want to move as quickly as possible. The operative method by which we would want to begin with is one that has just been developed in Alberta, with the regulatory body in Alberta holding both groups to start at the same time, versus the initial decision of the Department of Communications of the Federal Government. The bottom line is we want to start together, no one ahead, the monopoly company not ahead, nor Cantel ahead on the operation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that that's quite acceptable to Cantel as well; that, if they are going to enter the Manitoba market for cellular telephones, they have no objection to the Minister making an announcement on July 1 that on January 1, 1988, cellular telephone service will be available. I don't think they have any objection to that.

But I guess, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line question is to the Minister and given the background that the Telephone System is already under his predecessor, the Member for St. James, made a fairly sizable capital investment in cellular telephones, and the physical plant that's necessary to put cellular telephone service at least in place in the City of Winnipeg, given that investment has already been made and the Member for St. James has not been Telephone Minister for now approximately seven months, is the Minister saying that a business plan is still not available to him from the Telephone System to justify an investment they've already made approximately a year ago? If that's what he's saying, can the Minister indicate to me when that business plan is going to be ready so that we can expect this announcement that six months hence cellular telephone service will be available in the province?

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I proceeded with a policy plan to Cabinet and have that approved to proceed and also the policy position does include dealing with the issue of private radio operations interconnecting on our public telephone system because I don't think it's fair just to deal with the cellular telephone and not have some of the private operators. Motorola, etc., not be allowed to interconnect, for a fair price to interconnect on the system.

So I'm trying to get those two loose ends of the policy issue together so we're not just ad hoc'ing it with Cantel and leaving problems that you've raised in previous years on the Estimates process unresolved. So I'm trying to deal with both of those issues to get them up to speed and going at the same time. In fact, representatives from some of the private companies in the radio business at a meeting of the Electronics Association last week indicated they don't want to wait for cellular because it will take a little longer for them to get ready. That's certainly something I'm taking back to my colleagues in government.

You're right, the equipment is there; the business plan is there for the Telephone System internally. I'm having it evaluated externally as part of those projects, but I told Coopers and Lybrand to get it going immediately because we've already gone to Cabinet to get approval to proceed with Interconnect with Cantel and I hope to be meeting with the official from Cantel early next week. I've told the Telephone System they have to move on this issue, that technology can't be denied to the people.

The other issue is, is an overload, as you know. I think the Member for St. Norbert asked a question last year on the fact that cellular is unavailable in the mobile services, has a waiting list. The only issue I want to have resolved, Mr. Chairman, to my satisfaction, is the longer-term implications, the next stage of cellular development, the next capital purchase. You'll excuse me if I'm trying to be a little prudent on that. It's easy to justify the first stage which they've already done because they've already went out and bought the equipment, notwithstanding the fact that it's a little bit - well, you're raising the question because you know the answer.

Mr. Chairman, the second stage is one that I think is important because it requires another capital purchase beyond the capital equipment that's there. I think that's important to know where we're going and why we're doing it. So that's the only part of the business plan that I want to firm up and I'd certainly be willing to make that public. There are commercial considerations because we're competing with Cantel, so I would be willing to show you the plan privately because I don't believe I could show Cantel our business plan because it is a competitive environment.

The bottom line is the business plan would have a bottom line to know who is winning and losing. Experience has shown that up to 50 percent of cellular telephones will go to the competitive company and there may even be a greater number in this province. I think that's useful for us to see.

The second factor that's been useful: I've been studying some of the cellular telephone systems in some other jurisdictions in United States and contrary to the massive predictions of subscription for cellular telephone, I think there was an article in Barrons

magazine a couple of months ago. Even in cities like Los Angeles, it seems to reach a saturation point at a certain point in time. There are three companies competing in Los Angeles. If a fourth company was able to go in, they'd die, so Winnipeg is obviously a lot smaller market and that's why I'm concerned about the next stage of capital investment.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's very useful information the Minister is putting on the record and particularly if, in conjunction with the cellular telephone issue, we have a resolution of the Motorola Interconnect as it applies to their provision to rural municipalities, the fire alarm reporting system. I don't think I'm being unfair to the Telephone System, because I've said this consistently in committee, that they have made sure that the FRED system was the only one available, by simply denying Interconnect on the Motorola system or making Interconnect so expensive that their system looked like it was economic. So, if the Minister can resolve that, I think it provides a truly competitive environment, where municipalities, some of them very well satisfied to the southeast of this city, very well satisfied with the Motorola system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and I think I would just say to the Minister, he's right now attempting to speculate on the market share that the Telephone System may achieve in cellular telephone service, compared to the present competitor, Cantel. That's of course going to be a competitive situation and Cantel is not going to move into the province presumably to lose money in provision of the service. So (a), if the Telephone System is providing an efficient service, whether they've got 20 percent of the market or 70 percent of the market, there should be a profit in the provision of the cellular telephone, but in addition the Telephone System has the Interconnect charge from their competitor. So in reality, any delay of introduction of cellular telephone service in the Province of Manitoba simply denies the Telephone System two sources of revenue: (a) revenue from Interconnect which is a brand new volume of business that they don't have right now; and (b) if the business plan shows they're capable of offering cellular telephones competitively, the profits from that.

So I see no reason in this instance why the Minister would not be proceeding post haste in getting cellular telephone service introduced in the province to provide our business community with a very modern communication system. I hope to be able to discuss this at a later date because I'm not sure of the technology, but it's indicated to me that this cellular telephone may well be the answer to the expansion of our telephone system beyond the City of Winnipeg and our rural areas because it is a very very, very clear and unique system of communication, a 35 mile radius. I have to tell you, when I look at my telephone exchange in Miami and find that I have approximately, from where I live, if I was in the centre of the exchange, I have about a seven mile radius before I'm long distance. Now, if there was a cellular telephone tower in Morden, for instance, or Carman, I would be part of that exchange.

I'm not competent to comment on the technical involvement, the capital involvement in that, but if cellular telephones provides us with a method of (a)

providing private lines, and (b) providing wider area long distance toll free dialing systems without the necessity of ploughing underground cable to service farms which are, I mean miles from your central office, your telephone office, that has a real major revolutionary impact potentially on telephone service in rural Manitoba.

So I just tell the Minister to proceed post haste. I think his predecessor all too often bought the argument carte blanche from the Telephone System that we can't allow any of this competition because it might hurt us. In doing so and in complying with that, the Member for St. James no doubt has denied the Telephone System revenue opportunities which are there.

HON. G. DOER: I'd be interested in some of the projections I received on cellular because I asked the same question in terms of rural service. It's very, very expensive; even in a competitive environment, it will be extremely expensive. You pay literally for every call. You pay a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, there's no question about it but with the radio wave technology, it does have potential in the future. Those are some of the things we are trying to look at. The predominance of cellular telephones, even in the United States where it's been developed, is to go from remote location by cellular in major cities, on to the telephone system. Many cities in the United States, much larger than Winnipeg, have not yet even got it, even though where they have a deregulated environment. So the potential, I think, is fantastic in terms of cellular. I noticed in Japan today they're even going to use it in terms of their broadcast communication system. At one point, Mr. Chairman, it may be interesting to have a technical briefing on the potential of this system and also the cost. Because it is, as I understand, very, very expensive in terms of its cost at this point in time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure the Minister understands the proposition I'm making.

I realize that cellular telephones are very expensive on a per call basis right now as offered. But I'm saying that I am not able to compare the capital installation involved in cellular telephone for a 35 mile radius, and compare that to the - because that would be a toll-free zone right now, with the ability to link 35 mile radiuses ad infinitum in the province.

So in other words, from here to Virden we could have something like six cellular installations and have toll-free dialing right across by hopping from tower to tower. But what I'm asking the Minister, to make sure he understands, is not the per minute charge or whatever the actual use is, but what the capital cost is of putting that system in. Because if that is cheaper then, for instance, taking a 30 mile radius and linking that all through ground, underground plowed cable, because that's the system you're comparing it to.

I don't know whether the cellular telephone as a system is of lower capital cost than the system of plowing underground cable and linking it to digital switching, you see. Because in rural Manitoba, we've still got the old rotary dialers in the telephone offices. That equipment has been outmoded now probably for 15 years, and at the rate of capital change it's still

going to be there 10 years from now and denies many Manitobans of an expanded telephone system without long distance charges.

So, you know, it's an internal policy. I don't want the Minister to confuse the charge currently for cellular as, let me call it, a novelty or a new method of communication versus the cost of cellular in establishing and replacing an archaic and outdated telephone system.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I'm perfectly willing to provide a comparison, especially when we look at the whole planning for rural improvement of services this fall, that obviously all members of this Chamber knows is necessary. I'm perfectly willing to look at the capital comparisons for the advanced digital technology that we obviously plan on using at this point in rural Manitoba, versus what the potential costs are for cellular technology. So it's certainly something I'm willing to put on the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a couple of questions before we move on to the next section. I notice in this department, Expected Results, it says at the bottom, "Development of rural telephone service policies through consultation process." I know we've met together, along with the president of MTS, on this issue, but I'm just wondering how this particular section of the department will help achieve that goal in the near future.

HON. G. DOER: The Telephone System is obviously the operational arm of delivering rural services. The Telecommunication Branch provides government policy advice. Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, the advice one gets from an operational entity that is trying to maximize the return on its dollar may be different than the legitimate consumer needs or the legitimate long-term implications for the Manitoba public.

What we have had from the Telecommunications Branch is a review of all the developments of rural services in Saskatchewan and Alberta and other proposals, such as how it would affect your area, is different types of proposals that are used with areas abutting major urban centres, and how those can be accomplished, so that we are getting advice from a policy perspective and from a perspective of communications outside of the normal Telephone System that obviously is required to provide the service, but at the same time is looking at its bottom line in terms of delivering that service. So the way in which the Telecommunication Branch will operate is to be advising the Minister on the overall policy issues and some of the overall options.

The fact that we should have options in terms of the survey in this province between single or multiparty-line priority, the priority of extended areas, the whole issue of the areas of budding major urban centres, obviously, the Lorette, Ile des Chenes, St. Francois Xavier areas that we have heard of or I have verbally in our offices. So their involvement will be to ensure that all options are on the table, all options are considered, all pricing is considered, all potential future

technology is considered so that we don't have a process that is Telephone System-only driven. Obviously they have to be a major component of it but, from a government perspective and a consumer perspective, the advice of the Telecommunications Branch, I think, will be very useful in this process.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, I had to leave the room earlier when the Minister first came into this particular section, but did the Minister mention at the onset that this particular part of the department would be amalgamated with the Telephone System? I didn't quite catch all the remarks.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I think that would be a real mistake. For example, things like getting - (Interjection)-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: It would be taken out of this department and put somewhere else.

HON. G. DOER: Well, Mr. Chairman, both the Minister of Culture and I have agreed to work over the year for the hybrid nature of this department being in the Department of Culture with another Minister responsible for the day-to-day operations of the department, and we're going to look at that.

It's essential in my mind that a government policy component be outside of the Telephone System. For example, the Telephone System will recommend that Motorola not necessarily connect with the Telephone System because it may impact on the revenue whereas a Telecommunication Branch of the Department may point out that it's really not dealing with both sides of the policy issue to have Cantel come in here and compete in cellular and not have companies like Motorola who are "illegally" interconnecting in places like La Broquerie. So that branch gives you an overview and gives you some advice that is often consistent with the Telephone System but sometimes more enriched and enhanced.

MR. G. ROCH: Which area or which other department will this section move to?

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure yet. That decision is not being made by either myself or the Minister of Culture. It's made by the Cabinet and the boss and we'll only try to get a handle on where we think it should go, but it will be decided by our betters, as they say.

MR. G. ROCH: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions in this area unless other members have. We'd be prepared to proceed on to Section 4. dealing with Status of Women.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5.(a) Telecommunications Policy: Salaries—pass; 5.(b) Other Expenditures—pass; 5.(c) Grant Assistance—pass.

Resolution No.46: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$136,900 for

Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Telecommunications Policy for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Going back to Item No. 4. Status of Women, 4.(a) Advisory Council on the Status of Women: 4.(a)(1) Salaries; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I am pleased to introduce the 1987-88 Estimates of my portfolio as Minister Responsible for the Status of Women.

Over the past year, the impact of this important aspect of government has grown steadily. The scope of initiatives undertaken by this government to improve the status of women in Manitoba illustrates our commitment to include women's concerns in all areas of government policy and practice. I am proud to be part of a government which holds firm to its vision of fairness and equality for all Manitobans.

In moving towards a more egalitarian and inclusive society, this government has made the integration of economic and social policies a priority. Without such a policy framework, which links economic and social justice, equality issues cannot be successfully addressed.

The principles of fairness and equality that govern our policies, programs and legislation reaffirm our steadfast commitment to equality of treatment and opportunity for women and men.

Our efforts at working toward meaningful and positive changes for women also underscore our commitment to equality of rights and respect for human dignity. This vision which guides us means that we will continue to enhance the status of women until women participate equally with men in all aspects of political, social, economic and cultural life.

The positive approach we have taken combines proactive initiatives with active consultation and a thorough analysis. This approach is one which acknowledges that the social importance of women's contribution to their families, to the economy and to society can best be supported when their needs are fully integrated with the delivery of services, supports, and programs. Manitoba's record in advancing the status of women conveys a strong message that our government is committed to responding to the needs brought about by changing times.

Over the past few years, this commitment has been shown by taking the burden off of victims of wife abuse and pressing charges against batterers.

It has been shown by implementing one of the most effective computerized maintenance enforcement systems in Canada.

This same commitment was behind the government's decision to improve pensions for women in the province and to continue to work on other fronts towards increased economic equality.

This year, Mr. Chairperson, the legacy carries on. Under the direction of the Pay Equity Bureau, the government continues to be the leader in Canada for establishing a system of wages within the Civil Service, universities, hospitals and Crown corporations that is based, not on the gender of the person performing the

work, but on skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions.

This substantive effort will put more money in the pockets of women in this province and better enable women to provide economic security for their families.

In many parts of Canada, Mr. Chairperson, women's economic situation continues to decline. But in Manitoba, the wage gap between average full-time men's and women's wages is closing well ahead of the national average. We are not satisfied with the status quo, however. We remain optimistic and confident that we will be able to enhance women's status as pay equity is implemented.

Manitoba also takes pride in its position at the forefront of providing child care in Canada. The families in Manitoba who are currently benefiting from the kind of quality, affordable and accessible services, which we have continued to expand, will tell you that child care is a fundamental need for their families. When I speak to my provincial, territorial and federal counterparts at the upcoming annual Ministers Meeting, the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women, being held beginning on June 9, I will continue to seek agreement on Manitoba's position that a national child care act which encompasses the principles of affordability, accessibility and quality care is of primary importance to the economic equality of women.

As Status of Women Minister for the Province of Manitoba, I will stand firm on our position that an effective labour force strategy must contain not only job creation strategies for women but also child care and accountable and enforceable pay equity and Affirmative Action policies, as well as education and training policies that meet the needs of women.

The achievement of equality between women and men means much more than jobs and services. For many women, living a life safe from physical abuse is what they need first and foremost if they are to achieve the level of independence and self-worth that they need in order to carry on with their lives. We continue to deal with this complex problem by focusing on community based work, prevention, and by funding services which provide ongoing counselling for victims and their children, as well as batterers.

Another initiative undertaken to provide ongoing support and services to women has been the provision of core funding to women's resource centres.

Our impressive achievements in the area of appointments to boards and commissions also speak loudly about our commitment to action. I'm proud to note that 40 percent of those appointees are now women. Thirty-three percent of chairpersons and 32 percent of vice-chair positions are now filled by women.

We have also become more sensitized to the compound problems faced by multi-jeopardy women. The issues facing Native and northern women, farm and rural women, and immigrant, visible minority, and refugee women are all important areas in which we have begun a process of consultation and action. Our goal is to ensure that the needs of all women are met by government.

My staff at the Women's Directorate plays an important research and policy analysis role on all of these matters. They have put considerable work into the areas of human rights, health care, family law, services to battered women, child care, education, pay equity, and funding for women's resource centres.

Other areas of ongoing work include Native women and economic development, training programs, including the Single Parent Job Access Program, rural and northern women, immigrant, visible minority women and entrepreneurial women.

The Directorate continues to consult on a regular basis with a number of women's groups and special interest groups throughout the province in order to achieve effective integration of their concerns in the policy development process of government.

Over the last year, the Directorate has increased its active involvement in all areas of government operation and is now represented in more than 19 interdepartmental committees. It has played an important coordinating role in the establishment of interdepartmental committees, such as the Labour Force Strategy Review Committee and the Native Women and Economic Development Committee.

We have also demonstrated an ongoing commitment to effectively communicate information on Status of Women issues and initiatives. The Directorate's newsletter about women continues to be published regularly and is sent out to community groups, service agencies, government departments, and MLA's.

We believe it is vitally important to strengthen the lines of communication between all women and government. A telecommunications device for the deaf has now been installed in the office of the Manitoba Women's Directorate. This link to hearing-impaired women will enable the Directorate to more effectively act as a consultant with women, provide them with information and consult directly with them.

Ongoing consultations keep me in touch with the needs of women as they arise in every area of concern. The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and the Women's Directorate co-sponsored a rural and northern tour last fall, which enabled me to meet directly with women in various parts of the province. I spoke with women in Selkirk, Beausejour, Thompson, Dauphin, Carman and Brandon, and brought back their concerns around the issues of pensions, child care services and training for child care workers, services to battered women, training and education access, and the problems they face due to isolation. These informal consultations continue to be an enriching experience for me as Status of Women Minister, and I plan to continue these first-hand exchanges.

Immediately following these meetings, I established a toll-free long-distance line at the Manitoba Women's Directorate Office, so that ongoing communications can be maintained with women in rural and northern areas.

Mr. Chairperson, the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women continues to play a critically important role in providing the government with solid advice based on independent research and direct contact with women's organizations. The newly-established Manitoba Advisory Council on The Status of Women Act ensures this vital advisory body continues to publish sound, independent research. One example of this constructive, thorough analysis is the Advisory Council's Jobs Fund Report. This kind of document will be of ongoing importance as we strive to integrate the needs of women into every program and department.

The Advisory Council has also made recommendations on ways to improve training

opportunities and employment for women at Limestone and it was instrumental in advising government on the development and implementation of the Single Parent Job Access Program.

Establishing the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act is an important symbol of the pro-active approach of women's concerns that has characterized this government. By strengthening this vital link to women's interests at the grassroots level, the Advisory Council will continue to be on the cutting edge of issues at the forefront of the women's community in this province.

A report on the concerns of Northern women in Manitoba is forthcoming. The Council is expected to release its long awaited midwifery report very shortly and will follow up with a series of consultation meetings to be held in urban, rural, and northern centres.

The Advisory Council will soon begin to explore the complexity of issues surrounding reproductive technology and their impact on the lives of women.

Mr. Chairperson, both the Women's Directorate and the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women have been, and will continue to be, important resources for this government. Combined, they reflect our unwavering commitment of improving the equality of women in Manitoba. Collectively, they represent the hope and determination that characterizes our vision of equity and fairness for all Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'd like to thank the Minister for rearranging her Estimates so that I could arrive a little late.

I thank the Minister for her statement and I want to congratulate the Advisory Council on the Status of Women for the fine work that it continues to do. It is one area the reports are outstanding and I think if the government pays attention to these reports, and future governments, that women will have a place in our society that will not only be equal, but will allow them to have a freedom through economic equality that they have not had.

I must say, though, that their last effort, the Women in the Labour Force, has to be an indictment against the government and the Jobs Fund. All through the report it indicates that the - on page 62: "The Manitoba Jobs Fund does not incorporate Affirmative Action. That almost one half of all men participating in the Manitoba Jobs Fund have been employed in construction trade occupations. Many of these male workers have been hired and paid by independent employers and contractors who are compelled by law to pay employees standardized wages that far exceed the provincial minimum wage. There are very few women who have access to these types of jobs.

"The relatively small percentage of women who gained employment through the Manitoba Jobs Fund were overwhelmingly concentrated in low paying female job ghettos. Almost 60 percent of all female Manitoba Jobs Fund participants were employed in clerical, sales, and service occupations. On average, women employed through the Manitoba Jobs Fund earned an hourly wage that was less than one-half of that earned by their male counterparts. Women have not been full partners in

the economic development strategy of the Manitoba government."

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I don't know what kind of input that the directorate had into the Jobs Fund, but it is appalling to see that this kind of report would come out after all the publicity, all the speaking by the Ministers, not only the Minister who is responsible for the Status of Women, but all the members on that side of the House, who publicly stand up and indicate how much they are doing for women. In certain areas, there have been a number of things done, but it was almost hard to believe that a strategy such as the Manitoba Jobs Fund, where most of the money was pulled out of departments to put into creating jobs, that women should have been treated so shabbily.

I know that the Minister will be taking heed, certainly, of this report, and I hope that something very positive will come out of this report.

I once again want to congratulate the Council on the Status of Women, because I think they have done a marvelous job, not only in this report but in every report that I have seen. The study has been in-depth and the recommendations have been, on the whole, just worthwhile, and if we even get a part of them, I think that women will be better off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: While the member is looking for her notes, perhaps I could introduce the Executive Director of the Manitoba Women's Directorate, Doris Mae Oulton.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is there just someone from the Directorate, and no one from the Status of Women; is that correct? How are we dealing with this? Maybe the Minister could clarify.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Yes, it's been our practice, at least when the Estimates are in the House, that the Executive Director of the Women's Directorate be the staff resource person for all of the Estimates.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Then if it's all right, Mr. Chairman, possibly we could deal with both these areas without separating them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister could indicate how the members of the Advisory Council are chosen, and if any of the women's groups in the province are allowed to submit names as proposals to be on this board.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the membership of the Advisory Council is part of the normal boards and commissions process of the Government of Manitoba. It's my job to recommend names to my colleagues, and to ensure that they meet the aims and objectives of the process involved in members on boards and commissions.

We certainly actively encourage women's organizations to let us know if there are women who

are interested in serving on the council and bring certain qualifications and expertise that are needed. I'm very pleased, I must say to the House, at this point in time with the membership on the Advisory Council. It is very representative of the many different issues and concerns impacting on women, with representation coming from rural women, from farm women, Native women, immigrant and visible minority women, women who are full time in the home, women from various labour force capacities, and I think it's the nature of - it's because of such a representative body that we've been able to witness such a high calibre in the reports that have been forthcoming.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How long a term, Mr. Chairman, are the members put on the council for, and what has been the turnover in the last couple of years?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The term of office, or the length of the appointment through the Order-in-Council is two years. Certainly, there is provision for reappointment after the end of the two-year term and I think that the current membership of the council reflects a balance between those who have served for a few years and new members who can bring new ideas.

I believe that at least half a dozen of the members are very new appointments so that they are able to ensure continuity as well as some new and fresh blood on the council.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm sorry, I may not have caught this, but does the Minister plan to turn the board over - is that what she stated - after a couple of years, maybe half, or do people just stay on as long as they feel they can serve?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: There's no hard and fast rule. We're sensitive first to the needs of the council and then we're sensitive to the interests of the members on the council itself. So our first job is to consult with the council about the kinds of areas of expertise they feel are necessary on the council and to take that into account as well as to assure some continuity. So I think that with the current council there are some who are into their second and third term on the council but there are a good number - at least half a dozen - who have just been appointed.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to refer now to the Supplementary Information. On page 74, the Salaries for the Administrative Support, could the Minister indicate what the salaries are of the two support staff, please?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The current classifications of those two support positions are an AY2 and an AY3. However, the member will know - she might not know and I should clarify - there is provision within these Estimates for a reclassification for at least one of those positions and possibly both of them.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What was the salary?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I don't have the exact range in front of me but the AY2 goes up to, I believe \$18,000,

and the AY3 up to \$24,000.00. I'm not sure where the current individuals are on that range but I can certainly get back to the member with that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Do the members of the council receive a per diem, and, if so, what would it be?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, there is a per diem rate for members of council. For the first day of a meeting, the rate is \$38.35 per day; if a second day is required, the rate is \$32.35. Excuse me, let me start again. Those are half-day figures. A total per diem rate for a full day is \$70.70. If it involves half days, then the figures are \$38.35 for the first part of that meeting, and then \$32.35 for the second half day of that meeting.

Then for the Chair, the rates are \$74 for a half day and \$130 for a full day.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate if the rent comes in under the Other Expenditures, and would that be under Other Operating, or what does come in under Other Operating if it's not rent, and how much is it?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Other Operating refers to hotels, meals, publications, subscriptions, and things of that order.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what rent is paid on the Advisory Council offices and also for the Women's Directorate. Do they come both out of the Directorate? What other expenses might be there that I don't see written down there?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Rent is covered in the same way that any department is, and that is, it shows up through Government Services.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Turning to the Directorate, would the Minister indicate the salaries of the 6.26 professional/technical people, please, and also the salaries for the three administrative support staff?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The salary range for the professional/technical staff is \$32,000 to about \$36,000; for the administrative support, again, \$18,000 to \$24,000.00.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wanted to ask the Minister about two new appointees to Cabinet bodies. Now, while these do not fall under the Minister's purview - one was Elisabeth Wagner, secretary to Planning Priorities Committee of Cabinet; and Michael Mendelson as secretary to the Treasury Board - when I inquired about their salaries, I see that Liz Wagner - who I would take is a woman, and Michael Mendelson, man - her salary was \$59,632; his salary was \$71,585.00.

I would like to ask the Minister: What kind of input does the Directorate have into appointments and salaries of women and why would there be such a discrepancy?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: It would be the responsibility of each Minister to determine appropriate

salary levels and to work through the normal procedures with the Civil Service Commission. It would certainly not be possible for the Women's Directorate, which has been very busy with policy analysis, to begin to play a role when it comes to analyzing every job description and the appropriate salary level. That's why we have the Civil Service Commission and we have programs as part of the Civil Service Commission to deal with the whole question of salary levels and job classifications.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Possibly the Minister might just like to find out for herself and for the House just to see why there would be such a wide range in the salary structure between the woman and the man. It just seems so consistent with what is happening with women's salaries. I'd be interested, and I'm sure the Minister and other members of this House would be interested, to find out why there is such a difference.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I think it would probably be fair to say that the job classifications and the salary levels would be related to such factors as responsibilities and numbers of staff that need to be managed and previous experience and positions. So I think all of those factors, no doubt, combine to explain the difference.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just the same, if the Minister wouldn't mind just finding out instead of just supposing, I'd really be interested, and I'm sure other members would be, in finding out just exactly why the difference. Not just because these factors may be taken into consideration. There may have been something missed.

I would like to go on to something that I didn't ask under the Minister of Community Services; it falls under her area.

I would like to know what type of recommendations and input, possibly, that the Directorate may have when they're making a choice between two groups, such as the Elizabeth Fry Society, which had a core funding of \$60,000 that was cut in half, so that the Ma Mawi would be able to have support, also, to do the same type of work.

I was just wondering what kind of influence, and if the Minister does discuss that type of funding with the Directorate, considering that one group is getting cut back - and that is not to say that the Ma Mawi does not need the funding; I'm not disputing that by any means. But I find it very hard, when a group has been doing work and they have their staff and probably nothing much changes in the way of administration, that when you get your funding cut in half - I would just like to know what kind of input into strategy the Directorate might have in this type of an area where one group was so badly cut back, which almost pits women against one another, which is a shame, so that one group is funded but the funding comes out of another group's allocation.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, this is a good example where the Women's Directorate, and staff at the Directorate, play a very important role in analyzing situations and providing advice.

To go further, I was certainly involved, as well, with my colleague the Minister of Community Services,

around this issue. We met together with representatives from Elizabeth Fry, and had a good discussion about the issues. We certainly recognize the work of both the Elizabeth Fry Society, and Ma Mawi-Wi-Chi-Itata. Both supply valuable supports to women in conflict with the law.

Obviously, it's difficult when you see a growth in a new organization that came about because of the work of the original association, and to try to match the growth in needs and demands with the resources at hand. We've tried to do that, given that current situation, and I think have begun to address the situation in a satisfactory way, with an indication that we will try to support both associations and we will try to find a way to look at some of the difficulties that the Elizabeth Fry Society may be finding itself in.

I want to point out that I was able to assist in another way indirectly, and that was to encourage the organization, the Elizabeth Fry Society, to apply for funds through our Lotteries distribution system. They applied to the Community Services umbrella group and were successful in their application and, in fact, I just received word at the end of last week that they have received the amount requested and are delighted with the results from this Provincial Government.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm very pleased to hear that they've received some help, Mr. Chairman, but that doesn't get away from their year-to-year core funding. I just wonder what kind of support, you know, can they expect to get this type of funding on a yearly basis or is this something that they just sort of have to go from hand to mouth every year and again, we have a group, because of the inadequate core funding, ends up letting experienced staff go and maybe having to cut back on their volunteer services.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I'm certainly aware of the situation and, as I said, certainly appreciate the valuable service provided by the Elizabeth Fry Society as well as by Ma Mawi-Wi-Chi-Itata. My colleague, the Honourable Minister of Community Services has clearly indicated that she will be monitoring the situation and that her staff will be looking very carefully at the needs of this particular association and making recommendations based on that monitoring and review.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister could indicate, in a press release of December 2, 1986 that the Minister had written to Barbara McDougall, I understand, requesting that the Minister of Health and Welfare release the panel's report. Had she received a copy? This was on depo-provera.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: We've received indication, at least, that the - we've received information regarding this issue and the report of the committee that was studying this controversial drug - depo-provera. It is a report that has been released for information purposes. There are no recommendations forthcoming at this point. We, however, continue to be very concerned about the way in which this review was undertaken and the fact that certain groups were prevented from making presentation to the committee.

So, we are continuing to ask the Federal Government and the appropriate Ministers to find a way to seek

the input from those women who were excluded, particularly women who have actually used the drug and have suffered the side effects and were not able to appear before the committee. There is also a concern that this report that has been forthcoming as a result of the consultations, seems to divide the activists who are concerned about the use of the drug, from the professionals and to suggest that the differences in views are based on their different positions and roles in society.

Our concern is that there would appear to be real difficulties with this drug and we have yet to see the Federal Government take a firm stand and have had no assurances that they will be taking a tough stand when it comes to banning this controversial drug.

So, we're awaiting more information and we will, no doubt, have to continue to be in contact with the Federal Government Ministers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a letter from a woman and I don't wish to release it, but it was about a concern that she had and many women in her age bracket, if I could give you just a little bit of an outline of what she had to say that, and it starts off: We have heard and read much about Affirmative Action but little seems to have been done about the serious and grim plight of the unemployed upper-age bracket women between the ages of 40 and 65, who find it almost impossible to obtain employment - not because they lack the necessary skills, education or work experience - but because in many cases it seems they do not look as attractive as they did some 10 or 20 years ago to the predominantly younger male business executive who determines the applicant's eligibility for employment, or because they are over-qualified for the position applied for owing to their many years of work experience.

Or in other cases, a prospective employer may view the work practice and knowledge of a mature person as obsolete in today's progressive field of high technology and that these individuals may be too set in their ways to conform to new work practices. Therefore, many older women are forced to take lower-echelon jobs below the realm of their capabilities at minimum wage with no benefits and no job security.

Could the Minister indicate what types of programs, if any, there are for women in this age group, either for re-training or to help them possibly with counselling to actively be able to still maintain a credible existence until they reach the age where they will get more support, being senior citizens?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the question of older women and their particular needs in the labour market are certainly a concern to all of us and we continue to find ways to address those needs - in particular, a new job training initiative, the Job Training for Tomorrow Program focuses on the skill development of unemployed Manitobans and particularly those under-employed women in Manitoba.

In fact, roughly 60 percent of the \$10 million earmarked for that program will go to assist women and some of the components that will benefit women include women in non-traditional or technical occupations, employment adjustment in technological

change, and the over-55 component which provides additional wage assistance to employers training older workers. So it's an important initiative in respect of the needs of older women who are still in the labour force.

As well, I should point out the Women and Single Parent Job Access Program will also be an important tool for responding to the needs of all single parent women including those in the older age bracket.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, how does a woman access that job training program?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, I guess through two routes. One through employers directly and secondly through counsellors attached to our Department of Employment Services.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder - obviously, from this woman's viewpoint, "employers directly" is not going to be the route - so how then does she get in touch with the counsellors in the government? Where exactly, if someone asks me, where do they go to get this type of help, to get this type of training?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Through the Minister responsible for Employment Services and Economic Security and his offices.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is the Minister suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that women that are in these circumstances phone the Minister's office and this is the route that they go to get into these job training areas?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I was suggesting the Minister responsible for the program from the point of view of the appropriate direction in which to go. I don't have the government phone book at my fingertips and I haven't brought all the details of that program, but it would be through the offices of the Minister responsible that one would get the information. However, the Women's Directorate certainly plays an important role in directing individuals to an appropriate government program and providing advice and assistance in whatever way possible.

So perhaps, since I don't have the exact address or phone number at my fingertips, it would be best to suggest that they contact the Women's Directorate and we'd be happy to refer any individual looking for that kind of advice.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I would just be interested to know if the Minister has a list of the women's groups that the Women's Directorate and the Advisory Council have met with in the past year to obtain information that will help either with future reports or just with government policy.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I will try to give as complete a list as possible. However, I don't have all of that in front of me.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If the Minister could compile a list and would like to send it to my attention or table it, that would be fine without going through the whole thing.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes. We'll be happy to put together a complete list. We could put together a list of those organizations on our mailing list which, I believe, number several hundred. As well, we could try to indicate those groups that either I or staff of the Women's Directorate or the Advisory Council have met with.

Let me just, in rough categories, indicate that we, through the Manitoba Women's Agenda, met with a whole range of groups interested in issues pertaining to women. On my tour I have made a point of trying to meet with all related women's groups in rural Manitoba and Northern Manitoba. Currently, I'm actively consulting with indigenous women's groups in preparation for the Ministers' Conference in Nova Scotia next week, and as well, with a whole series of immigrant and visible minority organizations, in order to ascertain their views before formulating our complete position at that federal-provincial conference.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister - probably the groups would be included - of the Native women's groups that they have met with also.

I would just like to mention the triennial report from the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and I had, with some difficulty I may add, received a report. I'd asked for a report, the Annual Report 1980-81 on the Advisory Council of the Status of Women. I understand that the Library did not have a copy of it and we had to go to the Directorate of the Status of Women to get a copy.

I wonder possibly when the Library gave me this copy they kept a copy, but I wonder if the Minister, Mr. Chairman, would be good enough to make sure that the Library does have a copy of this report because it's interesting - Muriel Arpin was the first Chairperson of the Council and the chairperson's report, the first paragraph, indicated that a Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women was established in Manitoba October 15, 1980 after many years of urging by women's organizations and 10 women were appointed.

I'd just like to briefly put on the record some of the things that they were discussing. It was determined the Council would review, with the objective of developing recommendations, the following: appointments of women to boards and commissions; monitoring government publications for sex stereotyping; establishment of family courts; computerization of maintenance and custody orders; monitoring the division of assets on separation and divorce; closing of the Kingston Prison, equal pay for work of equal value; Affirmative Action programs; maternity leave; women in trades; integration of unmarried mothers into the community; family planning; sex stereotyping in education; day care; immigrant women; Native women; the role of the Women's Bureau in the Office of the Consultant of the Status of Women.

I just wanted to put that on the record to show that the initiatives that were started by the members of the former government under the Lyon administration are many of the same initiatives that we're still carrying on. Some have been completed. Many are still ongoing and it's very interesting to see that the women then have all had the same concerns. I think that no matter which side of the House we sit on, we do have many of the same concerns.

I would like to go on record, Mr. Chairman, as stating that, although we play an adversarial role in the House, it is often the way that we get things done, because we all want to see women get ahead, women be treated equally and not have such a horrible time and struggle. We wish this for our children and grandchildren who will be the future women of this province and of this country. While we may be at odds in certain areas, we on this side of the House certainly are interested in advancing the cause of women in this province and in this country. We may go at it by different routes, but I want to say that at the same time that the government is talking about doing things that we on this side of the House feel we would like to see a little less talk on it and a little bit more action in certain areas. I think that the government probably has started on the women in the labour force, a case study of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, because it is a glaring example of where the government has failed badly and how they could have come up with a strategy and literally have forgotten half of the population. That is just about what this study says.

I want to thank the council for coming up with such a good report, not just this report, and I'm looking forward to the report that they're coming up with on midwifery, which I understand is coming out at any time.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'd like to thank the member for those comments.

There does certainly seem to be a difference in this House when the women on that side of the House are raising the questions and delivering the speeches, but there's something about her male colleagues that creates a more air of excitement or of differences in this Chamber.

However, I want to concur with her that I think there are many issues that we need to work together on and that there's significant progress that has been made, but that much more can be made if we can find ways to work together, especially when it comes to that area of federal-provincial actions and policies.

I look forward to the support of members opposite as I leave next week for the Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women Conference, as we try once again to get recognition for the fact that there must be a national child care act, that we must deal with labour force strategies and women's equality in terms of a number of actions and policies at once, that we do not have the luxury of simply focusing on one issue such as training, and not be prepared to act immediately on questions of child care, on pay equity, on Affirmative Action and job creation.

That's been our approach. We've had some difficulty getting recognition for that at that level. We will make another attempt next week to push for a national child care act and to push for a labour force strategy that focuses on all those aspects that are so critical for the achievement of women's equality.

I'm pleased that we've been able to pursue action and policies on all of those items listed by the member opposite as they appeared in the Advisory Council's Annual Report of 1980-81, and that we, as I said earlier, are showing leadership across the country when it comes to appointments on boards and commissions,

to Affirmative Action, to pay equity, to family planning, to sex stereotyping and education, to the needs of immigrant and Native women. The list goes on and on.

I look forward to the cooperation of members opposite as we try to take those issues to the next stage and move even closer to that goal of equality between women and men.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just to try and get the last word, Mr. Chairman. I want to -(Interjection)-

Starting again, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister mentions about some of the initiatives, there are some areas - we certainly wish her well in her initiatives - that, of course, we're not going to be able to completely agree on and I hope that the Minister understands that. At the same time, while we have some of the same goals, the means that we would like to head there are going to often be different.

One of the areas that I did want to bring up when we were talking about salaries with both the Advisory Council and the Status of Women; one of the things that's happening, I think, and there may well be a feeling of resentment from the front-line workers, especially in the child abuse field, that the salaries out in the field are pretty minimal. Then they take a look at salaries in the government, and I don't want anyone to ever say that I do not want to see women well paid. That is not the problem here at all. I do want to see them well paid and it does my heart good to see women earning in the 30's and upward.

But I do feel that when we have women who are putting their very lives at stake, very often; when they go out and help women out of violent situations and are making not a great salary; when they're out there working and they look around, they're not going to stay very long. We're going to have a great turnover and I think I can't tell you how much I admire the type of work they do in the field.

I would hope that the Minister with her colleagues in Cabinet would take a good look at the type of salaries and the kind of dangerous work that these women are going through, and take a look at the conditions that they work in, which are not great many of the times. I'm not sure that I would have the courage to do the same type of work for the pay that they make.

I would like to see this Minister and the Directorate take a good look at the salaries and the working conditions of the women that are out in the wife abuse field, especially the ones in the country and in Northern Manitoba. They especially have a very dangerous role. I think they must get burned out very easily because it's pretty well a 24-hour job when you're working in these areas.

I would like to see the Directorate and the Minister get right in there and see if they can do something about upgrading both the facilities and certainly the salaries of some of these women so that they have a chance to stay in a field that they like, that they do well, and that they don't get burned out overnight.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'd like to thank the Member for Kirkfield Park for those remarks and raising those issues because they certainly are issues of concern to us. Like the Member for Kirkfield Park, we certainly recognize the commitment and dedication and

long hours that workers in the fields of child care and abuse put in. We recognize that many times it's above and beyond the call of duty that these workers demonstrate.

It's precisely because of that concern that so much effort and energy has gone into upgrading the child care system, for example, and why we now see a total budget of \$29 million for child care in this province. As part of that, as one step towards improving the salary level of child care workers, there have been salary enhancement grants that have benefitted those workers and we will be continuing to find ways to further enhance the salaries of those workers.

As well, in the field of abuse and services dealing with violence against women and children, we've seen an increase about a 700 percent increase of revenues going into that whole area and that has benefitted workers as well as clients of the system. However, there is no question that much more needs to be done and we're committed to finding ways to do that.

One of the measures that will be of significant benefit to all women workers throughout the province of Manitoba, particularly those who are segregated in various job categories and currently not yet paid for the kind of service that they provide, is Pay Equity. Through that program we will be able to begin to address the questions of remuneration for women on the basis of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions, all of the factors which the Member for Kirkfield Park has referred to in describing the work done by child care workers, and workers in the field of abuse, will come into play and have long-lasting and permanent benefits for women right across all labour market categories and sectors in the Province of Manitoba.

So I hope on the basis of the member's comments that we can look forward to strong and unequivocal support for all of our initiatives pertaining to Pay Equity.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, one last question, Mr. Chairman.

Pay Equity will be fine, but who is going to fund the Pay Equity for these services that depend solely on government support, and different agencies within the community which are just struggling themselves to keep their heads above water?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, that's certainly an important question and one which will be dealt with as we move towards implementation of Pay Equity in all sectors of our society. It would certainly help to have strong support from members opposite as we move from the public sector into the Crown corporation sector and then into the private sector in order to be able to adequately address all of the issues and the concern raised by the member opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(a)(1) Status of Women: Advisory Council on the Status of Women: Salaries—pass; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 4.(b)(1) Women's Directorate: Salaries—pass; 4.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

Resolution 45: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$659,400 for Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Status of Women, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

We are now returning to Item 1.(a) Administration and Finance, Minister's Salary.

The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, at this point we'd like to deal with the area that the Minister is specifically responsible for, Lotteries.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, I have a very short statement on Lotteries, and I have copies here for distribution.

Mr. Chairperson, the fiscal year, 1985-86, was one which witnessed a substantial increase in profits for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation. A 31.7 percent rise in net profits was accompanied by only a slight increase in administrative costs, less than 4.5 percent from 1984-85 to 1985-86. The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation continues to strive to maximize proceeds to umbrella groups and the two departments of government while simultaneously keeping administrative expenses to a minimum.

Net lottery ticket revenue was also up from previous years, showing a rise of 33.7 percent. Revenues generated by the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation's two full-time bingo hall facilities demonstrated a like-oriented increase of 46.5 percent. Meanwhile, bingo paper and break-open ticket sales followed this pattern with a 2.5 percent rise. A significant increase in casino revenues can be attributed to a growth in both daily revenues and daily net profits.

To meet the challenges of a fair and equitable distribution of lottery funds to Manitoba communities, the umbrella system was developed. Since its inception, the 12 community umbrella groups and two provincial departments participating in the system have seen a significant and dramatic development in the revenues distributed to them.

Gaming revenues have more than doubled overall in the past four years. Proceeds to umbrella groups and government departments have risen from \$20 million in 1984 to nearly \$47 million in 1986. Availability of these funds has allowed many programs throughout our province to continue, has encouraged new initiatives, and assisted in the completion of hundreds of community facilities.

Many seniors' organizations, recreational groups, sports clubs, ethnocultural activities, and heritage programs have received much needed funds through the umbrella groups. The United Way of Winnipeg continues its tradition of outstanding service within the city and throughout the province, assisted by Lottery dollars applied to administrative costs.

It is also through these same gaming revenues that the Community Places Program of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation will address the continuing need for the development of community facilities across our province.

Special programs and events, such as the Festival du Voyageur and Folklorama, continue to foster a better understanding among our population and provide experiences to enrich our communities.

Overall, it can be concluded that 1985-86 was a year of positive financial growth and that if this period is any indication, the financial future of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation is indeed a bright one.

In the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation's second full year of operation, the Security and Licensing Department continues to investigate irregularities with regard to licensed activities. A total of 784 investigations and inspections were conducted to ensure the proper use of licensed gaming activities. It is only through follow-up inspections and auditing that compliance with the terms and conditions can be confirmed, and the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation maintains the vigilance necessary to make the system work effectively.

The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation also installed a state-of-the-art surveillance system at the Casino-at-the-Centre premises for better security. The system ensures that players and staff benefit from taped surveillance so that any discrepancies can be checked through replaying of the tapes.

Manitoba has become recognized in Canada as a leader in control and regulation in the gaming industry. The foundation has identified a program to inform the public of Manitoba of the lottery system and where the proceeds go as a priority for the 1987-88 fiscal year. The intention is to show Manitobans how the benefits of Lotteries are being felt throughout the entire province.

In addition to monies earned through individual community groups through licensed activities, millions of dollars are made available through the umbrella system gaming fund. In 1985-86, more than \$25 million was paid to umbrellas and other groups, and an additional \$16.25 million was transferred to the Departments of Health; and Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation demonstrated its viability and accountability in the 1985 fiscal year, and there is every expectation that it will perform as well in the coming year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for her statement with respect to the operations of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation over the past year.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I raised this matter both in question period and again during the Lotteries Estimates, the fact that the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation should be dealt with before a standing committee of the House and not under the Minister's Salary.

Mr. Chairman, the amount of money that's involved in the operations of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation now are so great, so large, that they ought to be dealt with before a standing committee of the House, as are other major corporations and Crown corporations. That way, at least, we would have the staff availability at those particular hearings and a more formalized process than we can do under the present system of dealing with it under the Minister's Salary.

We had indications from the Minister last year, Mr. Chairman, that that may happen. She gave no firm commitment but certainly held out the expectation that it could well happen. Unfortunately, we've had no results.

Perhaps now that the super Minister, the Member for Concordia, is in charge of the Crown corporations, he'll be extending his long arm . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Ministers should be appropriately addressed according to the practice of this House.

The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Perhaps then the Minister of Crown corporations, overseeing the operations of all the other Crown corporations, Mr. Chairman, will now have an opportunity to extend his long arm over the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation as well and we may see real accountability instead of the kind of system that we've been going through for a number of years.

The Premier has indicated in his statement that it was going to be extended accountability situations now. There was going to be real openness and real understanding - a public scrutiny of the kinds of things that happen in Crown corporations - and, presumably, while not specifically a Crown corporation, the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation would fall under that gambit and we would have the opportunity of dealing with it in a somewhat in-depth basis.

In perusing last year's Hansard, Mr. Chairman, I noted that I said there: "One day there may be a government who will take Lotteries revenue for their general account." Mr. Chairman, it came true much quicker than anybody, I think, on this side of the House certainly anticipated. There was no indication during the Estimates of the Lotteries last year that that would occur, yet all of a sudden now I see a substantial chunk taken out of Lotteries revenues to be provided for other government expenditures.

The Minister replied, of course, last year, Mr. Chairman, that she was chastising members opposite here for suggesting ways and means of money being expended from Lotteries accounts on things like library grants, women's programs, health care and community facilities. The Minister's exact words were, and I can quote, Mr. Chairman: "I don't see how we can accommodate all of those suggestions from the members opposite." Yet all of a sudden now a number of those suggestions are being accommodated. We've had the Community Places Program, we have \$7 million going into health, and yet the Minister last year said they couldn't possibly be accommodated in terms of the crying needs of the public out there in Manitoba.

We had a trial period for casinos. A different kind of arrangement took place this year, Mr. Chairman, where they turfed out the usual beneficiaries of those casino periods in favour of this particular trial situation; and then they, in turn, discriminated against those same people that they turfed out by, unfortunately, buying off the Manitoba Sports Federation and the Festival du Voyageur, and yet saying to the other beneficiaries of that time period, "no, you can't have it," and it postponed their situation until the fall. So those people created some significant problem for them in terms of their cash flow.

The budget based on the Community Education Association, for instance, budgets on the basis of having a cash flow in March and again in November. When they were told on some short notice that they weren't going to get their March dates, it caused a significant problem, and after some badgering, I understand, the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation has now advanced them some money in order to carry them through that period

of time because they were unable to budget for it. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps some better arrangement ought to have taken place in that situation.

On March 16 the Manitoba Budget was introduced by the Honourable Minister of Finance. On March 17, the Minister responsible for Lotteries wrote to the umbrella groups to call them in to indicate that they are going to have their funding capped at 1986-87 levels. Mr. Chairman, a letter on March 17 - and on March 30 they were told at a meeting that was going to be the situation effective April 1 - one day's notice.

Written agreements are in effect - or were, at that time - in effect with Lotteries umbrella groups and the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation, indicating that any such change would require 90 days notice. The Minister gave them one day's notice, Mr. Chairman.

The question has to be asked: Does that now constitute termination of all of those agreements? Those Lotteries umbrella groups now, under what method are they operating? Are they going to have a legal position against the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation?

Quite frankly, you have to wonder why the Minister got herself involved anyway. Last week we had a sermon from the Minister based on how they were being in a hands-off situation with all of the groups, the Manitoba Arts Council, and so on. All of these people, there was a hands-off attitude and they did what they wanted.

Here's a situation where presumably the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation and its Board of Directors, entering into agreements with umbrella groups, have the same kind of situation. Yet the Minister inserted herself into the process, called them into her office and said - "That's it, you're cut off as of April 1 in terms of any increase in Lotteries funding." - breaking the terms of the agreement, superimposing her will over top of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Board, I assume, Mr. Chairman.

You have to wonder what now is going to happen with respect to those umbrella groups - umbrella groups that the Minister praises in her opening statement, that they have served - and I agree - they have served a very useful purpose and a very good way of distribution of these kinds of Lotteries revenues; but to treat them in the manner that the Minister has I think is shameful, and I think that an apology ought to go to every one of them to tell them that the notice period should have been respected under the written agreement that they all operate under.

We see, Mr. Chairman, partial implementation of the Decter Report coming to light. The Decter Report earlier indicated that all of Lotteries revenues ought to go to the general account, and we see while the umbrella groups have had their income levels frozen and certain other funds are now flowing through to the general account, you have to wonder whether the umbrella groups are now going through a weaning process.

Are they now being told that we'll slowly remove your benefits from this particular thing - we'll freeze it at 1986-87 levels and through a period of attrition, over the years, they will be weaned off of Lotteries revenues. I am wondering whether that kind of situation is the one that's coming along.

The licensing of bingos, Mr. Chairman, on reserves in Manitoba has been a question raised in this House, and a question that's been neatly sidestepped by both the Minister and the Attorney-General. I suppose they

have some fear that their traditional support in the Native community might be eroded somewhat if they came down too hard on these bingos operating illegally in the Province of Manitoba.

Yet at the same time, Mr. Chairman, they now want to get involved in the licensing of 4-H quilt raffles; they want to get involved in small community raffles throughout the province because of accountability. That is the watchword: "accountability." The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation wrote to the municipalities and said we're not getting accountability and therefore we want to take over the licensing of small raffles, \$200, \$300 and \$500 raffles that occur in these communities, because together it generates in excess of \$1.5 million of revenue, according to them, and that there's no accountability for that kind of a situation.

Yet you have hundreds of thousands of dollars of bingo money being generated on reserves in this province that go totally unaccounted for. They have no licence. They pretend to have no licence and yet the Attorney-General seems to ignore it.

We've seen what happened last summer when children were playing bingo for licorice and then they cracked down on those kids, but they won't crack down on the reserves where they have major - they have cars, they have appliances, they have thousands of dollars of revenues, and yet they won't crack down on that. They won't deal with those situations, Mr. Chairman.

I think something is the matter when any other group in society - it's almost reverse discrimination - any other group in society that tried that kind of thing would be hauled up before the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation, or into court for operating without a licence, but those people are not for some reason.

So I would hope that during the process, the Minister can indicate what they intend to do with respect to these bingos, and whether they intend to crack down, as they would on any other group, to force them into a licensing situation, to force them into an audit situation, to force them to be accountable.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a) Minister's Salary - the Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: To start, perhaps I could introduce Garth Manness, general manager of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation, and Peter Hak, director of Audit and Administration for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

MR. J. ERNST: To the Minister, Mr. Chairman: The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation purchased 830 Empress Street in 1985, some two years ago, for its general offices and warehousing space and so on.

Could the Minister advise what the cost of acquisition was, what the cost of renovations were, and the cost of major maintenance since the time that the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation took occupancy.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The cost of purchase for 830 Empress was \$480,000.00. The cost of renovations was approximately \$800,000, and there were no other significant costs.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister advise why the building is for sale at the present time?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The space at 830 Empress Street is no longer sufficient to accommodate the requirements of staff and therefore a new location has been sought out.

MR. J. ERNST: Is the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation going to lease the building at the corner of Berry Street and Ellice Avenue, formerly occupied by Sony?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Yes, an offer to lease that property at 1777 Ellice has been made, however, all the conditions have not yet been met.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister advise what the size of that building is and the anticipated cost of leasehold improvements to that building?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the square footage for that complex is 54,000 and leasehold improvements are expected to be around \$1 million.

MR. J. ERNST: Do they intend, Mr. Chairman, to operate that facility as a casino or a bingo hall in conjunction or in addition to the occupancy of the building as Manitoba Lotteries Foundation offices?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: No, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister advise then, Mr. Chairman, why the almost doubling of the amount of spaces required for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation? I've been in 830 Empress Street and, while there are some areas that have limited space available, there are others where a very great amount of space is available. I could see perhaps if 10 or 15 or even a 20 percent increase in space requirement, but certainly that kind of space, Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to wonder if it's necessary at all.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Yes, this space is being requested. It's based on a five-year plan which indicates that the Lotteries Foundation itself would be requiring in the neighbourhood of 38,000 square feet and it is in the interests of amalgamating depots pertaining to the Lotteries Foundation and the Western Canada Lotteries Foundation. A further 15,000 square feet is needed and that would be rented out.

MR. J. ERNST: In light of potential amalgamation with the Western Canada Lotteries Foundation, can the Minister advise if she's investigated the report about the cost of the stairway, and so on, that was in the news media a short time ago, and what effect that would have on our share of the operations?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: With respect to that particular issue, yes, I have asked the board to look into it, but that's unrelated to this particular issue pertaining to the depot and warehouse space.

MR. J. ERNST: Has the Minister received an answer yet from her inquiry?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I am still awaiting a report from the board. However, staff have been following the issue and have indicated to me that it would appear that from both the architect and other persons associated with this project that the work was substandard.

MR. J. ERNST: If we could move along to the question of the annual report, there was a significant change in format this year as opposed to last year and a significant change in format last year as opposed to the year before. Can the Minister advise why these changes of formats take place? It seems to me that analysis of last year's report provided a great deal more information than is provided in 1985-86. I have this latent fear that there is some more creative accounting going on and I want to be assured that that is not the case.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I'm sorry. I missed the gist of the last part of that question.

MR. J. ERNST: I had a concern, Mr. Chairman, that the change in format of the annual report providing, in my view, less information than was available last year, I want to be assured that it is not a creative accounting process that we've seen in some other corporations in order to adjust the appearance of their annual statement.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I'm not sure I understand the Member for Charleswood's question. Given that there has been absolutely no change . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't hear the Minister.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I'm saying I'm not sure I understand the member's question given that there's been absolutely no change in which the financial statements are presented. There has been a change in the information included in that it was decided not to include a detailed list of every grant made by every umbrella group since these are arm's length agencies and it is certainly - if the information is required by the member, he can certainly ask for it.

MR. J. ERNST: I wasn't referring, Mr. Chairman, directly to the financial statement per se, but to the report. The annual report, as I indicated, had a lot less information in it and that was my concern. I was concerned that there was some reason why that occurred. The Minister has obviously indicated that.

As I indicated in my earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, the umbrella groups were dealt with rather harshly with respect to having their funds capped, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that they have an agreement that calls for a 90-day notice period. Can the Minister advise why she did not live up to the terms of the agreement?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Whatever the source for the Member for Charleswood's comments, he's got it all wrong.

There has been a thorough and open consultation process with all of the umbrella groups well before a

decision in the budget. It goes back to about January 30 when I met with all the umbrella groups to explain the situation, to indicate that we would be embarking on both a pilot project with respect to an extended casino as well as a needs assessment, something which they had called for and were very pleased that we had decided to move on.

The process has been one of thorough discussion both between myself and all of the umbrella groups, as well as between staff and all of the umbrella groups. We are seeking advice on a continual basis as to how to implement this strategy, how to meet their needs and how to ensure that all of the initiatives and endeavours undertaken in these areas - in the areas of sports, recreation, culture, the arts, heritage, multicultural community services - are able to grow and thrive at a time when there is a clear need for some of that expected new revenue to be directed into some very important and pressing needs such as the health care field. I make no apologies for the fact that there is a need to try to reach out and meet some of the needs in the health care field. I think all members on this side of the House, at any rate, recognize the growing needs in that area and our obligations to ensure that we're sensitive and responsive to those needs.

In fact, as the Member for Charleswood himself noted, there has been a whole list of suggestions about where to put Lottery revenue. I'm sure if we totalled all of their suggestions, we would be looking at not \$7 million, but probably the entire Lottery - all the Lottery revenue that's available now through the gaming fund, through casinos and through bingos.

We, contrary to that approach being suggested by members opposite, decided that it would be in the best interests not to dismantle the Lotteries distribution system, not to exercise any form of cutback to those very important endeavours in our society, unlike the kind of cutbacks and dismantling of the Lotteries distribution system that is happening in provinces west of us.

Contrary to moves undertaken in provinces to the west of us, we have maintained the umbrella distribution system and made a commitment to try to find a way to ensure increases are possible and that a proper review is carried out of all the needs in our system, so that those who are no longer a part of the system feel that they have access to the system. That's been something that's been recommended by all the umbrella groups, and I don't think there is one individual or one group who has expressed any opposition to our approach.

We are continuing to discuss the whole question of the agreements to find a way that will be sensitive to their needs, as well as provide us with the ability to implement a decision to look to redirect expected surface revenue for 1987-88 into the health care field. I think it's fair to say, with no exception, the dialogue has been fruitful and productive and that we will be able to find a satisfactory solution to the issues and arrive at a thorough assessment of the needs of Manitobans in the non-profit community.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, the Minister spoke for five minutes and didn't answer the question. She indicated that the discussions that had taken place as

early as January 30, even given, Mr. Chairman, that constituted notice at January 30, that's still only 60 days notice instead of the 90 required under the agreement. Now is the agreement broken or is it not?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I did answer that question and I said that, unlike the approach being suggested by the Member for Charleswood, our approach has been one of dialogue and discussion and various options are being looked at. I'm looking for suggestions from the umbrella groups as to how to proceed.

The options range from a voluntary termination of agreements to putting on hold the agreements, while we put in place an interim letter of understanding to rewriting the agreements, to any number of things, so every option is possible. I have heard various suggestions from the umbrella groups and I am looking forward to working with this new advisory committee, which is made up of representatives of each of those groups, and I'm quite confident that we'll be able to arrive at both an understanding about agreements, as well as an arrangement whereby we can negotiate and talk about increases in the future.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, what has happened is we have umbrella groups who benefit almost entirely, their entire source of revenue comes from Lottery revenues. It is going to be very difficult to see those people stand up and complain publicly about the high-handed manner in which they have been treated by the Minister. I think in principle, the principle of the amount of dollars that they are receiving, and the fact that they have been well-benefited over the past several years due to the rapid increases in growth in the Lottery industry, Mr. Chairman, that they would agree that the process that's been gone through at the present time is quite adequate.

However, the high-handed attitude that the Minister has taken with respect to those groups, to say to them, look, this is it, you're cut off, bang, that kind of attitude, I think, Mr. Chairman, is the one that causes them some concern but they are afraid to bring that forward for fear that they might be turfed out altogether, that the suggestions of Letters of Intent, or new agreements, or voluntarily withdrawing or any of those kinds of things I think indicate a very serious concern on the part of those groups as to where their status is with respect to having their agreement nullified by virtue of having their funds frozen.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it also, whether the amount of money that they received is too much or not enough, or whatever, the fact of the matter is that they are being frozen at a level that does not recognize any inflation, that does not recognize that government departments, for instance, have received 4, 5, 10, 20 percent increases in spending in their departments, yet in the umbrella groups they have been frozen at last year's level.

It is a concern on their part I think also that some recognition - not in all cases but in some cases - should have been given to that matter as well because in some cases again it may present a problem for them in striking their budget.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, let me try again.

The approach that I've followed and that my staff at the Lotteries Foundation have followed is exactly the opposite of the one the member has suggested. There has been no heavy-handed decision laid down in terms of these umbrella groups. The exact opposite is the situation. - (Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, the Member for Charleswood persists in putting misinformation on the record.

Let me clarify the situation. A process of dialogue and consultation has been undertaken and is ongoing between myself and the staff at the Lotteries Foundation and all the umbrella groups. All the umbrella groups feel they are being consulted with in a satisfactory way and we are looking forward to continuing that. There has been no heavy-handed termination of any agreements. In fact, it has been our approach, and I think this is consistent with the feelings of many of the umbrella groups, that what we are looking at is not necessarily terminating any agreements, we are looking at restructuring agreements. We're looking at a form of understanding that will address both the needs of this government in terms of the exponential growth in Lottery revenue and the needs of the umbrella system.

Our approach has been quite different than the heavy-handed approach of the Conservative Governments to the west of us. We have not gone in and cut back on funds going to umbrella groups, or shut down the system, or put it all into general revenue. We have said we believe in the umbrella system. We believe in the work that you are doing as umbrella groups and your work is important and must continue. Therefore, our goal is to ensure that we find the ways to continue that distribution system as well as meet some of the new and pressing demands that are coming from Manitobans right across the province. Are members here going to tell me that we shouldn't be putting even a penny of Lottery revenue into the health care system? Are they suggesting we should dissolve all the umbrella groups? I'm not sure which position they're trying to give me. I'm getting conflicting messages. All I can say is that we are in the process of dialogue and consultation with the umbrella groups. No one has laid down a number on anyone and I think the member will find, if he talks to all of the umbrella groups, that that approach is a satisfactory one and will lead to a productive and healthy conclusion to this matter.

MR. J. ERNST: First of all, there's no misinformation being put on the record. Perhaps we can get for the record then, has the Minister complied with the terms of the agreement between the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation and the umbrella groups? Have they provided 90 days' written notice as required in those agreements to terminate their funding or to alter their funding?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Well, I'll certainly take that direction under consideration. The member is suggesting that we simply become heavy handed and terminate the agreements.

My approach has been a little different. It's been to say here's the situation. There's a need for some of the expected growth in the Lottery system to be directed towards health care needs. In all of my meetings with all of the umbrella groups, there hasn't been one voice

of disagreement with that approach. Every single one has recognized the need to redirect some Lottery revenue into the health care system.

So, instead, Mr. Chairperson, our approach has been one of finding the best way to achieve that, not to simply terminate, not to simply say, okay, here's your notice, and that's it, but to say what will work for you? What's the best way to deal with the situation of these agreements? Is there a less cumbersome way to have understanding between umbrella groups and the Government of Manitoba around the distribution system?

I find it interesting that the member opposite, the Member for Charleswood, is complaining about the system that will see some Lottery revenue injected into the health care system, while umbrella groups, themselves, have raised no opposition with that. They have said to me that they are prepared to work out a way that will be sensitive and responsive to their needs and deal with the question of existing contracts.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that the Minister is refusing to answer the question. She is embarrassed because she hasn't lived up to the legal requirements under the agreement, and she continues to put misinformation on the record with respect to my comments or the rationale for the questions that have been asked her, Mr. Chairman, and I find that appalling, quite frankly.

Perhaps the Minister can bring herself to answer one question and that is: What is the capped limit for each umbrella group for their funding, in dollars?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Well, first let me again put on the record that I have answered the member's question. We have chosen not to simply lay down the law and terminate agreements. We have said what are the options and what is your advice on those options? We are still seeking input on that matter before we make a decision.

Given that all the umbrella groups have been in support of the suggestion that some of the surplus revenue be redirected to health care, obviously, they are interested in participating in a process that will achieve that in the most efficient and sensible way.

With respect to the level of funding for each of the umbrella groups, I cannot give the member specific information on each of those groups until we find out exactly what the earnings were for '86-87. It's our commitment to ensure that umbrella groups receive an amount up to 1986-87 levels and to try to work out a mechanism for discussing and negotiating increases beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Provincial Auditor for the year ending March 31, 1986, makes a number of recommendations. As you probably know, we'll be reviewing this in detail in Public Accounts tomorrow; however, one of the recommendations on page 5 under Departments and Agencies operations, subtitled: "Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation," it says, and it may have been some time since the Minister has read this, but I'll therefore read it into the record.

I quote: "Payments have been made from a trust account administered by the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation in a manner which does not comply with the legislation establishing the trust accounts under The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act.

"Salaries and other administrative expenses of department employees in the amount of \$1.2 million have been paid directly from the trust accounts. This does not comply with the procedures prescribed in the act."

I would ask the Minister, firstly, how long this practice has gone on? I would assume it has been in existence for some period of time, and, if not, the Minister can correct me. Secondly, can she tell me specifically what procedures in the act have been contravened?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, I believe this practice has been carried on for some time and certainly by members opposite when they were in government, leading up to 1981. However, we're quite aware of the Auditor's concerns around this situation and will be addressing that matter through legislation that has been introduced in this House for First Reading, and members opposite will be able to peruse that legislation very shortly.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I think it's only fair that the Minister, at this time, indicate what is going to change the intent of that legislation and maybe it has been addressed by her on First Reading. Indeed now, will this be allowed; will the employees' expenses that I suppose were not to have been covered out of Lotteries Funds revenues, and indeed, I suppose then, were to have been paid out of an appropriation of Main Supply, is that the practice that has been in place for some number of years? Is that now going to be legitimized?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the practice that has been in place for some time, and certainly in practice when members opposite were in government was to - when a program was funded under Lottery revenue to ensure that the costs of operating the program and the salary costs associated with the running of that program were also paid for through Lottery revenue.

The Auditor has felt that that is problematic and that the legislation does not necessarily extend to the payment of operating expenditures and salaries associated with programs paid for out of Lottery revenue, and it's on that basis, therefore, that we will - and because of that concern that we will be amending the legislation or making that proposal to the House and providing all those concerned with the authority to spend Lottery revenue on operating and salary expenditures as well as direct grants to external agencies.

MR. C. MANNES: Again, I'd ask the Minister, originally what was to be the source of the funding for direct grants as the Minister has just indicated in her answer; and salaries in support of the program?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Presumably, the source based on the Auditor's concern for operating and salary

expenditures associated with the administration of a grant program should have been appropriation; whereas it was quite appropriate for the direct grant or grants paid directly to external associations in the broad parameters of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, could be, and legitimately so, paid for out of Lottery revenue.

MR. C. MANNES: So originally, when the number was very small - I'm talking about the amount spent on salaries - it was a small figure and when governments previously had incorrectly sourced that out of Lottery revenues, and now, Mr. Chairman, that number, based on the Auditor's report from a year ago, being \$1.2 million, he feels that that should no longer occur; and rather than the government now moving that wage cost back into appropriation - where indeed it would reflect again on the deficit of the province - it is now going to be legitimized by the bill the Minister has brought forward into this House to allow for the fact that revenues now will pay for the salaries; is that a fair assessment?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, what I'm saying is that if it's appropriate for the grant program to be covered by Lottery revenue or paid through Lotteries, then it only makes sense for the expenditures associated with the running of that program to be covered by Lottery revenue. It was the Auditor's opinion that the act does not permit those operating expenditures and salary expenditures to be covered by Lottery revenue and it's our intention to make that possible through amendments to the legislation.

MR. C. MANNES: One final question, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister wishes to put it in her way, I would say then that what the Minister is saying is that the intent, as was originally contained within the statute, was wrong; that the basic principle - and I'm addressing now that these staff costs, these employee costs should be covered by appropriation - was incorrect in the Minister's view?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, it would be my view that when the Lotteries legislation was drafted, it did not adequately encompass the principle that was at the root of the provisions in the legislation, which would be that if one has authority to spend Lottery revenue on a grant program pertaining to culture, recreation, fitness, sport and heritage, then one should have the ability to operate that program, which may require staff years, which may require other direct expenditures to be covered as well through that legislation; so it's a refinement of an original principle not adequately covered in the legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister: Has the Manitoba Lotteries Commission tendered out any of the transportation of Lotteries product for rural Manitoba?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the answer is yes, tendering does take place for products and delivery of products or transportation of products through the Lotteries Foundation.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister were all carriers notified of the tendering availability of the tender that was available or being left by the Department of Lotteries? Was there proper notification? Were all rural carriers given the notification that there were tenders for transportation available?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Notification was done by an advertisement in the Winnipeg Free Press on Monday, January 5, 1987.

MR. J. DOWNEY: If a carrier was in the western region of the province and didn't happen to take the Free Press, didn't see the ad, then they wouldn't have the opportunity to tender, is that correct? It was a one day, one newspaper advertising for the carrying of Lotteries product. Does she really think that's sufficient to notify the rural carriers that there was an opportunity for work under the Lotteries Foundation and that it was adequately advertised?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: It would seem, judging on the response rate from across the province, that most courier services would have been aware of the requirements. The proposals, in addition to those carriers in Winnipeg, came from Altona, Gimli, Treherne, and Lockport.

I think that the question of a rural carrier for the requirements of this contract is more related to some of the other requirements pertaining to this particular function and I apologize to the member for not yet responding and writing to his letter. I thank him for bringing this issue to my attention. Certainly, we'd be quite happy to review our advertising policy in the way in which our notice of contracts are carried out.

However, I think we have to keep in mind some of the special requirements of this particular activity: that products must be delivered COD and monies returned daily; that the courier must be available at short notice in some instances; that the courier is required to seek out volunteers from organizations, in some cases. It might be that some rural carriers might just find it totally impractical to respond to this kind of a requirement. However, I am certainly prepared to look at the tendering policy and the way in which tenders are advertised.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I would find it strange that the Minister would proceed to carry out a tendering process. I can tell you that most rural communities have daily services and they're hungry for business, I can tell you that. The rural carriers right now are not getting an abundance of business and they're having to pay the additional taxes that the province are incurring upon them, whether it's payroll tax, whether it's fuel tax, whether it's sales tax, whether it's property tax - they are all incurring higher costs.

Anything that the government could do to encourage use of those carriers, I think, is extremely important. It would seem strange that - and I'm not opposed to who got the contract, that's not the issue that I'm raising here. The question that comes to mind is that the Lotteries Commission had to go to support the carrier that was the successful bidder had to go to the Motor Transport Board in support of that carrier. It seems

strange that the department or a government would take a position for any carrier. I mean, it's really, I don't think, a normal situation for a department or a wing of government to put forward a request that a particular company get a special licence for carrying out activities when, in fact, there are already licenced carriers to do the job. That's the whole issue, Mr. Chairman. Here we have the Manitoba Lotteries going to the Manitoba Traffic Board, the Carrier Board, to support a carrier to do a service that's already provided. I know it's maybe not a big issue but I know that on break-open Lottery tickets and bingo tickets that I asked the Minister about, it did cause some concerns with a constituent of mine. I think, in principle, the Minister possibly should take a look at that whole area and, as I say, goodness knows, there are enough costs imposed upon rural carriers as it is, that they could use some additional business. There may be some technical problems but it isn't, I'm sure, insurmountable, the problems that would develop.

All I'm saying is I don't think it's a usual practice for a department of government to be overly visible, to create more competition for carriers in the system. Granted, they have to maximize their profits and get the fairest deal. The Minister has made reference to some bids that came in and I would expect without having to ask this question that the lowest tender was accepted. Is that correct?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I'd like to say that the member raises some good points. We'll certainly be reviewing our advertising policies for calls for proposals and also looking at other options that may be that we're going to have to spend a little more and have a couple of services in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if we can discuss for a moment the question of the needs assessment brought in at the time that the umbrella groups had their income levels frozen. I understand from a question raised by my colleague from Springfield during the Culture Estimates last week that the consultant has not been appointed. Is that correct?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, and you know that's correct.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister advise if a short list has been prepared and when they expect an appointment can be made?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Originally we sent out letters asking for qualifications from just about every consulting firm we could identify in the Province of Manitoba. We received roughly 24 letters of qualification. On the basis of our requirements that were clearly spelled out in that letter, 11 were short listed and sent the proposal or the tender. We have asked for anyone interested to meet our proposal deadline of June 19.

MR. J. ERNST: The Minister indicated she sent the short-listed group a proposal. Can the Minister advise

what that proposal was? Is that the terms of reference of the study to be undertaken?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, I'll clarify the terminology. I meant to say a request for proposal was sent out to all of those who made the requirements from the original mailing and they're being asked to submit a detailed proposal on how they would carry out the project.

MR. J. ERNST: Has the Minister provided basic terms of reference for these people, a basis upon which they can compare their proposals one from another. Mr. Chairman, is there a basic set of criteria?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, the request for proposal includes some details about the terms of reference and what we are looking for and has undergone a thorough consultation process with all of the umbrella groups involved so we received input from a whole variety of groups and individuals and refined the project proposal accordingly.

Roughly it calls for the consultants to review the following areas: review the present distribution system and present level of funds being distributed through that system, this includes the distribution of funds in all areas of Manitoba, rural and urban; to review each umbrella group including the board structure, selection criteria application process and administrative structures and procedures; to determine whether additional areas of activity should share in the current distribution system and, if so, through what mechanism; to determine whether there should be a re-distribution between umbrella groups or between umbrella groups and government.

MR. J. ERNST: Would the Minister be prepared to table that proposal?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Certainly. I have an extra copy here.

MR. J. ERNST: I thank the Minister for that, Mr. Chairman. From what she said, is the proposal not going to duplicate what the umbrella group study did last year under Al Miller? A number of the things that she mentioned just in her brief discourse there seems to relate to the umbrella group study that was done by Mr. Miller last year, at some expense I gather.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, this proposal in concept is quite different from the report done by Al Miller and the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation. That report was supposed to, and had the mandate to, look at the effectiveness of the current distribution system. This needs assessment is intended to look at the whole question of appropriate distribution between groups and groups perhaps not falling directly within the distribution system and to determine whether or not there should be any kind of redistribution, any changes for that distribution system in order to meet the growing and changing needs of a non-profit community.

MR. J. ERNST: Will this needs assessment also determine if there should be new umbrella groups

created, if there should be new special agreement arrangements made with respect to, for instance, the Manitoba Conservation Council is one which has made application for funding authority. The Member for St. Norbert, I think, made a very eloquent plea on their behalf last year during the Lotteries Estimate process, but nothing I gather has taken place since that time. Will this needs assessment be looking at additional groups such as that?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The intent of the needs assessment is twofold: one, to look at the effectiveness of the current distribution system and whether or not the umbrella groups are meeting the needs of the groups that it was intended to meet; the second is to look at the needs of the non-profit community in general and to see whether or not there should be readjustments made to the system to cover off those particular needs and interests.

We've had a number of serious requests from organizations, as well as calls from members opposite, to provide funding for groups now not either currently covered at all or not covered adequately in the view of the organizations, for example, going back almost a year now, from a new organization called the Conservation Council of Manitoba, which has been requesting special status as an umbrella group through the distribution system. We've had a strong lobby from the Manitoba Provincial Recreation Association, that recreation organizations be considered a separate umbrella group in the distribution system. We've had a very strong approach and a number of members opposite have echoed that appeal from creative retirement to very important organizations dealing with recreation activities for our seniors, certainly an important consideration for all of us. We've also had another appeal for a separate umbrella structure from the Manitoba High School Athletic Association and the list goes on and on.

Members opposite will understand the nature of the job ahead of us and the immense task that the consultant carrying out this needs assessment will have. It will certainly not be an easy task. In the interim, our approach has been to say that all organizations should continue to apply through the current umbrella distribution system since, in effect, that system was set up to try to capture many of the needs of the non-profit community. In fact, many of the organizations that I've just mentioned could have or do have access to funding through one of the other umbrella groups. Whether or not it's feasible or makes sense to set up new umbrella groups when so many concerns have been raised, such as that by members opposite, will have to be seen, based on the results of the consultant and the report of the needs assessment.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, if June 19 is the day upon which the proposals have to be back in, presumably it will take 30 or so days to analyze those and determine who is going to undertake it, when would the actual project work start and when is it anticipated that it will be completed?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, based on the time frame outlined, I would expect that we would

be able to have the project begin no later than the middle of July and have it continue to March 1, 1988.

MR. J. ERNST: So then the study period would be say a period of six or seven months, if I understood the Minister's response correctly?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: That's correct, Mr. Chairperson, however, in the interests of ensuring a thorough and complete review and needs assessment, I'm certainly flexible on that deadline of March 1 and will be very much in touch with all of the umbrella groups and this Advisory Committee that I referred to, to seek their direction and advice about the length of the study.

MR. J. ERNST: Well if we assume then for a minute, Mr. Chairman, that the study period will terminate March 1 - for the sake of argument - 1988, the final report tabled at that time, then presumably there will be some period of time for analysis of the report, and so on, which would take perhaps another few months of consultations, etc., any action might well not be forthcoming for at least a year or year and one-half or even two years.

Could the Minister advise what is expected to happen in the meantime to groups like the Manitoba Conservative Association? Are they going to be eligible for some special funding in the interim? Are they expected to try and qualify under some umbrella group or other? And they're not alone, certainly there are other organizations, snowmobilers and others who have indicated that they wish to have some funding as well. Who is going to undertake an analysis of those groups? Who is going to determine, in the interim, at least, whether they qualify? And if they do, how much they should get and where the money would come from under the limited funding that's now available for those kinds of activities?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: We will certainly encourage all of those organizations to continue to seek funding through the current umbrella distribution system. Regrettably, we cannot, without the data that will be forthcoming from a needs assessment, make decisions because that only will impact on other groups within the system. I would certainly find it difficult to arbitrarily take money from another umbrella group, whether it be the Sports Federation or whatever, and reallocate it to another group without the basis and advice of a needs assessment and a consultant.

It would not be, I don't think, a satisfactory solution for any of us, and I can only say that throughout this needs assessment, all of those groups, like the Conservation Council, will be encouraged to make representation to the consultant. However, I wouldn't want to, at this point, create any expectations that couldn't be fulfilled because, in effect, in the final analysis, it's going to mean a redistribution from within the existing umbrella distribution system. No matter which way you cut it, it's going to mean taking from another group and giving to a new group.

So I think the needs consultant will have to give some serious thought about that whole approach, other sources of funding available to various groups, and a

better coordination of our whole funding approach to the non-profit sector.

MR. J. ERNST: The Minister indicated she would encourage groups, such as the Conservation Council, who have not received funding, to make application to the existing umbrella groups. Mr. Chairman, if the existing umbrella groups are frozen, that their income levels have been capped, how in heavens name does the Minister think that a group such as that is going to get any money out of that group when they're going to be fighting internally for every dime they can possibly lay their hands on, particularly, since there's no built-in inflationary factor for those groups? They're being frozen at some arbitrary level base on last year's income.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: All of the umbrella groups, on a regular basis, receive applications and make decisions based on need. There is no fixed allocation of funds to any particular set of organizations. In fact, most of the umbrella groups have shied away from providing operating assistance, much to the consternation of many organizations because they see, on a daily basis, the needs coming forward and they know the demands on the system. They have criteria and a process in place for judging applications.

Every group that fits within that umbrella group has a chance at being treated seriously for funding as the next group. In fact, there's an effort on all groups to try to address new needs that come forward and there's no guarantee to any group, generally, that funding is in place for an ongoing basis, or in an ongoing way, in a permanent kind of situation.

So there is nothing to deny any group from seeking funding and nothing to indicate why they wouldn't receive funding or be considered seriously, especially in view of the kind of increases that these groups have seen. I mean the Sports Federation has gone from roughly \$2.9 million in '83-84 to \$8.7 million in '85-86; '86-87 levels are obviously higher than that. The Arts Council has gone from \$1.6 million to \$4.6 million. The Manitoba Community Education Association from \$385,000 to almost \$2 million. The Manitoba Community Services Council from less than \$1 million to more than \$4 million. The Heritage Federation from \$79,000 to over half a million. The Manitoba Intercultural Council from less than half a million to more than a million, the United Way from 1.2 to well over 2, and so on and so forth. All of those groups have seen major increases in Lotteries revenue and I think all of them are quite prepared to address new and emerging concerns that are forthcoming and to not be fixed or inflexible in their approach.

So I don't think that the suggestion by the member that because there may be a leveling off of funding for these umbrella groups, that there should be the kind of closing-the-door to new groups that he's suggesting.

MR. J. ERNST: I hope, Mr. Chairman, that's the case and that common sense and so on will prevail in these situations so that groups that are on the outside at the present time at least are not going to be arbitrarily frozen out for at least a year-and-a-half or two years.

I have a final question in this area, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister advise, on the short list, either Michael

Decter and/or the October partnership are short-listed for the needs study?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: No, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, if we can proceed to some questions on licensing, as I alluded to in our . . .

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Just before we do that, do you mind if we take a short bathroom break?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

(RECESS)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The recess is over. Committee, please come to order.

The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to address the question of licensing briefly here. First of all, with respect to the proposal that the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation take over small raffle licensing throughout the whole province, the 4-H Club turkey raffle or whatever, has the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation or the Minister come to a conclusion with respect to that licensing?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, first of all, let me clarify there was certainly no intention on our part to immediately go in and take over licensing.

Based on some concerns that were raised along the lines of concerns raised by members on occasion, either in this House or outside the House, it was decided to review the area and to seek comments from all municipalities about the question of licensing, within the parameters of the legislation that they are now responsible for, for any kind of raffle that is less than \$3,000.00. We were seeking advice as how to best handle the current arrangements. Some municipalities prefer not to be bothered with it; others have felt that it was important that they control it.

The Member for Charleswood will be aware that there have been cases brought to our attention where concerns have been expressed about where the proceeds of a raffle licensed by a municipality are going. There was one on the Peter Warren show that I had to deal with, pertaining to a bank being licensed to have a raffle and the proceeds going to put on a social function for the staff at that institution. It is those kinds of issues that come before us and therefore require some attention. So this was an attempt to get some feedback on whether or not there should be any changes and, if so, along what lines.

There has been no decision to take over the licensing of small raffles, raffles under \$3,000.00. Instead, we will continue to monitor the situation, and we will ensure that there is a greater sharing of information with municipal offices over the coming year, and foster greater understanding by all parties of concerns and problems so that we can ensure a more effective system.

I should point out that there were over 200 letters sent out throughout the province. There were 39 responses. Most of those were not in favour of giving up their licensing authority for small raffles. We'll

certainly continue to raise the issues and determine the best course of action.

MR. J. ERNST: As I understand it then, Mr. Chairman, the matter is more or less on hold and will be monitored over a period of time to see if any additional problems arise.

The Minister has indicated that is the case.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, in terms of licensing, I wonder if I could just read for the record the licensing provisions as information that was supplied to me last year.

Characteristics of Organizations:

1. To be eligible for licensing, an organization must be a volunteer, democratic, non-profit body and the intended use of funds must meet the requirements in section (b).

(b) Use of Funds:

Funds generated from a Lottery must be used to provide a benefit to the general community or part of the general community. The benefits should be in the area of advancement of education, religion, health, sport, recreation or culture, the relief of poverty or any other area considered appropriate.

2. Organizations using the funds for their own purposes will not be licensed unless one or more of the following conditions are met:

- (a) Membership in the group is available to the general community or part of the general community;
- (b) The general program offered by the organization is beneficial to the general community or part of that general community;
- (c) The specific program supported by the funds raised from the Lottery scheme is beneficial to the general community or part of the general community.

Now based on that, the Breezy Bend Golf and Country Club made application for funding for a licence. They were turned down on the basis of not meeting the licensing criteria. Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see anywhere in the licensing provisions that the Breezy Bend Golf Club does not meet the licensing provisions not just in one case but in several, presumably, if that organization simply received a letter denying their application and citing some condition that I gather that doesn't appear to me in the licensing provisions.

Are their new licensing provisions applicable? Have these been amended since you provided them to me last year? Or what is the case that the Breezy Bend Golf and Country Club, an organization that's been in effect for 25 years, that has carried on activities, Mr. Chairman, to the benefit of the entire community, if not a goodly portion thereof, whose membership is available to anyone who wishes to make application, I don't understand where the denial came from in this particular instance.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Let me say a couple of things first. This is the first time new licensing

arrangements came into effect in August of '86; also that the issue has not been resolved - there has been no final decision and I believe they are appealing the original decision; and, thirdly, that the Member for St. James has made a strong representation already on behalf of Breezy Bend Golf Club to see if there was anything that could be done in terms of this application.

Basically, it comes down to a question of whether or not we're dealing with a non-profit situation. That's really the fundamental principle that is underpinning these licensing regulations. For any organization, like the Breezy Bend Golf Club, it becomes a matter of whether or not that organization is prepared to assure or ensure that upon dissolution of that organization that the assets go to the community and not to the shareholders. I think the final analysis is up to the organization to make that determination and be able to indicate to us if the assets - if dissolution ever occurred - would go to the community as opposed to the shareholders and, hence, would be considered non-profit in the true sense of the word.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, then, can the Minister confirm that the matter is under appeal, it's before the appropriate body for that exercise, and that no final decision has been made. Is that correct?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, that's correct. However, I should reiterate the comments I've just made about it being really in the hands of the organization to indicate where assets would go if dissolution of that organization ever took place.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, there was a pilot project this past late winter and spring with respect to casino operations in the City of Winnipeg. Is the study completed, based on that pilot project?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: No, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. J. ERNST: Is there an interim report, some indication of the results of that pilot project?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I have some preliminary information from staff of the Lotteries Foundation, particularly in the area of financial benefits accrued during that pilot project, and can indicate that the average earnings from that pilot project were, I believe, slightly above previous average-day earnings.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, in light of a number of groups that benefit from casino operations who would have their dates altered, shall we say, as a result of the pilot project and who are sitting out there with some concern - I think, particularly, special agreement groups where they don't know exactly what's going to happen - does the government have some basic intent as to where they're going to go with casino operations?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'm not quite sure what the member's question is. The question of the pilot project is quite separate from the days now currently allocated to umbrella groups for distribution to organizations that apply to them for funding.

The current arrangement of 90 casino days here in Winnipeg is divided up between umbrella groups.

There's certainly no change in our arrangements with umbrella groups regarding number of days; that stays. And the revenue from days is fixed.

The only change that we're considering and discussing with the umbrella groups is whether or not it might be more beneficial for them if we simply pooled all the revenues from those 90 days and divided it on the same proportionate basis as currently exists, which would eliminate that question of which days are held when and which are more profitable and what happens when there's a less profitable period, as opposed to a more profitable period, and so on.

So there's no correlation between the 90 days. That's fixed, that's divided, no matter which way, whether it's pooled or whether the current system is in place. That's quite distinct from the pilot project which occurred for a short period to determine the viability of a five-day-a-week casino. Let me indicate, since the member has said this now on a number of occasions and put wrong information on the record about the Community Education umbrella group, the Member for Charleswood has consistently, despite having raised this matter in the House twice, and despite the fact that he has written to me and I have written to him twice on the matter, continues to put misinformation on the record.

The fact of the matter is that the allocation of days for the Community Education Association is quite a totally separate matter from the way in which arrangements are handled with the Sports Federation and with Festival du Voyageur. In fact, as the Member for Charleswood knows from my April 28 letter to him, the whole question of whether or not there should be a 27-day casino, whether the 27 days allocated to the Community Education Association should be done in one block or in two blocks was raised with them many, many, many months ago and a full consultation with them. So the issue has nothing to do with a block sum that was arranged, as in the case with the Sports Federation, but whether or not they're happy with the days, and the implications that caused for them in terms of when they get the revenue to meet their needs.

I have been quite sensitive to the issues they have brought to my attention and have committed myself, and staff as well have done the same, to resolving the situation. In fact, when the issue was brought to our attention about whether or not the current arrangements of when and where they have their 27 days would help them make payments that were expected of them, we indicated a willingness to change the arrangement and try to give them some cash in advance. It's as simple as that.

I think the member should get his facts straight before he puts such nonsense on the record and stop distorting the facts as they exist.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, we can continue going on and on and fighting over who's putting what nonsense on the record, the Minister or myself. The people who are involved know, Mr. Chairman, and that's very clear.

I'd like to go for a minute, Mr. Chairman, to the reserve funds. Last year, the report indicated there were \$2.7 million in the General Funds, 2.6 in the Special Fund and 6.6 in the Equalization Fund. Only three payments were made out of these funds according to the annual

report: the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation, the Folks Arts Council and the Royal Canadian Legion.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the Minister advised on page 3713 of Hansard that a payment of \$874,510 was made to the Keystone Association of Charities. That payment does not appear in the Annual Report and I would ask why?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The reason for that, Mr. Chairperson, is that it came after April 1, '86.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I'll accept that.

Can the Minister advise what the fund balances are as of March 31, 1987? I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that they'll be unaudited, but at the same time I'm sure they have a pretty close handle now, of three months after the closing of the books, what those funds are.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The balance in the Equalization Fund is \$9,250,000.00. However, once commitments against that are paid for '87-88, that will be roughly \$3,083,000; the balance in the Special 6/49 is \$3 million.- (Interjection)- \$3 million.

MR. J. ERNST: Special Fund?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Special 6/49.- (Interjection)- \$2.5 million.

MR. J. ERNST: There were federal contributions over the past three years: \$1.2 million in '84-85; \$1.4 million in '85-86; presumably some sums slightly higher than that in '86-87. If I understand it, no further payments will now be required. There's an additional \$1.5 million approximately that we'll no longer need to pay to the Federal Government with respect to that phasing-out agreement. Can the Minister advise, is this money returned now to the Gaming Fund, will it be used in calculation of revenues for umbrella groups, etc.? What will be the disposition of that additional sum of money now that it's no longer required to be paid out to the feds?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Actually there are two agreements with the Federal Government. One of them is an ongoing arrangement and increases with the cost of inflation. In 1986, total costs were \$1,821,000 approximately. The second part of the agreement is, as the member indicated, being phased out. There was a payment made in December of '85, another in December '86, and the final payment will be made in December '87; '86 figures for that amount were roughly \$1.6 million. When we no longer have to pay that, that just means that there will be that much more in the Gaming Fund.

MR. J. ERNST: If there's that much more in the Gaming Fund, will the capping of revenues to the umbrella groups still apply, or will it now be calculated as if this money was in the fund?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: First of all, this certainly won't have an impact on current arrangements until '88-89. Secondly, the arrangements with the umbrella

groups are based on '86-87 revenue figures as well as increases that are related to the results of the needs assessment.

MR. J. ERNST: I understand then there won't be any benefit as far as umbrella groups are concerned with respect to this additional funding . . . or benefits accruing to their system that was in place previously?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: There are really two separate issues being dealt with here. One is the potential increase in gaming fund revenue after the second part of the second agreement with the Federal Government is phased out, and the other issue is the whole question of revenues for the umbrella groups which is now all related to the needs assessment and discussions that take place around that. So they are two separate issues entirely.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of other questions with respect to Native bingo operations.

I appreciate that I received an answer of some brief import from the Attorney-General when I asked the question in question period, but what is the long-term application of this situation? Surely to goodness, we can't allow bingo operations particularly of the magnitude that are going on in reserves across Manitoba without some form of accountability and without some form of licensing.

As I indicated earlier, anybody who would undertake these kinds of situations, going unlicensed, would have been come down on very hard by the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation. The response that I got previously was, well, it's a question of Native self-government. At some point we'll have to determine that, but, Heaven only knows, that debate has been ongoing for any number of years and very likely will continue for many, many more years without any resolution. How in Heaven's name are we now going to address that situation?

I think the Lotteries Foundation ought to be pressing this issue to be resolved very quickly.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: As I've indicated in the House on several occasions when this issue has been raised, I clearly stated that it would be in all of our best interests to find a resolution to this whole question. The resolution of this question obviously ties into issues pertaining to self-government and the Constitution. All of us know those issues are up in the air, based on the failure of the last round of discussions to result in agreement then, and obviously tied as well to the whole Meech Lake accord.

Certainly, my approach has been one of consultation and a resolution that will satisfy both the concerns of our indigenous peoples as well as be consistent with our approach to the regulation of gaming activities in Manitoba. We'll certainly be making every effort to continue that approach and ensure that we can meet the needs of the Native community, as well as make sure that we maintain our standard of having the best regulated, the best run, most efficient system probably anywhere in North America.

MR. J. ERNST: You can drag in the Meech Lake accord and Star Wars and everything else, I suppose, if you

want, but we have to face the facts. The facts are it's unlikely that we're going to see a resolution of Native self-government in the Constitution very soon.

In the meantime, I don't think we can continue to be blatantly going on ignoring what is a multimillion-dollar business being operated outside the guidelines of what everybody else in the Province of Manitoba has to live up to.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, that if common sense would prevail and some recognition of the fact that we're not going to see a resolution of that within a short period of time, then the time has come to force the issue. If that's the case, then let's go to court; let's determine who has to obey the law in Manitoba and who doesn't. I think all of the other citizens of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, I think they deserve that amount of respect at least, that we should determine who has to obey the law; who has to conform to the rules and regulations set down by this body, and who doesn't.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has to accept that responsibility and has to now carry it forward.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I take the concerns around this issue very seriously, and my colleague, the Attorney-General, and I have been working steadfastly on a resolution of it and are committed to pursuing that course of action.

I find it passing strange that on the one hand the Member for Charleswood and others on that side of the House are insisting that I take a heavy law-and-order approach immediately when it comes to the question of indigenous peoples; yet on every occasion, on every chance they get, they're prepared to ask me to bend the rules. They did so today with respect to Breezy Bend. The Member for Charleswood has asked about exemptions pertaining to the Charleswood Hotel in his constituency. The Member for Springfield has asked about exemptions for a hotel that he used to own, the Dawson Trail Motor Inn, and the list goes on and on.

I am prepared to follow a approach and to show some flexibility while maintaining a system of integrity.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, we're again having more misinformation put on the record with respect to the Breezy Bend Golf and Country Club.

I asked simple questions. I made no representation with respect to their situation one way or another. I simply asked why they did not meet the licensing provisions as provided to me and why they were being turned down. I made no representation one way or another, so that misrepresents - (Interjection) - No, I'm not. No, I'm not.

In this particular situation, I'm simply saying if you can knock over a kid's bingo in the country here, for God's sake, why don't you deal with the resolution of Lottery licensing with respect to major bingos? Only because of the traditional Native vote; I think you might be a little worried about that. If you came down on them, they might not vote for you next time around.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Mr. Chairperson, I've never heard such nonsense or silliness before.

I don't know if the member is aware of the complexity of the issues involved around our indigenous peoples.

He will know that there are major issues pertaining to self-government; he will know that there are major issues dealing with poverty and economic deprivation on our reserves; and general treatment of our indigenous peoples for decades and decades and decades.

I don't think it's a responsible, a sensitive or a decent position for anyone to take to simply just hard-line it and say this is it, boom, we're going to exercise the full force of law and order.

I think that - (Interjection) - Mr. Chairperson, again the Member for Charleswood insists on putting misinformation on the record. He had fun with a question in the House many months ago where he chose to ignore the facts and chose to play it up in a silly way and now is using that information here in this debate.

Well, it's just silliness on his part to suggest that we shouldn't investigate situations if there are complaints and to see whether or not any regulations are being broken. We're doing the same here in the case of reserves and in the case of any gaming activities by indigenous peoples. We're investigating.

We're certainly - (Interjection) - again - see, Mr. Chairperson, only when it comes to Native people and indigenous people is he prepared to say shut it down, enforce the law. On everything else, he's prepared to leave the impression that we should be prepared to bend the rules a bit and encourage appeals even though the process is clear because of situations that the member is directly involved in.

Well, I'm sorry. We're certainly prepared to look at all sides of the issue, to look at the issues pertaining to the Native communities and reserves, as well as to look at those communities who border a reserve and who are being impacted by these gaming activities. Any decision and any outcome will be only after a thorough process of consultation and negotiations has taken place.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I have one question with respect to the Community Places Program and with respect to the allocation for health care, \$10 million and \$7 million, respectively. Can the Minister advise what accounts they came from, or against what fund are they a draw?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The funding for the Community - (Interjection) - I'm glad to see the Member for Charleswood calling his own colleagues into order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: The funding for the Community Places Program came from the following sources: about 5.2 from the Equalization Fund; about 3.1 from Culture, Heritage and Recreation; and 1.6 from the Sports Directorate.

The funding for the \$7 million referred to in the Budget and the health care requirements will come from expected surplus revenue for '87-88.

MR. J. ERNST: Surplus revenue then, Mr. Chairman, means, presumably, the difference between anticipated or actual earnings and the capped umbrella and departmental allocations?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, it would be the difference between expected earnings and the funds available to all umbrella groups and the two departments for '86-87.

MR. J. ERNST: Can the Minister advise what that anticipated surplus is projected at?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Yes, \$7 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a question regarding the regulations, whether or not certain organizations will be eligible to run raffles and draws. Has there been a tightening up of the regulations in the recent year?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The only change that has occurred in the whole question of licensing provisions has been on October 1, 1986 - the same licensing conditions that the Member for Charleswood referred to - and they were simply to clarify the question of charitable status and to get a better definition around charitable non-profit criteria for organizations.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I almost hesitate to ask this question because the Minister became somewhat touchy when we appeared to be asking for consideration for particular organizations.

But I find it difficult to accept that organizations that are groupings of people who have brought themselves together in a non-profit association, and I guess, to be specific, I should tell the Minister that I've received concerns from the Manitoba Simmental Association or the Lakeshore Simmental Association, which is an association that would not have an opportunity to return funds to the members, and in fact uses the funds from a draw that they would run to provide awards at 4-H Awards Days or Achievement Days; albeit, those awards would no doubt be given in the area of whether or not the 4-H member had a Simmental calf involved in his project, but it seems to me that the regulations are cutting rather fine.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The licensing regulations or provisions are clearly outlined. The Member for Charleswood read them out in the House.

The board attempts to adhere to those provisions and guidelines, and in this case, determined that the organization did not meet those criteria and did not benefit broad-community interests, and felt that it was primarily a self-interest group. That kind of criteria comes into play and is there because of the concern about trying to reach out as far as possible to non-profit community interests that meet the charitable aspects and needs of society.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The comment that was made a couple of minutes ago in committee strikes me as being somewhat strange when the Member for Charleswood inquired about what negotiations were being done with the Indian reserves and the Indian bands. Certainly, there is no intent on this side to discriminate on their

actions; but it strikes me as very strange when the former Deputy Minister will go into a band in my constituency, just prior to the election, promise them a quarter of a million dollars for their arena, but forget to put it in writing, and then we see a situation where we are disgusted when we see a manipulation of people who don't deserve to be treated that way.

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, a question under the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 42: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,377,400 for Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

The hour is now 6:00 p.m. I am leaving the Chair.
The committee will return at 8:00 p.m.

(English translation of dialogue in Vol. XXXV No. 56, pages 2468-69, 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 27, 1987.)

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . we are not just doing it for ourselves, but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this environment which is so fragile, and yet so vital to our daily well-being and to our survival, does not really belong to us. We don't have the right to abuse it and to degrade it. In all the decisions we make relative to the use of our resources, we must consider the generations to come, who have no input into these decisions, but who must bear the consequences - perhaps insurmountable ones - of an environment that compromises the quality of their future - excuse me - the quality of their life.

This environment is loaned to us . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Arthur on a point of order.

* * *

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm glad that it at least was confirmed that I had stated the same thing that I had heard.

This environment has been entrusted to us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that we would manage it in such a way as to allow, not simply its sustained development for those of us who derive profit from it today . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I still hear the Member for Brandon East moaning and grumbling -(Interjection)- Brandon West. He doesn't have to listen; all he has to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to let me proceed with my remarks.

MR. J. McCRAE: Carry on, carry on, have a good time.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . but also to ensure a better quality of life for future generations.

Now, I shall continue in English so you can sit down and listen, if that's what you want . . .

* * *