



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

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

39 Elizabeth II

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



**VOL. XXXIX No. 42B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1990**



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

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 10, 1990

**The House met at 8 p.m.**

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, before we resume the review of Estimates, I would ask that you petition the House to determine whether there is a will to sit beyond ten o'clock.

It is not the Government's intention in any way to push a long sitting of tonight. Nevertheless, I will leave it up to the understanding of the Opposition that there may be good reason to go beyond ten o'clock, and that the Department of Family Services, the consideration of their Estimates, will continue in the Committee Room.

Within the Chamber, Environment, and should Environment be completed before 9:30 or ten o'clock, we will, as the Government, be holding the Department of Justice in the wings, and their Estimates might continue.

Again, I am not putting a parameter around the closing tonight, but there is my understanding that common sense will prevail. Certainly, the Government has no intention to push the consideration beyond the late hour of midnight.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to sit beyond ten o'clock? Is it agreed?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) has quite eloquently put that he is seeking some type of co-operation to allow us to sit past ten o'clock. He does not need the Opposition's permission to sit past ten o'clock, even though it would be nice.

In our previous discussion, I had suggested to him that if in fact there is a possibility of an agreement, then we would be receptive to sitting until 12, midnight. Otherwise we in the Liberal Party would like to adjourn at ten o'clock failing any type of agreement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to sit beyond ten o'clock? Agreed? No?

\* (2005)

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** It is not a matter of House Business. I think the Government House Leader was essentially making

an announcement. We have procedures that deal within our rules in terms of sitting past ten o'clock. We certainly do not have any great difficulty sitting an additional period of time tonight, as we often do on a Monday night. The Liberals have their way of dealing with that. There are procedures, but our rules essentially allow for that. I would suggest we treat the announcement as an announcement, rather than anything requiring leave from the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** We are going to do Family Services in Room 255; the Department of Environment, should it complete its Estimates between the hours of 9:30 and 10, therefore, we require leave to do the Department of Justice. Is there leave for that?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, there is leave. That is agreed upon. The Honourable Government House Leader?

**Mr. Manness:** No, that is fine, Mr. Speaker. We are ready to go into Supply.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is agreed.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY—FAMILY SERVICES

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This evening this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Family Services. When the committee last sat, it had been considering item 6.(d) Special Programs and Immigrant Services: (1) Branch Operations \$145,700, on page 65. Shall the item pass?

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have just a couple more questions here, I think. On the Estimates expenditures on page 107 of the detailed Estimates, I am wondering if the Minister can explain, under the Employability Enhancement Programs, the reason for the actual expenditures being \$3,900,000 as opposed to the Adjusted Vote appearing a million dollars more, \$4,900,000.00?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family**

**Services):** Yes, it refers to the Gateway Program. There is a change in accounting practices from reporting it on a cyclical basis to an annual basis. There is a difference in the funding because of that.

**Ms. Barrett:** On the Immigration and Settlement Services area there is the new initiative titled Bridging Cultures Program. I am wondering if the Minister can explain that area which would appear to me to be the major difference between the expenditures of '89-90 and this year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, this is a new program that was announced during August and September. The details are just being finalized at this time.

\* (2010)

**Ms. Barrett:** I assume that some of those details are details as to how community-based activities could access the funding for the Bridging Cultures Program and what the parameters of that would be?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the guidelines as to the manner in which funds are accessed to the Bridging Cultures Program are being developed at this time.

**Ms. Barrett:** Do you have an estimated time of arrival for those guidelines?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We are hoping that we can put the program into place for the last quarter of this fiscal year.

**Ms. Barrett:** Then in the Grants list it has \$45,000 for this year. Would that be one quarter's expenditures, or is that what would be considered to be a full year's expenditures of grants?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The full year is \$65,000.00.

**Ms. Barrett:** For 1990—\$65,000 will be available for community groups in January?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, I indicated the full year would be \$65,000, so it will be pro-rated for the last quarter.

**Ms. Barrett:** So the \$45,000 figure here is inaccurate? In the Grants list, it says Bridging Cultures Program, \$45,000.00.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the \$45,000 will be available for the start-up of this program for the last quarter of this year.

**Ms. Barrett:** Then beginning the next fiscal year of April 1, there would be \$65,000 available for the full fiscal year?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We are not sure what the next budget is going to contain at this time, but we

anticipate that this program would be an ongoing one.

**Ms. Barrett:** Am I to assume that the \$65,000 figure that the Minister discussed earlier was the amount of money that was in the release when it was put forward in August or September?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I do not recall there being a figure announced at that time.

**Ms. Barrett:** I do not mean to belabour the point, but the Minister did refer to \$65,000, and I am having trouble putting that in context.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We would anticipate that the full year costs would be in the neighbourhood of \$65,000 and that may be an accurate figure for next year, but for the start-up costs and the final segment of this year, we have \$45,000.00.

\* (2015)

**Ms. Barrett:** I am wondering if the Minister does have any more specifics about what these at-risk immigrant families might look like, what kinds of general programs were announced in August or September? I think the Minister was probably busy doing the same kinds of activities that I was during that time period, and I do not recall the details of that announcement, or if we could have a copy of the announcement, perhaps would be sufficient.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I can tell you that the program was announced during August and September, but the final details of the plan are just being put together at this time. As the name implies, Bridging Cultures is an attempt to facilitate the adaptation of ethnocultural groups into the work force here in our province.

**Ms. Barrett:** So it deals with employment preparation. That is not stated in the detailed Estimates process, it says, supports at-risk immigrant families. So it was not clear to me that was employment preparation.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It will probably have a broader interpretation than that, but it is an attempt to facilitate immigrant families resettle in this province.

**Ms. Barrett:** Will the complete \$45,000 be distributed to groups? The reason I am asking is that it is a fairly short time period to have groups notified of the grants availability, having them present briefs for money, requests for some of this grant money and then turning around and getting the money out before March 31. Is it planned to have the

department spend all of that money before March 31?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, we have staff who have been working with these groups and we do not anticipate that there is going to be any problem. It is not a large amount of money to be spending.

**Ms. Barrett:** I will agree with the Minister on that. Just another couple of questions. In the draft annual report, it states that some statistics, or some percentages of immigrants coming into Manitoba—I was struck by the small but definite increase in labour market criteria.

In '89, 62.3 percent were selected for socially humanitarian, and 65.4 percent in '88, so there was a decline of over 2 percent in that category and, at the same time there was a 4 percent increase between '88 and '89 for labour market criteria immigration. The reason I was struck with this is that it appears to relate to what the federal Government guidelines in programs on immigration are aiming for, which is asking for a higher reliance on labour market criteria than has been the case in the past.

I am wondering if the department thinks that the federal immigration guidelines will have an impact on this small but definite trend in the Manitoba immigration figures?

\* (2020)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** You are asking me to speculate on what is going to happen in the future. Hopefully, we are going to still be concerned with uniting families, but also I expect that we are going to try and attract skilled workers to fill certain positions which are available in the province and have them come in as contributing members of society.

**Ms. Barrett:** I did not want to ask the Minister to speculate, just to share with us his plans.

Finally, in the Grant sections, there are two major areas of Grants in Immigration and Settlement: one to private-sector, registered business, and the other to non-profit, non-governmental organizations registered in Manitoba. There is a significantly higher amount of money going to private-sector, registered business than there is to the non-profit, non-governmental organizations; and secondly, there is no change in any of the grants for '90-91 over '89-90. I am wondering if the Minister can give me an example of what some of those registered business are, and what kinds of provisions they make, how do they access this money, as well as

some of the non-profit, non-governmental organizations?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** In the private sector we subsidize employers who hire immigrants who are attempting to get their certification recognized in the province, and may be in the process of having their credentials recognized. We subsidize the employer and the wage that they are paid. To give you some examples here, we have lists of employers—and that is perhaps not of interest to you, but the position may be. There are assistant accountants, technical assistants, dental technicians, lab assistants, lab scientists, junior accountant, industrial mechanic, aircraft mechanic, legal assistant, accountant trainee technicians, senior accountant. The firms are indicated here as well. While this training process is going on and the credentials are being upgraded and recognized, we subsidize the wage.

**Ms. Barrett:** I appreciate that information. Could the Minister tell me what the rate of subsidization is?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I can. The provincial contribution offered to private-sector businesses is based on a percentage of the gross wages paid to an employee over a 52-week period. Employers are eligible for wage subsidies of 70 percent of the gross weekly salary to a maximum of \$280 for the first four weeks; 50 percent of the gross weekly salary, maximum \$200, for the following 22 weeks; and 30 percent of the gross weekly salary to a maximum of \$120 for the final 26-week period. The maximum subsidy for the 52 weeks of employment will not exceed \$8,640.00.

**Ms. Barrett:** Are there any regulations or guarantees or requirements that these businesses must agree to that they will pay the going wage, or can they pay the minimum wage for these people, or are they required to pay what a dental technician would be paid normally?

\* (2025)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is the intent and the hope that they pay the employee at the going rate for that position, and also that they keep the employee on after the training period has been completed.

**Ms. Barrett:** The intent and the hope, but there is no requirement, is that what is being stated?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, on the far right-hand side of that list that I was reading before, it indicates those who have completed the training, those who have quit, and those who are continuing in it. They do not sign any long-term service contract, but the hope is

that their intentions are honourable and that they would not only pay the going rate, but also consider that the employee become a full-time employee and continue.

**Ms. Barrett:** Are there records kept of what the individuals who are being subsidized are actually being paid?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, we have that information.

**Ms. Barrett:** Do employers pay the going rate, or below the going rate, or the minimum wage?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Generally, they do.

**Ms. Barrett:** Can the Minister tell me how many of these individuals stay with the same business after their, I assume, 52 weeks of subsidization is completed?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told about 60 percent of the employees remain with that company and would point out that the employer takes part of the ownership for the program and the training and the funding of that. As I indicated, about 60 percent stay with that firm.

\* (2030)

**Ms. Barrett:** I would be interested in seeing what the percentage of employers, No. 1, who pay the average going rate for these various occupations; and, No. 2, for those who do not, what the amount less than the average going rate is? I am sure the Minister is understanding what my problem here is, is that without a regulation, or something more intense than an intent and a hope that they will pay, there is the possibility for employers seeing this as a way of getting help and assistance at less than what they would be required to pay a regular employee, and they would also get subsidization at the same time. So I am pleased that there are 60 percent that stay. I would hope that it would actually be higher. I am bit concerned, and I am not suggesting that I need any more information right now. I would just like to put on the record the concern that I have on this part of the program.

Can the Minister give me some information on the non-profit NGOs that are involved in these activities that access the \$50,000.00?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Perhaps I could give you the 1989-90 projects that were funded. The Afghan Association of Manitoba, and it was called the Afghan Community Development and Networking Project; the Ethiopian Community in Winnipeg, Integration and Settlement of Ethiopians in

Winnipeg; the Winnipeg Boys and Girls Clubs, and it was called the Intergenerational Conference; the Pembina Valley Development Corporation, Kandier Educational Needs Assessment; the Interfaith Immigration Council, Housing Research Project on Factors Affecting Landlords and Immigrant Tenants; Planned Parenthood Manitoba and others.

**Ms. Barrett:** These are all for special projects that deal with immigration and settlement issues. Is that accurate?

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

**Ms. Barrett:** The list that the Minister has given me, I understand most of it. I am not quite sure I understand the rationale for the Boys and Girls Clubs, Intergenerational Conference. How that applies nor what the Planned Parenthood money would have been used for.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Planned Parenthood Manitoba, the project was called Health Advocates Training Program.

**Ms. Barrett:** And the Boys and Girls Clubs, Intergenerational?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** These were immigrant boys and girls who were having difficulty relating to older generations of earlier immigrants to this country and it was simply called the Intergenerational Conference.

**Ms. Barrett:** That does clarify it. Were these the entire list or is this just a sample of the funding?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That was a partial list.

**Ms. Barrett:** Would it be possible to have access or get access to the full list?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is possible.

**Ms. Barrett:** Seeing as how it is possible, may I request it?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** You may request it.

**Ms. Barrett:** Will my request be looked upon favourably?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Certainly.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I just wanted it put on the record that my honourable friend from Osborne was not the only one who could make these kinds of series of questions here.

I have one further question of clarification that I neglected to ask under the earlier private sector register. Is this program the item called Program Recognition that is listed in the detailed Estimates?

Support for 26 new positions, 29 previous placements for recent immigrants in professional and technical occupations.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Ms. Barrett:** I have many more questions, but I am going to hold them until a later date. So I have no further questions under this area.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we could begin by clarifying which this area is. We are on Item 09-6D-1 Branch Operations, but the Minister has been willing to take questions in that area 09-6D-2, 6D-3 and 6D-4. Is that correct? So we have gone basically through the remaining appropriations. The Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) is finished with her questioning in this division.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** That is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** Good. Then let us start back at Branch Operations. Let me just try to get a better understanding of how this organizational structure works. In this particular division, where we have day care, for some particular reason we have an administrative structure that is presumably divisional administration.

We then have an administrative structure that is youth in nature and in responsibility and a series of programs, and now we have a third administrative structure. This is the branch, if I understand correctly, that is responsible for programs to immigrants, as well as special opportunity programming for certain individuals, but not necessarily because they are immigrants.

Is that a fair way of characterizing this? These next items that we have in this division, do they all report through this particular Branch Operations? Is it the administrative head of the Human Resources Opportunity programs, the centres, the Employability Enhancement and the immigration and settlement?

(Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

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

**Mr. Alcock:** Madam Acting Chairman, perhaps then the Minister could just position these series of activities for me in terms of overall Government policy. The Human Resources Opportunity programs, is it fair to characterize them as largely serving an Income Security clientele?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** Then there are some programs for newly arrived landed immigrants and the like that have been brought together as a result of some sort of departmental reorganization?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** Madam Acting Chairman, there were a series of services offered under the Department of Labour which were directed at immigrants. Does the Department of Labour still have responsibility in the area of immigration at all, or has that function been transferred here entirely?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Sometime ago they were transferred to the department of Employment Services and then in the reorganization of the departments, it has remained here.

**Mr. Alcock:** So then is it fair to characterize this area as being the province's centre or accountability point for services to immigrants in this province?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** At the provincial level, that is correct.

**Mr. Alcock:** When we talk about negotiations with Ottawa, for example, around changes to immigration quotas and changes to their relationship with the international community, is that done through this department?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We would have some input in that area.

\* (2040)

**Mr. Alcock:** Is there a relationship between this particular branch and the overseas offices that the province operates in the European community and in Hong Kong?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No.

**Mr. Alcock:** Particular to entrepreneurial immigration are there recruitment activities that are undertaken by this particular department?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There are no recruitment initiatives coming out of this department.

**Mr. Alcock:** Now does the Department of Education have any responsibilities for immigrants other than the broad responsibility it has for educating Manitobans and duly landed or visaed non-Canadians?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We share the responsibility with Education for the program called English as a Second Language.

**Mr. Alcock:** Can the Minister describe the nature of that sharing and the nature of that relationship?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The delivery of English as a Second Language is done by the Department of Education. Our role is that we have a member of our department seconded to Education to assist with that program.

**Mr. Alcock:** Would it be fair to characterize that relationship that, though the Department of Education is responsible for the specific task of teaching English as a Second Language, this department would have a broader responsibility in terms of reaching out to people, recruiting them for and seeing that they access those programs providing social supports to people who need them?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** For the most part, that is correct. The delivery of the program is done through Education, but for the social services they may well access various branches of this department.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is that the only function the Department of Education has relative to new Canadians?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am sorry. The only role that the Department of Education plays?

**Mr. Alcock:** Madam Acting Chair, I am just going to sort out where the responsibility lies for services to new Canadians or to immigrants, other than the general educational programs, you have mentioned one special service that is targeted on immigration. I am asking, is that the only one that is run by the Department of Education?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There are a number of services that are provided by our department. Education's role is in the language training under ESL.

**Mr. Alcock:** Are there other departments of Government that have specific responsibilities for supporting new Canadians?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The other department would be Culture, Heritage and Recreation, and their involvement is in the cultural area. Another department that I would mention is Industry, Trade and Tourism, which has some responsibility for entrepreneurial initiatives for immigrants.

**Mr. Alcock:** If we can just put that aside for a second, since I want to come back to it in a moment, but I want to just focus on the employment training for a second. This department operates through this branch some employment training programs, but, as I understand it, it is not the sole home of employment training programs in this Government.

The Department of Education operates some institutionally-based training at universities,

technical schools, colleges and the like. What is the boundary between those two programs? How have you differentiated? When you made the decision to transfer programs over to this department from the Department of Education, what was the basis on which those transfers were made?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Department of Education provides a much broader base of training for new Canadians, for immigrants. The bulk of the immigrants who are assisted by this department are on social assistance. That is a distinction that is made with Education.

**Mr. Alcock:** I want to come back to the immigration programs in a moment, and the supports to immigrants. I think that is an important point that bears following up on. I just want, for the moment, to try to get a sense of some of the boundaries here between this department and the Department of Education relative to the broader issue of training, not just of immigrants. Why is it that, outside of the traditional programs such as colleges and technical schools—maybe I should ask the question this way—certain programs are transferred to this department from the Department of Education at some point. I am wondering why the decision was made to transfer some of those programs and not all of them.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The transfer of those programs went the other way. Programs were transferred from Economic Security to Education. This department kept the programs for social assistance recipients.

**Mr. Alcock:** There was a program, I believe it was called New Careers. Does it still exist?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, it still exists. It was one of the programs that was transferred from this department to Education.

**Mr. Alcock:** One of the target groups for that program were people who required specialty training and support. Why would a program of that sort be transferred and not some of these others?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that the New Careers is primarily for Native people, that it was not targeted for just social assistance recipients, and that it was a long-term program. The decision was made that it would be part of the package that Education would offer.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am just wondering why this department would deliver any training programs? Why would you not transfer them all to Education if they are educationally based?



\* (2050)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That question has been raised before. These are ones that had a specific cost sharing for our training programs under the Employability Enhancement agreement, and because of that they have remained in this particular department.

**Mr. Alcock:** Would the department lose cost-sharing if these were delivered by the Department of Education?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The common denominator across the country seems to have these programs linked with the departments that provide social assistance.

**Mr. Alcock:** We are following other provinces. My question was, if a program like this was delivered by the Department of Education, would CAP not cost-share it? Is that the decision from CAP?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That may or may not be the case, but the important thing is to keep some linkage between our training programs and social assistance recipients.

**Mr. Alcock:** Does the Department of Education not respond to the training needs of social allowance recipients?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** In some cases they do but for our purposes, we feel that there is some benefit of having a linkage between training programs and social assistance recipients.

**Mr. Alcock:** Can the Minister help me to understand that benefit? What is the nature of that benefit? What is the tangible benefit?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** These are the individuals who access our department, and direct referrals can be made from Social Assistance Program to training. I think it is fair to say that we are more familiar with our clients and have a closer contact with them than Education does.

**Mr. Alcock:** Those same criteria exist in an awful lot of areas. The same argument can be made relative to health care. The reality is that you deprive them of a normal educational experience when you put them into something that is not part of the mainstream. That decision was made some long time ago with children. The decision was that children would be served by the regular school system, and that this department would provide support to that and move away from that principle when it comes to adults.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am not sure where we are going with this, but I guess if you are wanting me to say that the Department of Education could absolutely provide all of the education and training programs that exist, no doubt they would, they could. There are a number of individuals who access the training programs through the social assistance contact they have with workers in district offices. There seems to be some importance in this linkage between our social assistance recipients and training.

**Mr. Alcock:** We have too much to go through to belabour this point for very long, so I shall move on. I would leave it with the comment that one of the things that the program seemed to be directed at is to try to return people to the mainstream, if you like, to divert them from income security programs. Yet rather than taking them back into the mainstream, we seem to prefer to stream them off into programs that are still run by this Department. It is just an interesting policy that we had moved away from in other areas. It is kind of a throwback, in a way. Unless the Minister would like to respond, I can move on.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I can respond, but I guess I would prefer to move on.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am just looking at the Speech from the Throne. Under the heading Knowledge Skills and People, there are a number of initiatives that were spoken about in the speech relative to skills, training, opportunities, incentives and those sorts of things. I am wondering if responsibility for delivering on any of these promises made in this speech rests with this Department? Or are these all the responsibility of other departments?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I do not have the speech in front of me, but certainly we are as concerned as anybody with the success of training programs and having people move into the mainstream, not be on social assistance and become productive citizens.

**Mr. Alcock:** I will come back as we get into the program area and ask specifically about some of the ones that are referenced. I can come back to that in a minute.

The Premier (Mr. Filmon) during the campaign made a number of comments about enhancing immigration in this province. There was discussion at one time both of possibly establishing a separate immigration process such as the Province of Quebec has and other talk about increasing

immigration quotas. Now earlier, the Minister had indicated that this branch has responsibility for this relationship with Ottawa. Have there been any negotiations around that?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** This branch has not been involved with any negotiations, preliminary or otherwise, with Ottawa at this time.

**Mr. Alcock:** Ottawa moved recently to increase immigration quotas nationally. Did that have any impact on immigration quotas for this province?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Our percentage of immigrants coming to Canada has been between 4 percent and 5 percent, so if the number of immigrants at the national level is increased, there would be a subsequent increase in this province.

\* (2100)

**Mr. Alcock:** What is the anticipated numerical increase as a result of the national change in policy?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We have been receiving around 6,000 immigrants and with the changes it is projected that we would receive around 7,000.

**Mr. Alcock:** One of the concerns that is raised about immigration through a centre like Winnipeg is that often newly arrived immigrants do not remain here in Manitoba—move east and west. Is there any study done or any indication of how many of them do stick in this province?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Our department does not have that information.

**Mr. Alcock:** There is an entrepreneurial immigration program that is designed to give certain special status to individuals who are prepared to invest \$150,000 in this province. Is that a program that is administered by this branch, or is that something that is accessed through I, T and T?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the Department of I, T and T is responsible for that program.

**Mr. Alcock:** When we look at the programs that are offered here, the Human Resources Opportunity Program and the Human Resources Opportunity Centres, these are, if I am following what the Minister was saying earlier, diversionary programs, programs attempting to divert people from social assistance and to build a level of independence and self-sufficiency? Is that a fair characterization?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Your comment is probably more apropos to the Employability Enhancement Programs. The people who access the Human Resources Centres have other social problems that

these centres try to deal with. While the objective certainly is to assist them, they may not become employable and independent, but the Human Resources Opportunity Centres attempt to help them with some of their other problems.

**Mr. Alcock:** In the draft annual report the branch is characterized as being responsible for the development of programs related to, and there are three areas: Services for Manitoba's newcomer population; employability enhancement for social assistance; vocational counselling and placement of severely employment-disadvantaged individuals into skills training, work experience or work activity.

Now that latter category, is this the category that the Human Resources Opportunity Program and the Centres are targeted on?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** Would this program area consist of services to mentally handicapped individuals and physically handicapped individuals?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, it is not the sheltered workshops that have the mentally and physically handicapped.

**Mr. Alcock:** Then could the Minister characterize for us severely employment-disadvantaged individuals?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** These are individuals without educational and training skills who have been unable to access employment or are not able to, in some cases, be employed for even short periods of time.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is there any understanding of why that is the case?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** In many cases the lack of skills is something that has never been addressed. They have a very poor record of any skills at even attempting to find and hold a job and generally have been on social assistance.

**Mr. Alcock:** Of the 3,800 people who are, I presume, referred because they are dealt with through the Human Resources Opportunity Program, which lists as its activities assessment and referral, and 1,600 through the Human Resources Opportunities Centres which, if I understand the budgeting here, seems to provide a more substantive service. These are neither mentally handicapped or physically handicapped. These people are all basically illiterate, uneducated, untrained?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes. These are people who had very little training or education and have not been employed for some time. They are not physically or mentally handicapped, but they may have left the school system at a young age or simply left without a lot of skills. The school system provides some vocational training for some students. There are others who are in special classes, occupational entrance classes, occupational skills classes, where they have not received specific training in any particular vocation. They have a lot of difficulty accessing work, plus the work ethic that perhaps the employer is looking for simply is not there. There is not a job record, very limited communication skills; often social skills are underdeveloped. They simply have no work experience or job record on which a prospective employer can measure them or is prepared to take a chance on them.

**Mr. Alcock:** The Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Employability Enhancement for Social Assistance Recipients, was that involved at all with these particular programs, that encompass these programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is a separate agreement under the Employability Enhancement Branch.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am sorry, Madam Acting Chairperson, but I was being harassed by the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), so I just have to ask the Minister to repeat his statements.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is a separate agreement under the Employability Enhancement.

**Mr. Alcock:** The Human Resources Opportunity Program is a separate program under the Canada-Manitoba Agreement for Employability Enhancement for Social Assistance Recipients? I mean, which is who?

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

\* (2110)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** That is what I was referring to as being a separate agreement under the Employability Enhancement.

**Mr. Alcock:** The support for these centres is a separate agreement.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The centres are supported under the Canada Assistance Plan.

**Mr. Alcock:** The Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Employability Enhancement for Social Assistance Recipients, is that an ongoing agreement under the Canada Assistance Plan?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is separate from CAP.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is that agreement still in force?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told it is.

**Mr. Alcock:** Can the Minister tell us what the cost-sharing arrangements are, if any?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is a matching amount. Initially, when it started in 1987, the province put in \$3 million and the feds put in \$3 million.

**Mr. Alcock:** When it started, the two Governments put in \$3 million each in '87. Is that an annual commitment, or is that the total ongoing program? What is the size of the program today?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The total amount of the program now is \$12 million.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is it \$12 million on an annual basis? Is that still shared 50-50 with Ottawa?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It is still shared 50-50 by Ottawa, but the agreement has expired. It is on an extension at this time, and it is being negotiated.

**Mr. Alcock:** When did it expire, what date?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It went from '87 to '89, and it has been extended from that period. It is under negotiation.

**Mr. Alcock:** Has the Minister been able to anticipate when a new agreement will be in place?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The discussions are just beginning. It is an ongoing thing, so it is difficult to put a time limit on it.

**Mr. Alcock:** I notice on page 105 of the Supplementary Estimates when we look at the overall budget for the Human Resources Opportunity Program, there is about \$200,000 in recoveries from other appropriations.

Can the Minister tell us what is being recovered from which appropriation?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Selkirk training plant is now a human resources centre. It makes some equipment for parks under Natural Resources, and that is recovered from Natural Resources.

**Mr. Alcock:** Tables and hibachis—\$200,000 worth. That recovery is entirely from Parks and Natural Resources?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I am told it is from Natural Resources.

**Mr. Alcock:** On the Employability Enhancement Programs that are then offered under this agreement, and there are a number of them

referenced in the Supplementary Estimates, and a number of them that are detailed in this evaluation that was tabled, the Single Parent Job Access Program, the Job Access for Young Adults—I guess that is it in terms of the ones that were reviewed. The Community Based Employability Grants, I am not certain whether those were before referred to as the Employment Access for the Disabled, perhaps.

What happened to the range of programs then? If these are the four programs, Single Parent Job Access, Gateway, Job Access for Young Adults and Community Based Employability Projects (the Grants Program), then the environmental resource projects, Employment Access for the Disabled, Job Transition for Youth, and the municipal-based projects, have they gone out of existence, do they no longer function?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Those ones that you referenced now fall under the last item, the Community Based Employability Projects.

**Mr. Alcock:** So what we used to talk about is the Job Transition for Youth which served 191 program entrants, which consisted of grants to seven community agencies to provide counselling, training and work experience in Brandon, Winnipeg, in the Northern option, et cetera, that is now captured under Community Based Employability Projects?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** The Employment Access for the Disabled, which served 87 program entrants, is also under that, as is the environmental resource projects, which served 140 people, and the municipally-based projects, which served 46. Those are all under the Community Based Employability Projects Grants Program?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** I note, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that the total amount of funding for the Community Based Employability Projects is around \$900,000, and in the programs that I referenced there was approximately \$2.5 million.

So there is a considerable difference in the size of the programs that existed formally and that are now captured under the Community Based Employability Projects and Grants Program. I am just wondering if the Minister can explain why these programs were downsized so dramatically?

\* (2120)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It has been indicated to me that

there has not been a downsizing, but that significant funds are put into the program by the federal Government.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am just looking at this report which the department did on the diversion fund, and it does reference amounts against each one of these: Employment Access for the Disabled is .52 million; Job Transition for Youth, .9 million; environmental research projects, .46 million; and municipal-based projects, .57 million. If we just very quickly add that up, we find that comes to about 2.45; and, if it is a 50-50 cost-sharing, even if that is the explanation, that would be about a \$1.2 million program, not a \$913,000 program. If I am correct in understanding the date that this was done, that was for the year '87-88; we are some three years later.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The report that the Member has that we gave him shows the combined federal-provincial support for those. What we are talking about here is the provincial budget, and it shows the amount of money that we have put into the program.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I understood it when the Minister said it the first time, but I also understood, unless I misunderstood what he said earlier, that this was a 50-50 cost-sharing program, so that for every dollar that the province put in the feds put in a dollar. So twice 913 would be 1.8 million, and yet the total in these projects that have been collapsed into this one program line was \$2.45 million. There just seems to be a shortfall there; I am just trying to figure out why.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The program, when it started in 1987, called for each level of Government to put in \$3 million. Now that program shows both the province and the federal Government putting in between \$5 million and \$6 million, so the amount of money has increased. It may show up in different appropriations, but there has been a significant increase in the amount of money put into this by both the province and the federal Government.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am not disputing that at all. I am just trying to understand where that has gone because certainly the way that money was allocated in the report that we were given is different from the way it seems to be allocated here. I mean, presumably that additional money may have gone into the Gateway Program which is not referenced in this study and may provide the difference. Across a range of programs that you were offering before, the amount of money and presumably the number of

people being supported would seem to have decreased rather substantially.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** We are not sure just what figures you are looking at. Again, I would repeat that the total amount of funding that is put into that has increased. You know, you reference the Gateway Program which is a new program. The amount of money put into those others has not decreased.

**Mr. Alcock:** This is the report that the department tabled at the beginning of the Estimates process. Again, if you go through and add up the number of people that are listed here against these various lines, it totals 464 people served in the programs that are the subject of this report.

On page 107 of the Supplementary Estimates you say Community Based Employability Projects will provide grant funding to assist approximately 300 clients. Three hundred is a smaller number than 464, and that would seem to be consistent with the decrease in the funding to that particular area, not the overall program, but just to this particular area. There may be very good reasons for it. Maybe these programs were not as effective, and you have chosen to reprioritize in some way.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The report that we gave you earlier was a combined federal-provincial analysis of those programs. The budget that we are going through on a line-by-line basis here is the provincial budget. That may well account for the difference in the figures that you are referring to.

**Mr. Alcock:** Do you only account for the number of participants that are supported by your half of the funding?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that is the way we do it.

**Mr. Alcock:** The federal Government then operates a portion of this program that is independent of these programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** Unlike other cost-sharing programs that have provincial delivery and the federal Government simply provides certain funds, the federal Government also operates a companion program in the same program areas alongside of the provincial Government programs that deliver services to essentially the same clientele.

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

**Mr. Alcock:** That is something I was unaware of, and it is interesting to note. I was not aware that the

federal Government was going to maintain a program delivery capacity. We will have to ask them those questions federally.

On the Job Access for Young Adults program and the Job Transition for Youth programs that are referenced in this evaluation, there seems to be a relatively poor performance in the program.

In fact, if one wanted to be critical, and I am, of course not wanting to be that way, but if one wanted to be, you could almost make the case that young people were hurt by going into this program because the comparison group did better in employment than the group in that program. In fact it says here on page, that is Roman numeral XI, Conclusion 10 that the youth comparison group, that is the non-program group, but the group that was drawn to act as a reference group generally performed better than the youth program cohort. I am wondering if that rather startling finding has been evaluated and we have some explanation for that.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I can provide you with an explanation. There are several possible reasons why the youth comparison group of non-participants generally performed better than youth program participants. The small sample size could mean that the youth comparison group was not representative of youth participation. Furthermore, there are indications that youth program participants were less educated and less job ready than the overall youth population on social assistance.

**Mr. Alcock:** Was it an evaluation area or is it the evaluation group that failed and that is why we have this particular conclusion?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** There may have been a weakness in the evaluation, and/or there may be a problem with the design of the program. That is something we will have to look at.

**Mr. Alcock:** Has the current Job Access for Young Adults Program been significantly modified as a result of these findings?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I am told that the training period has been made longer.

**Mr. Alcock:** Is that the only modification?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** They are also attempting to do a more thorough job of the initial screening so that people are more job ready.

**Mr. Alcock:** I note the Minister is studying—is there more to be said to that?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No.

**Mr. Alcock:** The solution to that then is to choose participants who are more skillful than the ones who were chosen before. Is that what the Minister just said?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, the screening process hopefully will identify individuals who are more ready for the program.

**Mr. Alcock:** That strikes me as a rather odd way to deal with the program that is targeted on people who are seriously employment disadvantaged. I mean, if you were to screen in just university graduates your success rate might be absolutely fantastic. I thought the rationale for these programs was to target them on those people who were least able to find employment.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Well, it is an attempt to match the interest that individuals have with training that they may be more successful with. I think that certainly I agree that if you wanted to have a 100 percent success rate, perhaps you might get some university-trained individuals. I do not know whether there are such people.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am particularly interested in it, because we are saying then that these programs unlike—I mean there are lots of Education and Training programs that youth in particular can access through the federal Government or through the Department of Education, but we say that we retain these programs in this particular department because it is targeted on those people who are most in need, basically those people who cannot access other forms of support and as a result are on social assistance.

\* (2130)

Yet then we see that our program has a very low success rate, so we then begin to screen out those people who are at the bottom end. What then happens to those people who are screened out of these programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think it is a constant challenge to try and find programs which are going to be suitable for individuals and, as you have indicated before, where the success rate was not very high, what we are trying to do is provide some alternatives. I think the Member well knows that there are people out there who are very, very difficult to find appropriate training for. If we are going to provide training for individuals who are unemployed, it is best we use our resources where we have some chance of success. If there are new and different

programs that are going to meet the needs of individuals whom we have had great difficulty with, we would be quite interested in knowing about them.

I think we cannot give up. It is an ongoing challenge to try and match individuals out there with training and try and make them productive members of society.

**Mr. Alcock:** It is interesting. This review is generally a fairly positive one and does suggest that overall these programs do tend to leave better than half of the people somewhat better off than they were before, with the notable exception of youth. In addition, this effect, relative to the reference group, would seem to suggest that the youth programs are actually harming youth, although the Minister is quite right. In a small sample size and the difficulty in choosing a control group and all that, that could be a fallacious finding.

It also goes on to say in the conclusions on page 9 that all program cohorts, with the exception of youth, were able to increase the employability of the participants, that this program did not seem to have an effect on increasing the employability. In conclusion three it says, participants from all program cohorts except youth were financially better off. So this seems to have failed youth across a whole range of indicators.

If I understood the Minister's response, the program change as a result of this has been simply to lengthen the period that people spend in the program and to screen out those people who might be contributing to this less than happy conclusion.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Rather than to characterize it as a failure for youth, I would suggest maybe we have been less successful in that area. I think we have to continue to try and find programs that will succeed.

There are other factors that I think we have to consider with young people, with our youth. In many cases they have experienced a lack of success in the public school system. They have experienced a lack of success in accessing jobs in the real world. The total seriousness of their situation has not yet come home to them. It may be just a matter of time as they gain some maturity, albeit a very difficult time for them, for parents and others in society.

If we can find alternatives that are going to provide this education for them, we simply may have to wait until they grow a little older and maybe they are more apt to take to some sort of training or education.

Often youth simply are not ready at a particular time to take seriously the opportunities that are placed in front of them. I think that in cases where we have failed to enhance the employability of young people, it just means that we have to try again. I am sure the Member could even think of cases where the same training or other training becomes meaningful simply because they have advanced in age and perhaps gained some experience. We just have to find appropriate programs for them at the appropriate time.

**Mr. Alcock:** I think that actually is a rather enlightened position, frankly. I do think it is quite true that we often I think as a system abuse some youth by trying to serve them when they are not ready for it. Sometimes letting them fail a little can be a very healthy thing.

I shall leave that one for a moment. Can the Minister talk a little bit about the Single Parent Job Access Program? Were there significant changes to that program as a result of this evaluation?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** After the evaluation of the program, one of the items that was added was to provide training in specific skills, a component that was not there previously.

**Mr. Alcock:** The evaluation indicated I believe, if I am referencing the right page, that 66 percent of the participants successfully completed their programs. Ninety days later 42 percent were continuing to work and another 11 percent were in training for an impact rate, as they define it here, of about 53 percent. Roughly half of the people in this particular case of the 675 people whom we are attempting to divert from further reliance on income support would seem to be achieving that goal. Would that rate be consistent with the program today?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** I think then that number in the 675 sole-support parents who are listed in the Expected Results on page 107 of the Supplementary Estimates, if it was—I mean the impact rate that is listed in the study is 53 percent but, for the sake of this discussion, let us say it is half, which would be 337 and a half. Let us not quibble. What would be the cost of maintaining that many people on income support for a year?

\* (2140)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** It depends on the structure of the family, but an estimate is that it would cost \$8,000 to \$10,000 per family.

**Mr. Alcock:** Then if it is \$8,000 to \$10,000, and this particular program has a budget of about \$1.9 million, would it be fair to characterize this as a no-cost program, that in fact we are saving from Income Security in the removal of those 337 people, in this example, than we are spending in the operation of the program?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** With all of these programs, the anticipated and hoped-for result would be that there is a net benefit to society, to Government and to the individuals involved.

**Mr. Alcock:** That is the anticipated and hoped for. Is that the department's experience with this? Are we in fact finding that the diversionary programs are reducing the social assistance caseload and, as a result, lowering our cost in those areas?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** As the Member knows, there has not been a decrease in the numbers accessing social allowance, but it is probably slowing down the increase that we would experience.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, has there been a study of that? Is there any indication that is the—I know we hypothesized that, but is that what is in fact happening? Is the rate of growth—has it noticeably slowed in any statistical way, given the onset of these programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Our distinct impression is that it is slowing down the rate of growth and, just like any prevention programs, it is difficult to measure something that did not happen.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, we shall not debate that at any great length. You are right, it is very difficult. Can the Minister just help me understand the difference between Job Access for Young Adults and Gateway other than the size of the programs?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Job Access for Young Adults targets individuals in the age range of 18 to 24, whereas Gateway is a program that is open to recipients of social assistance who are 18 and over.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I read that part, but 18 or over would presumably include that group between 18 and 24.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Maybe I could just give you a little more information. Gateway is a combination of up to 52 weeks of classroom and on-the-job training for social assistance recipients 18 years of age or over.

The Job Access for Young Adults is a combination of up to 52 weeks of programming, which combines

in-school training and on-the-job work experience for 18- to 24-year-olds leading to employment in high demand labour market areas.

I am not sure if that helps or not.

**Mr. Alcock:** I am more interested in trying to understand how you differentiate between two 19-year-olds who come looking for assistance. How does one get streamed to Gateway and one to this other program?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The Job Access for Young Adults really targets the 18- to 24-year-olds and operates only in Winnipeg. The Gateway operates in Winnipeg, Brandon and The Pas and, by and large, services people who are older. I guess if the Member is pointing out that a 19-year-old presents himself in Winnipeg, the fact of the matter is that individual could be slotted into either one or the other.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** The hour being close to 10 p.m., I would like to ask guidance of the committee if there would be a will to sit after 10 p.m.

**Mr. Alcock:** I believe, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that question was asked in the Chamber earlier and unanimous consent was denied. However, I believe that the committee can proceed to sit after ten o'clock should a majority of the committee Members wish to do so. So asking for some kind of—what I would like to say, I have to be consistent with the position taken by our Party in the House and say no.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Is that the wish of the committee?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** No, let us finish.

**Mr. Alcock:** Well, after a valiant battle, I must accede to the wishes of the committee.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Then it is agreed. We will sit past ten.

**Mr. Alcock:** If the Member—Bob, are you from La Verendrye? Where are you from? -(interjection)- Turtle Mountain. Yes, the Member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) asks if he can leave now. I am prepared to give him permission to do so. I can assure him there will be no more votes at this point in the evening. -(interjection)- Oh, well I do not know if that is an equal.

Okay, I would like to talk a little bit about the Immigration and Settlement Services then at this point. I appreciate the Minister's assistance with the employment programs, and we will come back and talk about them in a few minutes.

\* (2150)

**An Honourable Member:** Did we pass something?

**Mr. Alcock:** No. We would not want to break a tradition at this point in the evening, would we?

In the Expected Results under Immigration and Settlement Services, 09-6D-4, we talk about the—this is on page 109—admission of approximately 30 special-needs refugees. I am wondering if the Minister can explain who this group is.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I can read some information into the record for you. This program is based on a 1981 agreement between the Minister of Labour and Manpower and the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration: facilitates private sponsorship and the resettlement in Manitoba of refugees with special needs. Manitoba will admit up to 30 cases a year under this program. Refugees admitted under the terms of this program are inadmissible according to Canada's normal selection criteria.

There are three components of this SPAR program. The first involves the admission of unaccompanied minors who have not reached their 18th birthday and have been separated from their parents. The second involves persons whose physical or mental health does not conform with standards established by Health and Welfare Canada and are termed or deemed medically inadmissible. The third involves settlement-risk refugee families and at-risk refugee women.

**Mr. Alcock:** There were unaccompanied minors, people with physical disabilities and medical conditions who might not otherwise be admissible. Then he mentioned women of some sort. Could he tell me what that last category was?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** You are right. The third involves settlement-risk refugee families and at-risk refugee women.

**Mr. Alcock:** How do we determine if someone is at risk? Is at-risk in the country that they are coming from, or is at-risk because of special needs here?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** The at-risk refers to the refugee camps in which they are located.

**Mr. Alcock:** Did the Minister talk about settlement-risk?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, I indicated that the third group involves settlement-risk refugee families.



That refers to large families who would have difficulty getting resettlement in other countries.

**Mr. Alcock:** Presumably through the federal immigration people and others who are working in these camps, they determine that a certain number of individuals or families are at high risk and under this program we admit 30 of them?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** Then in the Bridging Cultures Program, where we talk about at-risk immigrant families, we are talking about people who are at risk and somehow within our community, as opposed to being at risk in the camps or in their own countries.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes, there is a distinction there.

**Mr. Alcock:** In the Bridging Cultures Program, the being at-risk here in Canada is at risk of what?

\* (2200)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** These are individuals and families who would have resettlement difficulties here. There is perhaps some turmoil in the family, and they are having difficulty getting resettled in this country.

**Mr. Alcock:** How do we go about identifying those families who are at risk here, versus the other however many come in?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I think the Member knows that. The individuals we are talking about in this program are identified by the federal Government before they are brought to Canada.

With the program you are asking about that our Government sponsors, the families at risk are identified by the ethnocultural communities and brought to our attention.

**Mr. Alcock:** When I look at the numbers that are listed in the Expected Results here, we have 500 immigrants and refugees through Immigrant Access Service, related counselling services to approximately 500 newcomers and then the 30 special needs refugees.

Would these two groups of 500 be 500 different individuals, or is there any cross-over between those two groups?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** They are different groups but there may be some crossover.

**Mr. Alcock:** Would it be fair to say that of the 6,000 or so immigrants, soon to be 7,000 or so immigrants, that come each year to this province, that roughly

some number around or slightly below 1,000 are receiving direct services from this branch?

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

**Mr. Alcock:** I understand then how the 30 special needs refugees is a Manitoba commitment to the international community and to the national immigration program. The 500 immigrants, or the two groups of 500 that get service through these other programs, how are they identified and how do they access those services?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** They are drawn to our attention by the ethnocultural community, but we also have access workers who may encounter these individuals as well.

**Mr. Alcock:** There is an indication of 26 new positions and 29 previous placements for recent immigrants in professional and technical operations under Program Recognition. Is this recognition of professional credentials possessed by people from other countries?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Yes.

**Mr. Alcock:** Can the Minister describe this program to me? This is an issue here that has been discussed at some length relative to the medical community, but I also know that within my own riding, there are a large number of Polish immigrants with training in dentistry, and within the dental profession in general, who are in much the same position as some of the doctors that were talked about.

I am just wondering how people access this program and what professions it is reaching out to?

(Mrs. Shirley Render, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** This program is to encourage the creation of new permanent professional and technical positions by providing wage assistance to private sector businesses. By targeting these newly created positions for qualified landed immigrants and recently naturalized Canadians, this program will assist newcomers in obtaining meaningful Canadian work experience in their fields of expertise.

I read into the record earlier the types of positions that we are talking about. There are people like lab assistants, dental technicians, aircraft mechanics, accountants, legal assistants and others. I guess it is so important that we work to assimilate these individuals into our society and into the job market.

At the same time, I think it is important that the standards are maintained.

I am just personally aware of a person who was a health care practitioner who was allowed to practise her profession but then failed very narrowly to pass the exam and as a result will have to re-do the exam I believe in six months.

As I thought about it and talked to one of my colleagues, there is a tremendous liability that would exist if a person like that was permitted to continue practising. So I say that we have to be very careful in evaluating individuals like this to see that they do meet a minimum standard.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, I certainly would support the Minister on that. I think the real question is, do they have an opportunity to access the certification programs and apply for the certification in this country so their skills can be shared with all of us?

I have no further questions.

**The Acting Chairman (Mrs. Render):** Item 6.(d)(1) Branch Operations, \$145,700—pass; (2) Human Resources Opportunity Program, \$6,156,100—pass; (3) Employability Enhancement, \$4,956,800—pass; (4) Immigration and Settlement Services, \$1,133,600—pass.

\* (2210)

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Resolution 52: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$65,197,600 for Family Services for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

The last item to be considered for the Estimates of the Department of Family Services is item (a) Minister's Salary. At this point we request that the Minister's staff leave the table for consideration of this item.

Item 1.(a), shall the item pass?

**Mr. Alcock:** I do understand that when the Minister's Party was in Opposition they had a tradition of proposing all sorts of innovative amendments to this particular item. I believe there were quantities of asphalt and other such items offered in substitution for the Minister's salary.

I would like to close this by not proposing such an amendment. I think that if there is any Minister in Government that earns his salary, it is this Minister.

I want to just take advantage of this moment to thank the Minister very sincerely for the time, effort and energy that he and his staff have put in, for his openness and his willingness to share information. I cannot recall an Estimates process where we have had such open discussion on substantive issues and such real information presented and discussed. I think that is to the credit of this particular Minister.

I want to thank the staff because they worked extremely hard and those little misses that came out each meeting I found extremely helpful. I hope that this characterizes an attitude with this department that will continue into the future.

I found this an interesting test drive if you like of this department and sort of a warm-up to the real Estimates that will take place in the spring. For this Minister, like a lot of new Ministers, occupies a unique position in that he is new to the department so it is more difficult for him to be held accountable for some of the activities that the department may have undertaken. This will not be the case in the spring.

The Minister now has a period of time to focus on his department to deal with many issues that confront him and to put forward in the next budget, which will be his first budget, something that reflects his philosophy and his beliefs about this department. I look forward to engaging in the examination of those Estimates. I hope at that time that we will see a department that has spent some time examining its organization like the Minister has indicated, that has done a little more work to anticipate some of the things that impact on this department.

If there was one thing I was a little distressed with, which was how little this department looks down the road. I hope that the Minister will have had an opportunity to address some of the concerns that were raised in Rehab and Community Living, and particularly look at the way in which some of the attempts to downsize the institutions have perhaps not been as successful as we have hoped.

I hope that by the time we are next at this table that we will have some substantive agreements in place with the Child and Family Services agencies so that we have some comfort that these agencies will not continue to be so damaged as they have been in this past year.

Also, I want to share with the Minister one thing though that occurred to me when we talked about

the Income Security area, because we did talk during the Estimates about caseloads of 240 per worker and those sorts of things. I have asked people who contact me—one of the concerns that gets raised is how difficult it is to access help. When we develop a system that forces people to go back to these overworked workers, it often creates frustration for the workers as well as the recipients, but just to give the Minister some feeling for that I asked all of the recipients that I talked to to keep records for me about their experiences with the department.

I encountered a person the other night at an environmental meeting in my riding who told me that she tried to call her worker the other day, and she had to try 71 times before the phone would ring because she got a busy signal every other time. When the phone finally rang, it rang 32 times and nobody answered it, so she hung up, thought maybe she was calling the wrong number, hung up and called back again. It rang 16 times the second time before it was answered, and when it was answered, she was put on hold for eight minutes and 56 seconds. Then she finally got a hold of her worker who asked her why she had not called sooner.

I just think it is illustrative of the kind of pressure that these people are under, and I do not hold the workers entirely accountable for that because with workloads of 240 cases each, and with the kind of pressures that they are under, it is no wonder that these kinds of situations occur. It leads to enormous pressure on everybody concerned and great frustration on the part of all who are involved.

I must say I do not understand the rationale for organizing this last division. I think to try to jam together programs that are so desperate and so not a part of each other into a division simply for organizational reasons is silly—just to make the organizational chart look pretty. I hope, and the Minister has indicated, that there will be some effort at reorganizing both the regional operations across the three areas that deliver regional services for areas, I guess, if you include the private agencies. I would hope that there is some better definition of the boundaries between the employment, immigration and day care programs into the future.

This is not a department that is going to have its problems resolved overnight, or even in this next budget, or this next decade, or probably within my lifetime.

I would just like to close by wishing the Minister, the staff and all those people who are so affected by this department the very best as you attempt to do what you have before you.

Once again, thank you very much.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I did want to have the final word this time in this division.

I would like to also share some of my feelings having gone through this approximately 43 or 44 hours of Estimates. It has been a very long, and I might say, in many ways grueling experience, although it has been a very positive one too. I have appreciated the good humour I think almost more than anything else of the Minister. I can only assume I know what he has gone through, this being his first Estimates process as a brand new Minister. I have a bit of an understanding of that seeing as how it is my first Estimates process as the critic. I will admit with complete honesty that it is much easier to be the critic than it is to be the Minister, particularly the first time and particularly in this department.

This department has the third highest amount of money spent on it, but I would say arguably—I know that Honourable Members here would perhaps disagree with me—but I think in many ways it is the most important department of the Government. It deals with issues, people and problems that are the most intractable that we as a society have to face. It deals with those problems when they have become the most problematic.

\* (2220)

We have not yet managed to get to where prevention and intervention at early stages are something that we are able to do with great regularity. I have begun to understand, and only begun to understand, the complexity of this department, the range of this department. I think that there are problems with the way it is organized. I am sure there have been problems with the way these services have been organized since the very beginning. I anticipate that this department, which I think of as a living thing, will continue to change and evolve over time and would anticipate there might even be some changes between now and the next time we meet.

I have learned a great deal. I will admit with the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), I will agree with him that this was a learning experience for all of us, and that the next budget Estimate process will probably be different than this one.

I think that the Minister has stated several times that we are in a period of transition and in a period of stabilization. He has made that point clear to not only Members in the House and in this Estimates process, but also to organizations that have been meeting with him and have been asking for meetings with him and have been asking for direction and assistance.

I think that the department, the Minister, the staff, the programming will all be held more accountable this next budget. We will all be looking, as we all should be looking, very closely at what the programs are, how the department is delivering those programs, how it is meeting its goals and operating principles which I think are excellent. I think that they certainly cover all of the basic areas.

I think this Government this year has put a little more emphasis on some of these goals and principles than others. I would disagree with some of the emphasis that has been placed on some of the goals and operating principles. I am looking very forward to seeing how the Minister and the department work through the budget-making process in coming forward with the Estimates next year.

I certainly hope that we are able to start the process on time, more or less on time, so that we can get through the process. I think it is very important for organizations and agencies to know what they are going to have to spend early in the fiscal year. Again, that is something that the entire Government, both Government and Opposition, will have to work on to make sure that process does come to pass on time.

I will not say it has been fun. It has been a very long process, but I think it has been a very important one. I have learned a lot and many, many elements of it have been very enjoyable. I do give the Minister a lot of credit for having gone through a very difficult first two months in a very difficult position. I think he has handled himself very well. I congratulate him for that and wish him all the best in the holiday season.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I would just close by saying that I sincerely appreciate the kind words of not only the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), but the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) as well. There does seem to be a recognition that this department has had some difficulties in the past. The Member for Osborne said he did not think things would change in his lifetime. I think things have changed and will

continue to change, and hopefully we will leave it more positive and better than we found it.

I would say to the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), your Leader had indicated to me that Mother Teresa could not run this department and also assured me that I was not Mother Teresa. One of your caucus Members referred to this department as the department of human misery.

There seems to be that sort of recognition that this department is fraught with problems that people have a difficult time resolving. The challenge I would throw out to the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) and her counterpart, the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) is that maybe we can work together to bring about some positive changes.

I think this department has been much, much too easy to play politics with, and I do not think we serve the people of Manitoba very well by doing that. I appreciate the kind words that she has said this evening and also the Member for Osborne. Maybe the three of us can work together a little more to bring about some positive changes.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary \$20,600—pass.

Resolution 47: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,069,400 for Family Services for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

This completes consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Family Services.

The time being after 10 p.m., committee rise.

## SUPPLY—ENVIRONMENT

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. Would the Committee of Supply come to order, please. The Committee of Supply will continue to consider the Estimates of the Department of Environment.

We are considering item 2. Environmental Management.

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Madam Chairperson, when we last were considering these Estimates I had just put a question to the Minister about sewage lagoons and septic fields, and specific to sewage lagoons, at the outset, I wonder if he remembers the question? Can he answer it, or would he like me to repeat it?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** If I remember, the Member was asking the method

of enforcement on sewage lagoons and some implication of whether or not sewage lagoons function in our environment.

Certainly the opinion of myself and I think the department that sewage lagoons will operate under Canadian environment, Manitoba environment if you will—all licences require monitoring of those lagoons and their discharges.

**Mr. Edwards:** I see the Minister is going to be standing. He and I both are suffering, I think, from ailments. Perhaps it is time to get this over with. -(interjection)- I do not speak for my friend in the other Party, but I am not in a particularly fit state myself tonight.

I have a letter which I am prepared to table from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) dated August 20 of this year to Mr. Dalmyn which indicates that the Premier has been advised by the Department of Environment that they were undertaking a major review of the private sewage disposal systems regulation under The Environment Act on a priority basis. I wonder if the Minister can give us a report on how that review is going?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, there has been an internal group that has done a major redraft of the regulations, and it has had some public input because I know Mr. Dalmyn has had an opportunity to comment on it. There will be further public discussion and then the regs should be finalized.

**Mr. Edwards:** The Minister and his department may be aware of a report which arose out of a conference sponsored, I believe, by the federal Department of Environment, and I believe if I am not mistaken, it was approximately 1985. That report has been specifically drawn to the department's attention repeatedly by Mr. Dalmyn who is a constituent of mine and who I have had the opportunity to meet with on a number of occasions.

\* (2010)

That report states in part, page 9, with respect to sewage lagoons, that viruses are regularly found in lagoon effluents and that cold climate lagoons somehow seem to contribute to the longevity of those micro-organisms, then goes on to state that the lagoons allow these micro-organisms to escape thermal shock by allowing them time to acclimatize to the cold environment. The micro-organism is quite dangerous in fact to public health if allowed to enter the water stream in any significant numbers, remaining viable in cold climate lagoons.

Has the department considered those conclusions which stem from that report, and are they still convinced that cold climate lagoons in this province do work to do what they are supposed to do?

**Mr. Cummings:** The department says they are well aware of the report, and they are tracking this type of contamination.

**Mr. Edwards:** If I am not mistaken, and if the department is well aware of the report, they can confirm what year—I think it is 1985. If they are tracking the problem, or considering it, what have the conclusions been? Do cold climate sewage lagoons do all they are intended to do or not?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, they do.

**Mr. Edwards:** Does the Minister say, does his department say that this conclusion from this report is totally fallacious, without merit? Is that the conclusion we are to draw?

**Mr. Cummings:** The conclusions are not false, however, neither should we panic. We should put them in context. That is, there can be situations during cold weather when there might be some levels that would be detectable. That is why we are tracking and monitoring to make sure that nothing is allowed to get to a level that we would consider a concern. Many times I suppose, the management of the lagoon itself, in cold weather, can provide the margin of safety that is required.

**Mr. Edwards:** It has just come to my attention that in fact the report is 1987 which I have been quoting from. Can the Minister indicate—he says that these lagoons are monitored for bacteria levels to make sure they are working. Can he indicate the monitoring process, how often it is done, what in fact the testing procedure is?

**Mr. Cummings:** I think I got this one right. I have at least two out of four that agree. The fact is that these lagoons are monitored prior to release, that is usually a twice-a-year release.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is the checking that is done by the department—what occurs, if in fact there do appear to be problems upon checking a sewage lagoon? What is the process for bringing that to the attention of the appropriate authorities?

**Mr. Cummings:** If tests gave results that we were not satisfied with, there would either be no discharge or chlorination of the effluent would be required.

**Mr. Edwards:** This report, which the Minister has

indicated his department is familiar with, indicates that the implications to public health loom large of the then cold climate sewage lagoon system. At that conference, again if I am not mistaken, the Province of Manitoba was represented. Is the Minister saying that there is no problem? What can he tell us? Is he saying that our lagoons are not cold climate lagoons, that is why they were not talking about it? Is he saying that everything is fine? Or is there a cause for some concern and some rethinking of our approach to cold climate sewage lagoons?

**Mr. Cummings:** The reason that we are monitoring and controlling them is to make sure that any concerns are kept under control. I did not say that, to use the Member's words, there was no reason for concern. Obviously any discharge has to be properly monitored. I think maybe the difference comes in whether or not the Member believes that there is regular, ongoing discharges from lagoons or whether they are controlled discharges, they are allowed after they have been monitored and tested. The latter is the case; therefore you can deal with the problem of cold weather by retention. That is why the capacity of lagoons in this province are generally engineered to accommodate that.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister indicate if there have, in fact, been any overflows caused not by design, but caused by runoff being such that there were discharges that were perhaps not preferred by the people running the lagoon, but simply happened? Have there been any of those in the last year in this province?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am told that any overflows which would come as a result of overfilling of a lagoon are very rare, and not normally of the nature that would get into a stream. If a lagoon is overfilled or exceeds its capacity prior to its normal discharge time, the department would do testing to see if it was possible to discharge it, then might well allow discharge ahead of time if it is within acceptable bounds.

\* (2020)

**Mr. Edwards:** Have there in fact been—I want to just restate this. I appreciate the Minister's answer; it is informative—discharges, which were the result of emergency situations rather than planned discharges in which the appropriate guarantees that the Minister speaks of were not in place? Have there been any of those in the last year?

I know the Clean Environment Commission in the report I read some time ago has certainly noted that

those have happened on occasion. The municipalities, for whatever reason, simply do not have the capacity to take the sewage that is being created and dump it, or it simply runs out because the lagoon is not big enough. Is the Minister saying that has not happened in the last year?

**Mr. Cummings:** The department does not readily recall any time when this has happened. It has probably occurred on one or two occasions across the province, probably within the course of a year. Usually what you are talking about—unless the Member has other information I am not aware of, it would be where a cell overflowed, and not that raw sewage was pumped directly, other than under controlled circumstances. No one can recall when we have licensed that to occur.

**Mr. Edwards:** With respect to the discharges that do occur, whether controlled or otherwise, what is the potential health hazard of micro-organisms being put into the environment which then get into the normal water stream? What are the signs that discharges have occurred improperly?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not sure if I understood the question. Is the question, would there be downstream problems for population and what are the signs of those, or what are the signs if an inspector goes around and is looking for illegal discharge? Which one is he referring to?

**An Honourable Member:** Answer both, if you can.

**Mr. Cummings:** I am sorry I gave him the idea.

To answer the first one, the obvious would be and obviously why we insist on drinking water standards in this province, treatment of water being put into systems where it is going into households to protect against just that potential, from whatever source, whether it is from natural sources or whether it is from a discharge, the hypothetical question you are referring to.

In terms of what would the department do to check, fecal coliform counts would go up and surface water source would not be potable without treatment as a result of that. It would be, I take it, primarily through checking fecal coliform.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, I am not a chemist or have not had training in what the Minister speaks of, the coliform count. Can the Minister maybe give me some direction? The testing for E. Coli, is that what we are speaking of, that coliform count is an E. Coli count? -(interjection)- Okay.

Is there also testing done of potential viruses in sewage lagoons on a regular basis in the province?

**Mr. Cummlings:** No, there is not.

**Mr. Edwards:** Does the Minister not acknowledge that in fact viruses such as the polio virus, according to this study of 1987, survived three times as long as—longer than E. Coli and streptococci or whatever the other. I understand that would be another micro-organism, and that viruses in fact, according to this expert, were regularly found in lagoon effluence. Does that not warrant checking for viruses in our lagoons?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Madam Chairman, the department tells me that E. Coli would be a—fecal coliform tests would be an indicator, and they would automatically assume the potential of the others being there if they found that indicator rising.

**Mr. Edwards:** I take it that the presence or absence of E. Coli somehow leads the inspectors to know whether or not viruses exist without doing an independent virus test. Is that the gist of what the Minister is saying?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Regulation and the operations would—the principle that would be followed would be that they would make the worst case assumption based on E. Coli tests and take appropriate measures.

**Mr. Edwards:** Where E. Coli is present or even present in acceptable levels, is it impossible that viruses exist at a level which is not acceptable?

**Mr. Cummlings:** The assumptions are that statistically you would not expect to find those viruses if E. Coli could not be found in any samples taken.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is that assumption one that is widely held in the community, because I point to at least one author who clearly questions that assumption and recommends the testing of cold climate sewage lagoons for viruses? Is that an assumption which the Minister is prepared to say that his department has investigated and has determined is an inaccurate conclusion of this author and one that does not warrant virus testing specifically in lagoons?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Protocol at the Department of Environment follows as established under the Canadian drinking water standards and is, I am told, widely accepted as being of a high standard and state of the art in terms of making sure that there is

safe drinking water available and to extrapolate from that the processes that we follow.

\* (2030)

We believe that we are doing everything that is required to assure the safety of those who may be exposed or potentially be exposed under circumstances that you describe, but that does not necessarily directly contradict what you have in front of you, but the process that we are following we feel is one that is nationally accepted.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is the protocol the Minister speaks of specific on the issue of the need to check for viruses in lagoons in addition to coliform counts?

**Mr. Cummlings:** Perhaps I have done it myself, but the fact is we are talking about two different standards. You asked about testing standards that we use for potable water, but at the same time, in testing lagoons we would not be following the drinking water standard in testing the lagoon. We would be using the drinking water standard to test water that was going for human consumption. Therefore you assume that not very many, or no one, should be drinking untreated water or water from any other source than one that they can identify. There certainly are no statistics that support that there are dangers or outbreaks relative to these diseases that can be in any way traced to water consumption.

**Mr. Edwards:** We have been speaking about two things. Let me ask then, specifically, with respect to checking the lagoons, not potable water, but lagoons and the checks that are done of lagoons by the department. Do they check for viruses? If not, is there some protocol—was the protocol the Minister was speaking of specific to potable water? Given that, is the department not concerned that there is a need to do checks for viruses as well as E. Coli, and have they come to the conclusion that at least this author is wrong about the need to do that? Perhaps the Minister can indicate what evidence they have based their conclusion on, which contradicts this one?

**Mr. Cummlings:** The department is not rejecting what conclusions are drawn in that report that you refer to but is indicating that using the indicator of coliform that they do not routinely test for viruses, and to our knowledge, no other jurisdiction does in this country either in terms of checking lagoons. There may be greater statistical evidence with the Department of Health, but we do not have any, and

therefore feel reasonably secure that the process that we are using is ensuring the safety of the public. You are making the assumption that any discharges from lagoons could automatically lead to an outbreak of some type of viral infection.

What I am saying is that the tests that are used do not allow for discharge when it would deem to be, using the coliform basis, improper to discharge. I am sure—and I have not read the report particularly, but I have had some communication with Mr. Dalmyn. It would appear that he is basing a lot of conclusions on that report. We do not have statistical evidence to draw other conclusions beyond what protections were taken.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is there statistical evidence that this report is wrong?

**Mr. Cummings:** No, we did not say it was wrong. I said a moment ago we were not disputing the report, but neither should the Member necessarily indicate that the tests that we are using are necessarily wrong.

**Mr. Edwards:** Let me ask, because I think perhaps the Minister was under the assumption we were talking about potable water when I asked this question before. Is it necessarily true that, as E. Coli count goes up and down, or levels are present which are acceptable or not acceptable, you can judge whether or not there are viruses which might be harmful to human health, which are also present in acceptable levels or not acceptable levels. Are the two linked so that an E. Coli test can tell you whether or not viruses are present which might be harmful to human health?

If the department is doing tests and subsequently allowing certain discharges and certain cases, which the Minister has already talked about, without checking for viruses and viruses are present, then they are not insuring that the discharges are in fact acceptable. Is the Minister saying that the tests for E. Coli satisfy the need to determine whether or not harmful viruses are present or not?

**Mr. Cummings:** The department is satisfied that testing for E. Coli is a reasonable indicator and, if you control the E. Coli level, operate the lagoon so the E. Coli level is maintained at acceptable levels or below acceptable levels, that also will control any virus.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, I am sure the Minister is tiring of this line of questioning, I certainly am. I would like an answer that satisfies my lay

person's conclusions which are to be drawn from this report. This report states that E. Coli actually does not satisfy all the criteria of an indicator organism. The Minister seems to be suggesting that test for E. Coli is sufficient. It will tell you if the viruses are present in acceptable or non-acceptable levels. This report disagrees. Does he disagree with this report?

I do not think that you can have both. I do not think you can say the report is right, but we do not need to test for viruses, because this report says you have to test for viruses if you want to protect the public health. They say, not testing for viruses has implications to public health that loom large.

\* (2040)

**Mr. Cummings:** We have not had any evidence, I am told, that there have been viral outbreaks that would indicate that we are not keeping this matter well under control. The issue is not to dispute the report that the Member has in his hand. It would seem that we are well within the national standards in terms of the testing that we do. To my knowledge, no other jurisdiction is doing that testing, and that would indicate to me that if everybody is still using that as a reasonable standard for testing in this country, and given the current good health of the population across the nation, I would suggest that there is no evidence to show that the process is not working well. That is not to say that more could not be done, but I think when you are looking for those types of additional tests to be imposed on lagoons, that we have to make sure that we do an adequate job and do it with a reasonable efficiency.

**Mr. Edwards:** What would be the additional cost? Can the Minister indicate, has there been an investigation by his department as to what the additional cost would be of doing those types of checks at the same time as the coliform counts were done?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not think I referred to costs. I said efficiency. These tests would probably have to be done by the Department of Health. Ward Lab does not have the virology capacity, if that is the right term. I was referring to the efficiency of getting the work done so we could manage the number of lagoons that we are responsible for.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, with respect to the issue of fluoridation, that is one that as the Minister knows there has been an ongoing debate for many, many years.



Can the Minister indicate what the present view of the department is with respect to fluoridation and its impact on public health, whether or not his department continues to support fluoridation as a desired input into the water system, and I guess implicit in that is whether or not they agree that there are any environmental impacts which are negative as a result of fluoride being put into the water supply?

**Mr. Cummings:** The question should be more correctly put to the Department of Health, as the regulator in that area.

As far as environmental impacts of the adding to the water, we have not identified that is an issue that the public needs to be concerned about.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, have there been studies done with respect to the Lake Winnipeg watershed and the effect of fluoride on the water and soil quality in that area as a result of the fluoridation of Winnipeg's water supply?

**Mr. Cummings:** There have been studies of the effluent from the Winnipeg treatment plants, and there is no indication that there is fluoride discharge there that is a problem.

One should also take note of the fact that there is a low level background fluoride level in the water that Winnipeg pipes in, in the first place. Coming out of Shoal Lake there is a fluoride level, and I cannot recall the figures. It seems to me it is .03. It is identified. I have seen the figure, but I cannot tell you what it is.

The fact is the Shoal Lake water has a background fluoride level in it that has to be taken into account presumably when the fluoridation is done.

**Mr. Edwards:** Perhaps the Minister can elaborate, .03 or whatever he is talking about, he says that is a natural level of fluoride in the water. What level is pumped in or put in the system before it reaches the resident of the City of Winnipeg?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, I should not try and go by memory on that detailed a figure. I cannot quote with certainty what the background fluoride level is. I was simply putting that fact on the record so one would not assume that it is unnatural to find fluoride occurring naturally in the water systems. It can and does occur naturally, and that was simply why I indicated that Shoal Lake water, without anything added to it, has a measurable background fluoride level.

**Mr. Edwards:** Of course not, Madam Chairperson, but as the Minister is certainly aware, there is a man-made addition of fluoride to the water supply. One commentator has indicated that in 1988, for the City of Winnipeg, that amounted to some 145 tons.

Can the Minister indicate whether or not that would be an accurate conclusion as to the amount of fluoride that was in fact put into Winnipeg's water supply?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not the regulator in that area. I do not have that information.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, that commentator has also concluded—this I think will be clearly within the Minister's jurisdiction—that each year some 21 tons of that are introduced into the aquifers and stream beds between Indian Bay and Winnipeg. Now, would the Minister consider that level of depositing of fluoride in that area a polluter and something worthy of attention from his department as environmental pollution?

**Mr. Cummings:** If I am talking about the same thing that the Member is, tests were done regarding the one well-publicized spill that occurred, and certainly we were unable to detect anything that caused any changes in the background levels of fluoride. If he is indicating that it has got into an aquifer somewhere, perhaps he would like to elaborate.

**Mr. Edwards:** No, I am simply indicating that, of course, at Indian Bay, it is my understanding that the fluoride is introduced—I may be wrong about that, but that is my information—and that some 20 to 21 tons, speculators have indicated, ends up back in the environment, specifically the Lake Winnipeg watershed area. I wonder, and I gather the Minister is saying that there is no environmental effect which should cause any concern, if in fact that level of tonnage of fluoride each year, some 20 or 21 tons, will not in fact over time cause environmental problems.

**Mr. Cummings:** It is my understanding that fluoride does break down in the environment, and that may well be occurring in Winnipeg's treatment plants before they are discharged.

\* (2050)

**Mr. Edwards:** The Minister indicates that may well be happening. Has the department done any testing to determine what the environmental effect has been, or is likely to be, with that level of tonnage of fluoride entering the watershed after it has come through Winnipeg city's water system?

**Mr. Cummings:** Testing of the rivers and testing, as I have said earlier, I am referring to discharges from the plants, we are not detecting any levels of fluoride that would cause concern.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister indicate with what regularity that testing is done, and whether or not it has been done, for instance, in the last year?

**Mr. Cummings:** River quality is tested monthly.

**Mr. Edwards:** Where is it tested on the river?

**Mr. Cummings:** There are both upstream and downstream tests taken, plus at three points within the city jurisdiction.

**Mr. Edwards:** All of those points are tested on a monthly basis? Is that what the Minister is saying?

**Mr. Cummings:** It is our understanding that is likely a correct assumption. We will provide a report to the Member so that he can go through it.

**Mr. Edwards:** I would appreciate that, Madam Chairperson.

When the testing is done, is the testing done on the protocol that the Minister has indicated earlier—the potable water protocol? What is the procedure for testing and specifically, I guess, with respect to this line of questioning, is the level of fluoride tested for? I would be interested to know as well what the testing procedure is for water.

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not think by memory we can recall all of the parameters that are included in the testing, but that will be included in the report—what the water is tested for. Obviously, the sampling itself was taken in a prescribed manner so that we get the most accurate cross section of the river. I can assure him that that is being done in a correct manner, that water quality standards would recognize. The exact tests, I suppose we could try to list them, but they are included in the report on the water quality.

**Mr. Edwards:** In the last year then, what have the downstream tests told the Minister and the department about the quality of water coming out of the Winnipeg area?

**Mr. Cummings:** One of the major concerns that we have always had is the high bacterial count of water exiting the city's jurisdiction. That is why we are now presently working with the city to get additional treatment at the treatment plants.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is water quality also tested in the Assiniboine and in the Seine River, for instance, in the City of Winnipeg? Can the Minister indicate with what regularity those tests are taken?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Assiniboine is tested in three or four sites quarterly. The Seine is not tested regularly, as the Member is well aware. It is not flowing a good percentage of the time in the last couple of years. You are testing still water when you are testing. I had occasion to ask what the water quality was after the Save Our Seine meetings, and I cannot recall the frequency or the location of the tests. It seems to me the one test area was close to where it discharges into the bigger river and that water was within acceptable standards. Certainly it was not a good test of what is flowing through, because in fact there was almost nothing flowing through.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, I am interested to know about the proposed medical waste sites. I will seek direction of the Minister as to whether or not this would properly come up under the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation, or whether he would entertain questions now about the—I see him shaking his head so I assume he will—siting of a medical waste facility in the Province of Manitoba. Can he give us an update as to the process, which I gather is under way, to determine a site, an appropriate site, and when a decision is expected by his department?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Minister of Health are looking at the larger picture as to what is generated, the volumes and so on. That report will be available before very long. It is my understanding that it should soon be available so that we can then start to plot a strategy for the province. There is an application, recently approved, for a medical waste transfer facility, not a treatment facility. BFI has a license to operate a transfer facility. There is another application in from a smaller company that also is applying to handle medical waste, primarily dental waste, I understand, on an entrepreneur basis to begin to approach practitioners across the province to get dental waste out of the waste stream. That one is not completed yet.

**Mr. Edwards:** Does the Minister feel confident that all biomedical waste now, in the Province of Manitoba, is being adequately disposed of?

**Mr. Cummings:** Adequate is—there is a judgment call and obviously if we thought everything was being done that could be done today we would not have commissioned the work to be done by the Health Services Commission—Department of Health. We think there is room for improvement, and

we want to be able to deal with that in a larger scale across the province and as efficiently as possible.

We know that incineration is possible. We know there are advocates out there today who say that small scale equipment in individual hospitals can be made to work at standards that are acceptable, using other technologies. We want to get a firm picture of everything that is out there and how it is best brought into a location where it can be disposed of, knowing full well that there are some cost implications to doing this. It will bear on Health Services Commission in terms of overhead with whatever method of disposal is finally concluded.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is there, in fact, still biomedical waste ending up in landfill sites in this province, to the Minister's knowledge?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, I think that is a fair conclusion.

\* (2100)

**Mr. Edwards:** To what extent, Madam Chairperson, and is the level that is occurring monitored by the department?

**Mr. Cummings:** The department informs me that they did an across-province survey last summer to get a quick reading on this issue and the conclusion was, as I indicated a moment ago, that some of it is going into landfills. We also concluded from the information we received that our best conclusion would be that what would be considered more dangerous or infectious material is not being left to casual, if you will, or to that method of disposal, that it is being kept separate and disposed of properly by other means, but there are materials going to landfills.

**Mr. Edwards:** Can the Minister indicate what the time line is? I believe he said he felt a report would be ready in the short term. Can the Minister indicate what the time line is for the establishment of a medical waste treatment centre for Manitoba, such that all of the biomedical waste which should be treated, other than going to a landfill, is in fact treated properly?

**Mr. Cummings:** I indicated that it is my understanding the report will be available shortly. I would think the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) could more accurately report on the stage of it. Further to that, one need not draw a conclusion that we would necessarily build a system in the province. We could well function with a transfer system and hire facilities that would be acceptable as well.

**Mr. Edwards:** What happens with biomedical waste coming from the veterinarians' offices around this province? Is that treated as biomedical waste, as I would assume it would qualify. How is that waste disposed of? Is it monitored by the department as biomedical waste?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not know what regulations are covered on our veterinarian clinics through the Department of Agriculture, but by personal experience I can tell you that the agricultural clinics that I have had experience with would not have what the Member and I would normally think as biomedical waste of a very large degree. Some of the small animal clinics in the city might be more inclined to have that type of material, rather than the large animal clinics that we have in the rural areas. They would more likely have dead animals to dispose of which would be disposed of either through dead animal facilities or landfills which have burial grounds on them. A number of landfills have what are referred to as burial grounds for livestock purposes where they are covered daily, and that is governed under our regulation.

As far as operating on infectious material, it would probably be the dead animal itself that would be infectious, and it would be disposed of by burial.

**Mr. Edwards:** Does that in fact happen at landfill sites in Winnipeg to service the various veterinary clinics around this city? What happens to carcasses coming out of those clinics?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not aware of the city landfill accepting that material. We do not directly regulate those veterinary clinics, but it is my understanding that it might well be by incineration, small incinerators that some of them have available to them.

**Mr. Edwards:** Just one final question on this. Can the Minister indicate who does regulate the veterinary clinics and who would be responsible for overseeing the disposal of whatever, hazardous waste or the term, biomedical waste, which was coming out of those clinics?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not know whether it would be treated in terms of biomedical waste. I think what Veterinary Services, which is in the Department of Agriculture, are concerned about and would be regulating would be the transmission of disease from dead stock or parts thereof. I think they would be regulated and controlled under the Veterinary

Services Branch. Certainly we have not undertaken to extend regulation in that area.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to ask the Minister a few questions concerning an item that has been of concern to me for a couple of months now. I am sure he is well aware of the issue, and that is the Palliser Furniture plant in Transcona. I will not belabour the point too long, but I need some clarification on that.

I have attempted several times during Question Period to ask questions on that subject and unfortunately, through time constraints, I was prevented from asking the necessary questions. For that particular plant there have been news releases, there have been consultant's reports, there have been director's orders, all dealing with this same subject.

There are still concerns out in the community as I have indicated to the Minister today. I know he has a copy of the petition that the residents had gathered together in the community amongst other Ministers in that Government. The questions I have are dealing with, to start with, the director's order. It states that the necessary steps to ensure compliance with all of the conditions of the environmental Act Licence No. 1242 on or before January 31, 1991 is the first condition that the Palliser Furniture plant has to meet. With that particular clause, it does not state in there what steps the Minister would take should this particular industry or business not complete this particular clause, not comply with this clause.

\* (2110)

I would like to know what is the Minister's response to that, and what steps his department is going to take if this plant does not meet the necessary regulation or clause.

**Mr. Cummings:** In the event that they would not comply or would not be in a position to comply, we would have a choice of fining them as a result of charges or we could ultimately shut them down.

**Mr. Reid:** I would like some indication, Madam Chairperson, what would be the Minister's—what data he would rely on to determine what course of action his department would take, whether or not they impose the fines or they impose the close-down order.

**Mr. Cummings:** I think that is hypothetical. Palliser has a problem and has moved, depending on what

your opinion is of the speed in which they have responded—but they have given us full access to the consultant's report, which relates to questions I had earlier about the professionalism of work that is done outside of the department. I think the department accepted the professionalism of this report, and we fully expect compliance. I am not here to say whether it would be a \$300 ticket or whether you would go on to court to seek a higher fine. That is entirely hypothetical until we reach a point when they are out of compliance. It is certainly my expectation that they will be able to meet that and certainly intend to see that they do, frankly. It does need to be completed.

**Mr. Reid:** That did not quite meet the needs of the question that I had put to the Minister, as well as, I am sure, it does not meet the needs of the concerned residents in the area. These people have waited approximately a year to have this situation resolved, and I am sure if the Minister was a resident in that area he would be seriously concerned himself.

I am sure he is privy to the pictures that were attached to the petition that was given to his department. He is well aware of the dust problem.

Of course, attached to that duster is some concern about the presence of formaldehyde. Whether it be in free air or attached to the dust particles themselves is a moot point in this case.

I think it is important for these people to know and have an understanding, because there was some discussion between myself and the owner of that particular plant approximately a week ago. The owner indicated to me that there was some technology that was going to be put in place as part of this director's order. Yet when I have had some discussions with Members of this House who have knowledge of this particular case, there is some discrepancy in facts, that they are not going to apply the necessary technology to meet the needs as the consultant had recommended.

In this case, that is why I asked the Minister what necessary steps he has in place to deal with the eventuality that these recommendations of the consultant are not implemented.

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not going to answer a hypothetical question about how big a fine would be imposed. I potentially said they could be shut down as a result of non-compliance. If the Member has some technical information that I am unaware of, if

he wants to put it on the record or give it to me privately, I would be interested to hear what it is.

**Mr. Reid:** I am unsure, Madam Chair, whether it would be advantageous for the people in that portion of Transcona to have this on or off the record. What we are looking for is to have this issue resolved once and for all, to have this matter expedited as quickly as possible for the benefit of all parties. It does none of us any good to have this hanging over our heads.

I will put it on the record. When I had some discussions with the manager of this plant, this manager indicated to me that they were going to construct a new facility to filter out the dust particles that were being emitted from the cyclones of their plant. In the cyclones of that plant, they have emissions on one cyclone of 4.9 pounds per hour and, on the other cyclone, 4.2 pounds per hour of dust emissions.

If you calculate that on the number of hours that that plant is in operation six days a week, that works out to a lot of emissions. If formaldehyde is attached to those dust particles, you have a major problem in that portion of the community, as the pictures proved, and of course the consultant's report went on to state that it was a problem from those particular cyclones.

What process that they were going to use, as the manager indicated to me, was that they were going to build that housing facility and then they were going to stack freshly sawn lumber in there and allow the air to be blown through the lumber and hopefully the rough particles of the lumber would filter out the dust. If that so-called solution does not work, we are still at the same place we were before we built this building, and we are going to have another problem with the residents, the people who live in those areas, similar to the situation we have right now. They are going to be knocking on the Minister's door to find out what the Minister is going to do about it.

There was, in the consultant's report, talking about a bag-house technology, these cyclones would be ducted into and would filter out the dust particles before that air was vented to the atmosphere. This director's order does not give any assurances to myself or to the people in the community of Transcona who are affected by the dust that this technology is going to be implemented. The concern we have is that this process is just going to continue on in an experimental phase until

they get to the final step where they have to put this bag-house technology into effect.

What I need from the Minister here is some clarification on whether or not his department is going to be allowing this business to experiment with the lives and the quality of life of the people of east Transcona.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, it is up to the company how they meet the standards that are required. If they cannot meet them, then they will suffer the consequences. If they are choosing to not use the bag-house, as you indicate, then they had better have some confidence that the other system will work.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, that goes back to one of my original questions. When I ask why and what steps the Minister has in place that he can deal with this situation should this technology that this plant is not going to use and the construction of the building just strictly as a filter system, it does not work.

What steps does he have in place to make sure that this plant is going to meet the needs before they go through the experimental phase? Why should these people's quality of life have to be continually affected over and over again without having the proper steps put in place in the first place, especially since the consultant had recommended that point?

**Mr. Cummings:** As I indicated to the opening question, we have a number of options from fines to court charges to outright order to close. The only issue that I regulate is how they get to the standard that has been imposed. If they choose to use a certain technology, that will be a decision that they will have to live with. I suspect that they must have some reasonable belief that this will work. Either that, or they think that they can very quickly go beyond that if it does not cut the emissions.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, I do not think that is going to satisfy the needs of the constituents of mine in Transcona whose lives have been affected to the point now where some of them are forced to seek medical attention, and to the point where—it is on record—that they have medical attention. In fact, some of them are to the point where their homes are for sale now because, on the advice of their doctors, for the safety and health and well-being of their families, they have to move.

Now the emissions from this particular plant have caused a great deal of discomfort for these families

to the point now where it is interfering with their personal lives. They are the ones who have to take out of their own pockets the expenses necessary for them to relocate. In no way is this company being forced to compensate them for a problem which is solely the company's. I think it is incumbent upon this company and this Minister to make sure that these people in no way are responsible for any of these expenses that they are having to incur at this present time.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, I did not word that in the question, and I know I should have.

\* (2120)

In the consultant's report, Mr. Rae of the Environment Department says the abatement controls would have to be in place by the spring of 1991. Well, Madam Chair, that is an extensive period of time for the implementation of such controls considering this problem has been going on for a year and these people are having some effect on their lives. It also goes on in the report to say the presence of attached formaldehyde in all of the samples may explain some of the sinus discomfort and eye irritation that some of the residents have expressed.

Now the consultant's report talks about formaldehyde in the free form, but it does not say anywhere in there where you have formaldehyde in an attached form or the concentration in the attached form and what are the allowable limits and how it may affect the families, particularly in the case where there are people in that portion of the community who have asthmatic conditions who have been seriously impacted by this dust and formaldehyde emissions. I want to know what steps this Minister is doing to correct that particular problem.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, obviously by indicating that they must be in compliance by the end of January is setting a deadline by which the company will have to live. Secondly, I understand the people have been referred to a medical officer who is attempting to ascertain the impacts that are being indicated. Frankly, I can appreciate the discomfiture. The condition of the licence is that there shall be no visible dust beyond the boundary of their own property, and that is what they will have to achieve in order to avoid circumstances that we talked about earlier.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, I wish to inform the Minister

on my visit to that particular plant, and I am sure the residents will confirm this in that surrounding neighbourhood, that the dust problem has not gone away, that there is still wood particles on the ground surrounding the plant and on the plant site. Every time you get a wind it is going to whip up that dust. It is going to pick it up and deposit it in the neighbourhoods across the street, and you are going to have several hundred residents hostile again. This is after the building was built to contain those particular wood-dust particles.

I want to read a bit from the consultant's report where it says smoke from the incinerators. Well, we have conducted no tests concerning the emissions from the two incinerator stacks on the premises, both, and in particular the Logic plant stack were observed to be discharging concentrations of dense, sooty smoke in excess of those permitted by the licence.

We see the news release on the Palliser plant just last Friday where they talk about recycling two million pounds of wood waste per month. Will the Minister give me some indication now whether or not that wood waste is being used to heat and fire the boilers of that particular plant, and is that wood waste being consumed by fire and then going up the chimney in smoke and soot? Have we done any tests to determine the concentration there?

**Mr. Cummings:** The compliance that is required by the end of January includes those stacks.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, there was no indication in the consultant's report that stated or gave any recommendation on the type of technology that would be used to clean up the stacks at that particular plant, outside of the cyclones. What steps is the Minister taking to ensure that all areas are going to be re-evaluated, and who is going to do the re-evaluation?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not sure what the Member means by "re-evaluation". Is he saying that the licence is not correct or is he saying that the company is not in compliance with the licence? The compliance will be enforced.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, if we get to the point of January 31, 1991, how are we going to determine as a province that this plant is meeting its environmental licensing?

**Mr. Cummings:** Through inspection.

**Mr. Reid:** Who will be responsible for that testing? Who will pay for that testing?

**Mr. Cummings:** For licence compliance, in this case it will be us.

**Mr. Reid:** These tests will be done by the Department of the Environment in Manitoba? Will these be a matter of public record?

**Mr. Cummings:** They will be done by the department and they will be public record.

**Mr. Reid:** This testing that is going to be done by this Minister's department, will it meet the testing needs and regulations of the Department of Environment, or will they be similar to the testing that was done by the previous consultant who was hired by Palliser's?

**Mr. Cummings:** They will be done by the department to the standards that we impose, and the standards that we use for this licence or any other licence.

I note certainly an implication, if not an intent, that the Member feels because work was performed by a consultant that somehow that might be questionable in its professionalism and the conclusions which it draws. That is an issue that we have addressed earlier in this Estimates process; that is, that the department has its own professionals who examine the work that we see and can thereby verify the professionalism, if you will, of the work that is done by, whether it is by proponents applying for a licence, or whether it is consultants who put their professional stamp on a report that they put forward. I hope the Member is not implying that he felt the report that we have in hand was not professionally done.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, I would not for a moment think of doing that. I am sure that these are competent people that the company has hired. Unfortunately the Minister must remember that: when one pays the piper, one calls the tune. I am sure if he keeps that in mind he will know why I asked the questions about who is doing the testing.

\* (2130)

This is why I had, Madam Chair, some concerns about the consultants doing the original testing in this case, because they were under no obligation to the Government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba to release all of the details since we were not paying for those tests to be done to protect the lives of the citizens of Manitoba.

My question for the Minister is there were certain test methods, parameters and raw data that on

record at Johnson Gray Associates office. Has his department called for these test methods, parameters and data? Does he have them on record and will he release this information?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not sure whether we have the information that the Member is referring to or not. We have a report from the consultants. The critical point will be when we determine if the company is in compliance with its licence. If they are not, then they have a problem.

**Mr. Reid:** Will the Minister undertake to gather this material that I just talked about and release it for our viewing for the Members in this House, please?

**Mr. Cummings:** The information that the Member refers to, I do not know whether I can guarantee him that that information is available or not. We have a report within the department, and that is sufficient for the purposes we had asked for. Other information which they may have gathered for the proponent which was not asked for by us may or may not be available. I frankly cannot answer that.

**Mr. Reid:** A few moments ago the Minister said he had all the data from the Johnson Gray Associates, the consultant's report, and that they were available to his department. Now the Minister tells us that he is not sure whether they have all the material.

I would like to know which is the case here, Madam Chair?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not recall making the statement that the Member just indicated. I said that they made available to us a report. The report was in the area that we needed the information. If they have other information that the Member is aware of, that I am unaware of, that is possible.

Bear in mind that when it comes to compliance of this nature, it will be the samples we take and the decision we make as a result of that which will ultimately force action or demonstrate compliance.

**Mr. Reid:** That is why I ask about the test methods and the other data that is important because as one knows—and I am sure the Minister knows full well there is a method that each one of us can employ at our own discretion whether or not we make the language in a particular document hard or soft.

If the wording in this particular document is softened up in any fashion, it could have less serious consequences for the particular plant that was employing that company to do that testing for them.

In that case that is why I would like to know, and



I would like to have the availability of that material for our perusal.

**Mr. Cummings:** If what the Member is saying is in fact the case, then the company has just shot themselves in the kneecap or maybe a little higher because certainly the report is not particularly complimentary from what I have seen of it and in fact, we will be doing the testing and making the determination on the licence as I indicated.

I am not sure that the relevance of the consultant's report, in this case, is to the enforcement of the licence. We are not basing the enforcement of the licence on the consultant's report. We are basing the capacity of the company to respond to the order that we have given it on the consultant's report.

Of course, they have to make a judgment as well in the implications that they have and whether or not they use the exact recommendations of the consultant or choose some other alternatives, which is what the Member was asking about earlier.

The bottom line is, and I hope he is prepared to take this back to his constituents, that they will be brought into compliance, that we have reached the end of the line in terms of compliance and will stand by that.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, that is why I had asked the question earlier, and the Minister said that the consultant's report may not be relevant. That is why I had asked the questions in Question Period a number of weeks ago, and asked the Government to do their own testing or to hire a consultant to do the testing for us if we do not have that particular expertise. That is why I put it on record at that time because I want to ensure impartiality in this case, not to say that it has not taken place, but to ensure that it does take place.

I would just like, for the record, for the Minister to state unequivocally, that he will not be releasing the data, the test methods or the parameters of the testing that was done by the consultant, Johnson Gray Associates.

**Mr. Cummings:** I would like to go back for a moment to something the Member said in terms of the validity or the relevance of the report. The capacity of the department wanted to use the outside expertise in terms of collecting information on the formaldehyde. That is a legitimate use of outside information, but we are not going to use a consultant's report to base enforcement of a licence on them. If I implied that at some point, I did not

intend to imply that. That will be based on the information gathered by our department or by someone who reports directly to our department as the Member said a moment ago.

In terms of the information that the Member is requesting, if we have that information, we will make it available. I am not sure that we have it.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, will the Minister attempt to gain access to that information? Will he make it available in a relatively short period of time? I ask for an attempt by his department to gather that information.

**Mr. Cummings:** We will attempt to get that information.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, since it states in the director's orders that particular plant has to take the necessary steps to ensure compliance, I am sure if one reads between the lines there it indicates the plant has not been in compliance with the full terms of the environmental licensing since there are many residents in that area who have had their quality of lives negatively impacted by the emissions of this particular plant. They have incurred expenses to deal with this situation, not only for their personal health and well-being and the medications that are necessary for that, but also to ensure that their quality of lives on their particular property are kept up. That includes furnaces, cleaning and stuff like that in their particular personal property.

What steps are the Minister's department taking to ensure that there are no expenses incurred by these particular people in this area?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, I have no doubt about the discomfiture that the Member refers to, that the concerns are ones that the people feel quite justified about. I think it is a civil matter. Our responsibility will be to bring the company into compliance so that those problems do not continue.

There is a larger question, I think, in terms of planning as well, location of housing and industries adjacent to one another. It can be as simple a matter as who was there first. It can also be as complicated as matters arise from agricultural enterprises which run very much into the same sort of problem where people will claim health problems as a result of being too close to agricultural enterprises.

So it does become evident that one of the more important things that can occur, whether it is for environmental protection or whether it is for health of the community that long-range planning and



community planning in terms of industrial, residential and all of the other categories that are concerned, it is much more critical that be dealt with up front before these types of things begin to happen.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chair, I just want to indicate to the Minister that these particular homes and the families living in them were there much longer than that particular plant, that particular industry, was in that location. In that situation, I think it is important that these people do not have their quality of life impacted, and I would appreciate the Minister ensuring that the necessary steps are taken that will guarantee the quality of life will be reinstated to what it was before, and that these people will not have to continue in the direction that their lives have been going in for the last year.

\* (2140)

**Mr. Cummings:** We will take the necessary steps that we are capable of under The Environment Act, but as I indicated the other matter the Member raises is a civil matter.

**Mr. Reid:** On that note, Madam Chair, is the Minister indicating that the people in the area who are affected or feel that they are affected by the emissions from this plant—would they be in a better position? In the Minister's statement he mentioned civil action. Is he suggesting that they proceed with civil action in this case against this particular plant?

**Mr. Cummings:** No, I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting, however, if the statement that he made earlier is correct, then it will have to be decided on whether or not it is correct by civil matter, not through The Environment Act.

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** Madam Chair, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister about the past incident that happened in my constituency, the gasoline leak.

Last September 18, 1990, there was a discovery of a gasoline leak from an 80,000 gallon underground storage tank at a gas station located at the corner of Simcoe and Notre Dame Avenue, when there was, I understand, an underground shifting of the soil and an underground disconnection of the pipes and cracks in the tanks, which happened probably earlier than the discovery date, about three or four weeks.

If the Honourable Minister remembers, the residents were ordered to leave their homes and about 20 homes were affected on both sides of

Simcoe Street. I went there because it is my riding and my area. The following day when they were allowed to come back and return to their homes, there were two people from the Department of Environment who were testing all the homes. Has there been any written report about the incident?

**Mr. Cummings:** There are a number of fact sheets and reports on daily activities that went back and forth on the occurrences at Simcoe Motors. If the Member is asking me if I have had a recent update, I have not; but the Environmental Operations division was closely involved. Recovery wells have been installed, pyzometers (phonetic), which are monitoring vapour, monitoring ground waters.

We have reduced two areas. I think probably the two areas that the Member might be the most concerned about, 791 and 778 Simcoe, have been brought down to no detectible gasoline vapour level, but there appears to be some problem at 778 Simcoe as of the date of this last report—this was shortly after the incident, pardon me, so this is not an up-to-date report.

There was a detectible level of gasoline vapours getting into the air in the basement through floor and foundation cracks, but that was back in September shortly after the occurrence. I have not had any recent report of testing at that site.

**Mr. Santos:** Madam Chairman, will the Honourable Minister provide me a complete copy of this written report, whatever exists now, because I have been doing my own little investigation about this matter. In fact I went there, so that I will not be receiving only information from one side. I like to know all the data and all the facts, including the official findings. Will the Honourable Minister provide me with the written report that exists now?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, I will be glad to get an additional update on the most current information we have and will provide it to the Member in written form.

**Mr. Santos:** Exactly a month after the incident, precisely on October 17, I received another complaint and again I did my own little investigation. I received a complaint from a resident, a father who has two little children, a boy nine years old, and a girl 13 years old and a wife, and he is so worried about the health of his children and his family. He told me that he had to open the window of the basement of his home in order to let the gasoline smell out.

I went again to Simcoe Street to see and feel for myself the situation of the complainant. I personally witnessed for myself their conditions. It is a condition of insecurity and fear about their long-term health. So I made some more investigations and there are some people who gave their statements.

Frank Auxtero, formerly from 759 Simcoe Street. This is what he told me. He does not live there any more. He left the place and he now lives in 182 Barnham Crescent. He said that he had smelled this gasoline long, long before it happened. Therefore, it seems to me that the discovery is quite a later incident, but the danger and the risk had been there all along.

Another resident there was Ursula Peter, a tenant at 806 Simcoe Street. She said that last spring she smelled gasoline and it had given her a continuous headache. She was initially blaming her fridge, that there might be some leak in the fridge. It turned out that she was wrong and it was due to the gasoline.

Another couple, Ernie and Caridad Guerrero, formerly of 769 Simcoe Street, are now residing at 806 Wellington. When Caridad arrived from home she said that she smelled gas fumes even as early as 1984 and 1986.

So I get restless and say this might have been a long-term kind of risk and when I went there last time, I noticed that there were blowers in the station, even during the cold winter already—

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please; order please. The Minister is experiencing difficulty in hearing the question.

**Mr. Santos:** Frank MacLaren and Associates, consulting and geotechnical engineers, apparently had installed this. Initially there was one blower sucking all the fumes from the sewer system and, until October 15 and 16, they were still smelling some fumes and I found that there were two more blowers installed there to prevent the gasoline.

Then I went to one of the homes. The lady there, the old grandmother, never left the home on the day of September 18. Everybody had left but she was there all by herself. Because she cannot communicate in English, she was afraid to open the door to anyone and she stayed there during the most crucial day, which was during the week when everybody was evacuated. This is the residence of 791 Simcoe Street. Her name is Remedios Basilio. I learned that she had passed away suddenly.

\* (2150)

Before that happened I was in their home twice and I saw a cat with a tail without any fur at all. It is like the tail of a lion and that cat had been there all along throughout the years. I also saw a dog tied down near the opening of the sewer in the basement and this dog was without hair on his back.

**An Honourable Member:** A dog.

**Mr. Santos:** A dog, yes. There was a big wound on its back and because this was right immediately at the opening of the exhaust of the sewer pipes, it gave me some kind of fear if this could happen to an animal, this cumulative effect, and indeed she was complaining about having lost some of her hair, that grandmother who died suddenly.

So when there was a symposium at the thing, I asked the scientist whether there would be this long-term effect of fumes on animals and she said unless I got the specific information, she could not answer it scientifically. There may or may not be.

What I am saying is that if this could happen to animals and could happen to people and there could be some cumulative and noticeable degradations of one's health, who should be held responsible for all these things? Would this recurrence of the peace of mind and physical health of both adults and children in these areas, would this be something that the Government should be guarding against or should they be going after these private companies?

Is there any responsibility Government may have in regard to this matter in failing to protect the long-term health and safety and peace of mind of its own citizens?

**Mr. Cummings:** Madam Chairman, I would not want to make light of the concerns that people had some fear of potentially gas fumes getting into their residence. There is no question that gasoline in very, very minute quantities, once it is in ground water or underground, it takes an extremely long time to have it removed.

I would not want to comment on whether or not the types of health problems the Member referred to are possible in relationship to that, but the fact is that the department did a considerable amount of testing in that area and had reached the conclusion that the gasoline fumes were below detectable levels and needed to be kept that way, of course, through continuous ventilation and test wells to collect the fuel and remove it from underground.

I never miss an opportunity to tie all of this back to the fact that whenever we get into a discussion

about handling of hazardous waste, we should not lose sight of the fact that probably one of the most hazardous things we handle is gasoline and spills or anything else associated with it, which can be very difficult in the long term to deal with. It is our responsibility as a department to monitor, to make sure that cleanup is done properly, which would be the responsibility of the company.

The Member is asking me who is responsible in a civil sense for the concerns he is raising of the people. It is the company that is responsible for the spill. I understand that the company has acknowledged through doing the clean-up work that they are the responsible body. I do not think there is any problem with identification of the responsibility. Therefore, I would encourage him to direct their efforts that way.

We also however are always available as is the city to do additional monitoring. The fact is, when you refer to the fact that some residents felt they had concerns from earlier on about having smelled gasoline in their area, there is no record of either the city or the province of anyone having made a complaint. It is unfortunate perhaps that they had not. It might have been something we could have dealt with.

**Mr. Santos:** Madam Chairperson, would this Government have any measure to propose in order to deal with things of this nature that may occur and reoccur time and again, in order to be ready and be prepared in terms of preventing these kind of things from happening, and if they should happen, in terms of at least preventing and giving some kind of assurance to residents about the accumulative effects on their health and their security like recurring headaches and upsets and emotional and mental sufferings.

**Mr. Cummings:** The department becomes involved early on through the clean-up process, the emergency response and providing fact sheets into the immediate area. In terms of the health issues I would rather that they were dealt with by medical people. Of course if that health issue surrounds the uncertainty, the best that we can do is make sure that we have all the information that is available in the hands of the public. That is what we have undertaken to do.

**Mr. Santos:** When this grandmother died I learned of it after about four days. Had I learned it earlier—in fact I was even frantically late that night trying to get

in touch with Markesteyn, the Chief Medical Examiner, so that he could at least have a post-diagnosis of what happened, whether this contributed or not to her sudden death, but it was already too late, and nothing could be done medically to do that. I want to know, maybe the Minister is not the proper person to ask this, but had there been time to do such post-mortem examinations at the request of some people, would they have to pay for it or should the Government help out?

**Mr. Cummings:** That is far beyond my area of expertise, except to acknowledge that I am sure the Member knows, if someone dies suddenly other than having been in a hospital for I believe it is 24 or 48 hours, an autopsy is automatically performed and the Medical Examiner would have to verify the cause.

**Mr. Santos:** Leaving now the long-term effect on human beings, there are also some long-term effects on properties in the area. Indeed, many of the residents there have left, and some of them are in fact selling their homes. In other words, there has been some kind of degradation of property values. Is there any remedy at all for this kind of injury suffered by a community from things that are not within their control?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am only aware of what has happened in other similar situations and the affected parties have sought to obtain reimbursement or acknowledgement from the company that is responsible, but I certainly cannot speak to what the possibilities of succeeding at that would be.

**Mr. Santos:** I would like to conclude now, but may I request the Honourable Minister provide me with any kind of update and all kinds of reports because I am still not satisfied that everything is okay. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, I believe there are still ventilation and sumps, wells being used. I would be very surprised if they are not still in operation, and we will give the Member any current information we have.

\* (2200)

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. The hour being 10 p.m., what is the will of the committee?

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson):** Madam Chair, before we go past this section I also have a couple of constituency-related questions. One has to do

with Flyer Industries which is located in the constituency of Radisson.

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please; order, please. I did not get a clear consensus of the will of the committee, and at that point in time the Honourable Member for Radisson was on her feet and I recognized the Honourable Member for Radisson.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, on a point of order. I sense my colleagues in the official Opposition as well as the Government, seek to sit. We will not certainly force a vote on this issue, and we will see that we will sit later. I simply want to put on the record that our Party wished to rise at this time, but we understand that the other two Parties wish to sit.

\* \* \*

**Ms. Cerilli:** As I was saying, I also have a couple of constituency-related questions. The first pertains to Flyer Industries which is located in the constituency of Radisson, and the practices of Flyer Industries have affected residents on Pandora Road. One of the things, particularly in the summer that happens is Flyer Industries runs their buses while leaving the doors open. Can the Minister tell the committee if he or the department are aware of this practice and what type of intervention they have taken with Flyer Industries?

**Mr. Cummings:** We do not have a copy of the licence. The department informs me they believe that they have a licence with certain conditions on it that relate to that matter, but cannot recall the details of it, and to the knowledge of those of us present I do not think there have been any complaints that have come in.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I can assure the Minister that I heard a number of complaints during the campaign, and I would appreciate being given a copy of the licence, and I would like the Minister to indicate what is the suggestion for the residents in that area to do? If they would like to complain, where should they call or write?

**Mr. Cummings:** The Department of Environmental Operations. The number is within the phone book. My number is 945-3522, and we will make sure that it gets referred to the right area.

**Ms. Cerilli:** What are the regulations that would deal with this problem?

**Mr. Cummings:** The relevant controls would be under The Environment Act and the City of Winnipeg Noise By-Law.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I make it clear to the Minister it is not so much the noise that people are objecting to, it is the fumes. Is the Minister or the staff here aware of the standards for the emissions that would affect the pollution coming from Flyer Industries when they are leaving their doors open and running their buses, and if that is something that their licence permits them to do?

**Mr. Cummings:** As I indicated earlier, we cannot recall what the conditions of that licence would be. We would have to refer that to go back for further examination, but is the Member saying that the exhausts should be exhausted in a different manner? I do not know whether that is controlled under the licence or not. Frankly, I will have to plead ignorance at this point.

**Ms. Cerilli:** As I said, I will be satisfied with getting a copy of the licence.

The other matter that is affecting constituents in Radisson has been alluded to or raised already, and that is the cleanup of the Domtar site. I would like the Minister to outline what practices the department is aware of, up to this point, that have been used to deal with the creosote that has been contaminating the soil in that area?

**Mr. Cummings:** If I remember correctly, this question was referenced the other night in the Estimates process, and we agreed that we would put out an updated and recent fact sheet into the community. Obviously, we have not been able to do that in the last five days, but there has been, I am told, a fair bit of detailed information from the company that has been made available in the community as to what their proposals are with some fairly technical information included.

Primarily, what they are doing is scraping up the contaminated soil and stockpiling it in a location where it would be impervious to get into the ground water. At that point, they have another decision point as to exactly how they will get the creosote out of the soil. Obviously, one way would be to haul it away somewhere and incinerate it, but that is not necessarily one that they can accomplish given the costs that are associated.

\* (2210)

There is a detailed plan for an operation that would do a wash. A final decision has not been

made on exactly how they would decontaminate it. As I said before, while it is taking some time to accomplish, the corporation is putting forward the effort and the money, and that is a heck of a lot better than having an orphan site that the taxpayers have to pay to clean up.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Residents in the neighbourhood have informed me that there has been a high-pressure spray used to spray concrete that was on the site. Can the Minister assure the committee that this concrete is being tested before it is being taken from the site? Can the Minister inform us where the concrete is being taken once it is taken from the site?

**Mr. Cummings:** After the concrete has been decontaminated, it is deposited at the Brady Landfill after it receives our approval.

**Ms. Cerilli:** How many tests have been done on the concrete, and when were these conducted? What is the nature of the approval process?

**Mr. Cummings:** A large number of tests have been performed by the department on the concrete. I cannot, by memory, or the department cannot, by memory, supply me with that information. Very likely the officials on site are using a swab test to determine if there is any contamination left on the cement, and then a verbal approval is given once that official is satisfied that the material can be moved.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I would appreciate it if the department or the Minister could forward the results of those tests to me.

I understand that there are plans being made or proposed for the site. Can the Minister explain what those plans are?

**Mr. Cummings:** There has been an awful lot of discussion around this site. None of it is in the form of finalized plans. Originally the site was going to be a subdivision and then, of course, it was recognized that it was a contaminated site, so obviously that has been killed. Until the decontamination and the cleanup is completed, I do not think anybody should be thinking about other planned uses for the site.

My discussions with Domtar a considerable number of months ago—I think shortly after I came in office, I had a chance to question the Domtar people about what they were doing and how soon they were going to get on with the cleanup of that site as a result of initiatives taken by my predecessor. I am going very much by memory here

but, if my memory serves me correctly, the implication was that cleanup will still continue to take some amount of time, and they would endeavour to make the area clean and as attractive as possible while that work was going on.

Obviously, when you are removing concrete, you are removing logs, you are removing steel that is embedded in the ground and all manner of things, it is not going to be terribly attractive while that work is going on. Then the decontamination of the material that is scraped up will, of necessity, be not a pretty sight, but it will ultimately be safer.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I understand that there currently are some plans registered with the department or being considered by the department for the site and I, again, would appreciate a copy of that plan and also for the Minister to give me a copy of any notice that is sent to the constituency.

**Mr. Cummings:** I think the plans that the Member must be referring to are the ones that I just talked about in terms of a clean-up process. If they have a plan to do something further with it, either I am unaware of it or have forgotten, but certainly we are not a planning department. If someone has plans for this property that they have registered somewhere in terms of a use, they would not register it with us.

**Ms. Cerilli:** When I contacted the department I was told that there are some plans that are registered and are currently going through an approval process. I was under the impression that there was one plan that had been outlined what was going to happen up until the clean-up work that was going on there this summer and then there was going to be further plans that were going to be approved. Is that correct?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, but those will be clean-up plans, not use plans. Obviously we would be responsible for the cleanup, but I thought when the Member was referring to plans, I thought she was referring to future plans which would be use plans and those I am not aware of, but for the cleanup, yes, they have got to have our approval for any of the processes they might want to put in place.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 2.(b) Environmental Management (1) Salaries \$3,212,300—pass; 2.(b)(2) Other Expenditures \$973,000—pass; 2.(b)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations \$152,700—pass; 2.(d) Manitoba Hazardous Waste Management Corporation \$2,000,000.00.



**Ms. Cerilli:** Previously that part of the department was considered under a committee separate from this committee, looking at the department. I am not sure if it is the appropriate time to pass that now.

**Mr. Cummings:** I think the problem is that we had the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation in Committee of Natural Resources and Public Utilities. By passing, this does not affect what we are doing in that committee. This simply is an allocation within our Estimates to acknowledge the fact of the cash flow that is going forward to the Crown corporation. As I indicated to the Member in Committee of Natural Resources and Public Utilities, I think in private discussions, that does not directly reflect the budget of the Hazardous Waste Corp. Their budget is \$2.5 million, as it was the year before. This is to account for the funds that will flow through here as part of their receipt of funds. They do have additional borrowing authority that remains from other decisions made, so they have ample funds without flowing the full \$2.5 through here, they have other borrowing authority that they can cover that budgetary requirement, so I would encourage the Member to pass the figure.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 2.(d) Manitoba Hazardous Waste Management Corporation—pass.

\* (2220)

Resolution 44: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,888,800 for Environment, Environmental Management for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 3. Environmental Advisory Organizations \$488,800 (a) Clean Environment Commission: (1) Salaries.

**Mr. Edwards:** Very briefly, the Clean Environment Commission panel selection is one which I do not seek to challenge based on the people who have served. That would be inappropriate and improper. Does the Minister intend, however, to import to Manitoba's legislation, eligibility criteria similar to that which have been put into place for panels federally and I believe, in some other jurisdictions? Is there any thought that would be imported to Manitoba for the future appointments to this commission?

**Mr. Cummings:** Not at this juncture, although I contemplate within the amendments in Bill 24 that for joint panels, we would be using the federal criteria for appointment of Members, because that

is the only way we would achieve an agreement with the federal authority. It is not my intention that we would be making amendments to allow for that provision within all of the appointments within the province.

**Mr. Edwards:** I realize that obviously Bill 24 and the joint assessments, at least in this time frame, are being treated as exceptions. I understand that. My question though, over the longer term—is the Minister saying that is not something which is on the agenda for his department? Are there other arrangements which he is seeking to make for the future appointment of commissioners or is the status quo acceptable to the Minister as far ahead as he is willing to project at this time?

**Mr. Cummings:** We are always reviewing internally the efficacy of how we operate, particularly the perception of the public on the independence and the quality of the appointments that we make to our boards. To that extent, without changing criteria or suggesting that I intend to change criteria at this juncture, I am willing to indicate that we are examining what criteria we may give ourselves internally to make sure that we have a good cross section of expertise combined with public interest at large, involved in this board. It is a most important board, and we want its credibility maintained.

**Mr. Edwards:** I appreciate the Minister's candour. Perhaps not by way of question, but simply a suggestion—it has always struck me that on boards like this, where the quality of the candidate may in fact be undisputed, it sometimes heightens the public respect for that board to have criteria set out publicly. The appointments may in fact have fit that criteria in any event.

However, knowing that there is in place an eligibility criteria of which these people have passed before their appointment does tend, I think, to raise their esteem. I simply leave with the Minister that reflection which no doubt was considered when the federal Government brought in their eligibility criteria. I do look forward, as the Minister indicates, to further progress on establishing criteria in the law, preferably in the regulations, to set out clearly the qualifications that commissioners must have.

The Minister is right. The role of the Clean Environment Commission stands only to increase in the coming years, as it, indeed, has in the last couple of years with the number of projects and the

importance of those projects coming before the Clean Environment Commission in Manitoba.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Madam Chair, to begin with, what are the professional staff—I see that last year there was three and this year there was four—what other professional staff that are with the Clean Environment Commission? What are their backgrounds and what function do they perform?

**Mr. Cummings:** There is the chairman, Mr. Eagleton, and I referred to his expertise earlier, who is a full-time employee. I believe his fairly lengthy history with Civil Service and related to Natural Resources matters is quite fully appreciated and is reflected in the job that he does. We have two people on staff, one of whom is a technical advisor by the name of Jim Warrener and secretarial support which would go with that. The other positions are technically listed as vacant. We supplied support from the department to fill those responsibilities during the peak of the workload. We are presently recruiting to fill them on a permanent basis because two of these were added under reallocation within the department. Just a moment. Jim Warrener is a water-quality engineer by profession.

**Ms. Cerilli:** In reading through the Act and the end report, I was surprised to find that there are only 10 people, that is the maximum for the people to be on the CEC, and that these positions are permanent and do not change with the different projects undertaken. Are there any plans to change that, to increase the number? The Minister said earlier that they can bring on extra expertise. It seems to me that there would be a requirement to have a greater number of people.

**Mr. Cummings:** Each appointment has a term, I think, probably, usually a two-year term. Also, we have the capacity to appoint people who have special knowledge or special background that would be useful to a hearing. We did that in the case of Repap. We appointed a gentleman from northern Manitoba to the directors of the board. I think some confusion may have arisen by the size of the board that heard the Repap hearings.

There was a considerable amount of interest by the various board members who wanted to be involved in that process because it was a very important and unique experience. The entire board did involve itself in the Repap licensing process, but that would not necessarily always follow. In fact I see where, similar to the municipal board, the board

could have a vice-chair who would take hearings and in fact has, in an informal sense, done that on occasion. We do not have a formal vice-chair appointed, but not all commissioners would sit on every hearing.

\* (2230)

An example of what this commission has dealt with would indicate that it would be very clumsy, if you will, or not very efficient to try and get all the Members involved in each hearing. Over half of the hearings would be waste-water treatment lagoon licences, and those types of process need not have more than a three-member board. They have other advantages that one might refer to in having members continue on the panel for a period of time. If you have some expertise that begins to be collected on the part of particular members of the panel, that they might be willing to work more regularly on similar type hearings, it certainly would expedite the process. It gives a reservoir of experience if you allow people to stay on there for some period of time.

I think as a Government we have demonstrated that we want to recognize the independence of this commission. There are still people on there who have been there for a number of years and were appointed by the previous administration.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Madam Chair, that was one of the questions that I wanted to ask. How long have certain members been on the commission, just to give some examples, if there are a number of people who have been on for longer?

The other thing I wanted to find out is the number of hours, the amount of time that these people work in a month or in their tenure with the committee and how they are reimbursed for their time.

**Mr. Cummings:** First of all, other than the chairman, they are reimbursed on a per diem. An example of people who have been there for quite some time is the chairman, who has been the chair for 10 years, Barrie Webster, who has been there for about 10 years. I really do not have even the names, let alone the period of time that each of them have served on the board with me. The fact is that the commission has been in place for quite some time. Most of them were appointed prior to my becoming Minister. I do not think I have made any appointments since I became Minister.

**Ms. Cerilli:** The other two areas of my question were the amount of time that these people are putting onto

the commission and the amount of the per diem. What is the per diem rate?

**Mr. Cummings:** I am not sure if I can give you the precise figure, but I believe it is \$198 for a full day. A full day would include hearings in the morning and the afternoon, and I do not know about evening hearings—evening hearings would constitute another part of a day. Very often when they go into the country, they have rather extended periods of hearings or have two different hearings, one in the morning perhaps, or carrying through into mid-afternoon and then move to another town and have one in the evening if it is deemed it could be wrapped up in an evening session. They do try to structure themselves to do it at as reasonable cost as possible.

**Ms. Cerilli:** What are the considerations when selecting the panel members? I am thinking initially in terms of geographical representation. Are there panel members that represent different regions of the province?

**Mr. Cummings:** Regional representation on a body of this nature has some relevance, but as I indicated earlier, we have placed a fair bit of importance—and I think in the case of CEC we will be placing increasing importance on the backgrounds and the qualifications of people that are involved so that they bring forward that independence of mind and background to deal with some very pressing issues.

Also knowing that one of the problems in filling these boards, of course, is to get people with top qualities and capabilities who are willing to make themselves available on a per diem basis, you do need a spectrum of people and obviously not everyone is going to be an expert. Each member will bring their own individual area of knowledge to a board such as this and regional location is probably not as important as their interests.

**Ms. Cerilli:** With the number of upcoming projects having an effect in the North, can the Minister tell the committee if there have been panel members that have a sensitivity to aboriginal concerns or culture or if there are any aboriginal members on the committee, and if there would be any plans to include these on other committees that would deal with projects that are in the North?

**Mr. Cummings:** The types of panels that the Member is talking about, and the projects that she is talking about may very well precipitate appointing additional people who have specific areas of

knowledge that could be useful to the commission and things that she is talking about are certainly something that will be considered.

**Ms. Cerilli:** When I began that line of questioning, I was asking what are the considerations then when appointing people to the panel? It seems to me, since it is the environment, there is such a broad number of areas—air, water, wildlife. What are the main considerations when selecting people to the panel?

**Mr. Cummings:** There is such a broad spectrum of people who are there that we do have a cross section of interests. For example—without thinking about it, I did not respond directly enough to the Member's question—we do have a person who is quite knowledgeable on Metis issues on the board. We have, as I indicated, people with some technical background.

I think the Member might want to consider, in this line of questioning, the fact that the people who sit on this board do not, in and of themselves, have to be the technical experts that analyze the assessments that are brought forward. They have people available to them, not only within the commission, but from the department to answer questions and to explain the technicalities of certain issues that are brought forward. Really, we want people who are capable thinkers because ultimately they will have to use that capacity to make a decision.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Is it true that there is only a three-week requirement from when hearings are to begin to when the public is to be notified? If that is the case, is changing that to increase the amount of time to give the public more time to prepare for the hearings, would changing that time require a change in the Act, or is that something that would be up to the discretion of the panel?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not think there is a set criteria such as the Member is referring to. It certainly could vary from one project to another. I do not think we would want some of the small projects that are caught up in the process to be forced into a very elongated period, but usually there tends to be a sensitivity during that period.

The fact is that a person does not have to have every technical aspect of a presentation finalized in order to present a concern to the commission. That is what I referred to earlier, that if someone has a concern, for example on ground water



contamination, and the concern is related to the issue that is before the commission, they are quite free to come forward and say so.

\* (2240)

Based on the information that they have available, without providing entirely technical information, by raising that concern they alert it to the commission who can then instruct or question the proponent in order to determine if this is a possibility and what has been done on the assessment to acknowledge that.

The time frame that is allowed there, the implication is that you have a lot of technical work to do in order to respond. That is not the case in the majority of the hearings that the commission goes through. For example, waste water treatment lagoons—we know how to construct a lagoon that does not leak. The question very often is simply are we going to allow it in that particular area. It gets in front of the Clean Environment Commission to allow people to express their concerns. They have to express them relative to environmental matters, but very often degenerates as well into discussion of a planning nature which of course ultimately has environmental impact.

**Ms. Cerilli:** The Supplementary Estimates material gives a run on a list of the projects that are coming up for environmental assessment under the commission. Can the Minister give some clarification of the number of Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 developments that the commission has assessed in the last year?

**Mr. Cummings:** In '89-90, the projects that the commission undertook were: The Town of Beausejour sewage lagoon; the City of Portage, sludge disposal and application; Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting, Namew Lake; Westlake Regional Water Supply, diversion of ground water; R.M. of Rhineland, Town of Altona, CSP Foods; North Duck River Dam, water development and control project; Deago Properties, installation of a sewage treatment plant; Cojef Ltd., burning site; Department of Highways, relocation of Highway 340; Repap, Phase I, modification and expansion of the Manfor Complex; Norquay Holding, water treatment plant; Highway Gardens, water treatment; Airport Holding, water treatment; Whiteshell Holding, wastewater treatment—pardon me, all of those were wastewater treatment; R.M. of Portage,

liquid waste disposal facility; Pelican Lake Enhancement Project; and Ducks Unlimited.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I will read the record, but I would also appreciate a copy of that list. What I am interested in finding out is the number of projects that fall under each of the three classes for development.

**Mr. Cummings:** The list I just read were all Class 1 and Class 2. Repap licence was a Class 2. The majority of them, in other words, were Class 1. A road would be considered a Class 2 development as well.

**Ms. Cerilli:** How would the Minister respond to the concern that the existing Clean Environment Commission, the way it stands, is not capable of handling the Class 3 developments?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, the flippant answer is, not politely. The fact is that there is a reflection on the commission to say that they do not have the capacity to deal with a Class 3.

The fact is, we have indicated we are prepared to add to the commission and make sure they also have the resources that are required. If they need legal expertise, that is available to them. Class 3 licences, which would be very major undertakings, also contemplate that additional criteria might be imposed upon the appointment of members to a panel because of the reflection of the federal interim guidelines, which are still in effect. So I am not worried about the ability to respond as that time approaches, given what I just said and our ability to add to or to supplement, but there is no point in having, considering the number of projects that this province has. We are only a million people.

I have just read a list, that would be quite small, I presume, compared to a lot of other jurisdictions, that we do not need all of the expertise and all of the capacity on hand just in case we might need it. This is a long-term plan. I am sure that we can provide the expertise and the resources as they are needed.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I understand there are plans under the Government's decentralization to move the Clean Environment Commission's office to Steinbach. Can the Minister give a rationale for this move?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, as the Member is well aware, a large percentage of these hearings would have been held outside the City of Winnipeg anyway. The commission travels. There is no reason why they cannot operate out of that location or any other location across the province. It seems to me that it is no different from a number of other operations,

that while there will be some changes from their present location in Winnipeg here, there will probably be advantages to being there as well. Their cost of overhead may very well be lower. It will be further for some members; it will be shorter for others. So that balances off.

As we have indicated all along, in the decentralization process, it has to be reasonable. I do not think that there is a preponderance of reason to leave it in Winnipeg. It could have been put in Dauphin just as easily, or Portage. Steinbach is just as reasonable a location. The fact is, Steinbach has a very good landing strip for those Members who might choose to fly in or proponents who want fly in. It could very well be that they could get there quicker and easier than they could to Winnipeg.

**Mr. Cerilli:** Are there not meetings with a variety of consultants that the staff would undertake, and are these consultants not mostly in Winnipeg?

**Mr. Cummings:** It is just a short trip to Steinbach. Frankly, that would be the consultant's problem if they want to work for the commission. The fact is, that in itself enters into a discussion about reasons why decentralization has relevance more than just to put some jobs in a community. Responsibilities that are in a community tend to attract other activities that continue in association with that. That is what makes a community vibrant.

I do not care if it is the hog plant in Neepawa or whether it is a Government office in another community, the service to each of those requires services additional to just space and air. I do not make any apologies at all for the fact that there may be times when some people who wish to do business with the commission will have to go to Steinbach. Certainly, the commission will also be going to where the relevant areas are when they are having hearings.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Can the Minister table any cost estimates or projections of changes in costs to the Clean Environment Commission because of the move to Steinbach?

**Mr. Cummings:** Their operational budget will be the same.

**Madam Chairwoman:** Item 3.(a) Clean Environment Commission: (1) Salaries \$289,100—(pass); item 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$123,400—(pass).

\* (2250)

Item 3.(b) Manitoba Environmental Council: (1) Salaries \$62,500.00.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Can the Minister explain any changes in the number of people on the Manitoba Environmental Council over the last two years? Has the size of the council changed, and can the Minister explain how many people are involved with the council?

**Mr. Cummings:** There can be as many as 50 to 55. There are a lot of vacancies right now. There will probably continue to be some vacancies for a while until the council and myself reach an understanding of how we can best communicate with each other. Certainly, I value their input but if I do not get it until later on, it is not much good to me. I have had some discussions with the council.

I am sure the Member is privy to the letter that was written to the membership wherein Mr. Neily suggested that I had indicated I would like a smaller council that could communicate more directly with me and me with them. That is not to reflect on the council or the members of council, but perhaps we can contemplate some change in structure that would allow more direct and quick communication. Certainly, there are lots of models that could be used, and it is not meant necessarily to limit people's involvement in the council.

The council has been doing a fair bit of work in terms of analyzing things such as the federal Environment Act. I got the information after they had presented it in Ottawa. That is not particularly useful to me. They have made representations to a number of Clean Environment Commission hearings. I feel that is fair and reasonable, but that is not really a form of advice to the Minister.

The fact is that I want to be able to communicate and I have had, I think, a pretty good relationship with the Members there. I have tried to get their views and to acknowledge their concerns as much as I can but the fact is, it is the system that is holding us up more than anything else.

I hope to meet with the council at their next meeting. I am sure there will be a very lively discussion as to how they see their role and how we may be able to reconcile that with them best giving me the advantage of their advice, because I see an advisory council to the Minister as being able to quickly and efficiently give the Minister advice on issues of the day. The better we can structure that so it works, the better it will be for me.

**Ms. Cerilli:** That raises a number of other questions. To begin with, what does the Minister mean when he says there are a number of vacancies? What is the structure of the committee and what kinds of vacancies are these?

**Mr. Cummings:** The fact is that the Environmental Council has been to a large extent self appointed. They canvas among themselves and ask other people if they want to be part of the council, and then they put their name forward to the Minister and ask the Minister to appoint them.

That can work, but that tends to create a very large body that is very cumbersome to deal with. The fact is that if you look at the Manitoba Environmental Council, the small executive group does make an awful lot of the decisions. So what I am proposing to talk about, and it is very much open for discussion, may not be all that radically different from what they are doing, except that perhaps a model of the national round table whereby the membership is not large, but they have resource people and they have additional Members who are used within the committee structure, but they are not Members of the round table.

That means that you can have as many people as you want who are part of a committee, but not necessarily part of a whole body.

All those sorts of things need to be put together for discussion. I took some umbrage at the council's suggestion that their funds had been reduced. The fact is we provide two staff to them, and additional dollars are the same as they had been previously, except that they were not extended, as I did the year before in advance, permission to go beyond their budget.

They felt that was a reduction in funds. I simply say it is certainly not. They put a high priority on being able to host the national convention here. Those funds were not a tradeoff, because they had already been told to stay within their budget, but we did fund that national meeting here as well.

**Ms. Cerilli:** It would seem to me that if you have that many people, and I would assume that they are coming from all across the province, that \$13,000 is not going to be very much money to get them together. Is there a mandate for how often the committee is to meet? Have they been fulfilling that mandate?

**Mr. Cummings:** I suppose legislatively the only requirement they would have is to meet annually.

The organization, because of the way it is structured, because of the work it does, because of the distances that are associated with operating in this province does not have a good regional representation, which gives rise to the fact that regional committees which file reports to the central committee could have some considerable benefit as well.

There is one thing that I do want to make quite clear. That is that I do not see the Environmental Council as structuring itself in such a way that it starts to form a second Department of Environment. That is one of the things that they have pressed me rather hard on, that they want more expertise so they can analyze works that are going on. I do not think that is a route that I am prepared to move on. What you are doing is structuring a second capacity that we already have through the department. We need to make the best use of the people who are available to sit on the Environmental Council. Some of the vacancies that are out there are people who have never attended a meeting. Some of the vacancies that are out there are members who have been quite regular. Some of the vacancies that are out there are people who have been on the council for long numbers of years. All of this will have some clarity after I have had a chance to meet with them earlier in the new year.

**Ms. Cerilli:** The Minister mentioned a plan for restructuring. With the plan, are there also some ideas for how to appoint people who would be on the central body?

\* (2300)

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not think I can give any more clarity to that. I have simply made the point that I want to have the opportunity to discuss this and look at that as an option. There is no point in my negotiating through the Opposition. I will negotiate directly with MEC.

**Ms. Cerilli:** I would just hope that there would be a concern for getting adequate expertise and regional representation on the panel. I am concerned, though, if the group is not meeting as a whole often, how often is the council being consulted?

**Mr. Cummings:** Primarily, their mandate says that they would provide advice to the Minister, timely advice. I meet with the executive as often as seems reasonable. That has been about once quarterly, I would suggest. We have no exact time frame.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Is there a record of the

recommendations that the council has made? If there is, I would appreciate a copy of those recommendations. I wonder if the Minister can tell the committee the number of the recommendations that have been followed by the department and by the Minister?

**Mr. Cummings:** There are very long, written submissions that come from MEC to my office periodically. Sometimes I get them before the media does, sometimes I get them afterwards. Sometimes I get them before the Opposition; sometimes I get them afterwards. Sometimes I get them sorted through my mail basket in time to be able to make a decision based on that advice. Sometimes they take the form of being criticism of what I have done rather than advice of what I should be doing. I think all these things need to be taken into consideration in terms of how we structure the relationship between the Minister and the council.

**Ms. Cerilli:** By the sounds of that answer, it does not seem like there is a direct line then to the Minister's office. Can the Minister clarify, though, if there is just a simple list of the recommendations that have been made from the committee to the Minister, and if that list can be made available?

**Mr. Cummings:** No, there is not a compiled list. In fact, I have received some rather good presentations from MEC when we meet from time to time with the executive. My criticism a moment ago was related to the structure as much as the advice. I certainly do not object to any advice that they may choose to give me. It is the structure that we put ourselves in in obtaining that advice. It is not structured to work expeditiously.

My communication with the executive is not all that bad. The formal communication from the council to me, because of the size of the council and all of those things that are associated with getting together 50 people from across the province to make a decision on an issue, simply means that it is very preponderous for them to be able to take action.

It was originally structured as well to represent a cross section of environmental groups. The Eco-Network equally represents a broad cross section of environmental groups. I get advice from other bodies as well, as well as from the Round Table. I can indicate that I think the structure is the problem as much as anything. The list of recommendations that they have given I cannot give

you, but certainly all of their communications to me are public. They are circulated to the membership. I would be surprised if you do not already have them.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Of the major projects that I am aware of, it seems that there has been a clear recommendation that has been made. The Minister has disagreed or the Clean Environment Commission has made a decision that has disagreed with the Manitoba Environmental Council.

I had one other question that I wanted to ask. Of the major projects that were listed in the Supplementary Estimates and that the Minister read off that were under last year's Clean Environment Commission, I would like to have a listing of the decisions that were recommended by the Environmental Council. Can the Minister make that kind of a list available?

**Mr. Cummings:** I will provide the Member with all of the information that I have received from the Environmental Council. None of it is confidential that I am aware of. She can go down the list if she chooses and see how many of the licences that we have approved they have disagreed with.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 3.(b) Manitoba Environmental Council: (1) Salaries.

**Mr. Edwards:** I have just one question, Madam Chairperson. Did the Minister consult the Environmental Council on Bill 24?

**Mr. Cummings:** They attended the public consultation process, and I received this morning the results of their recommendation from a Saturday meeting.

**Mr. Edwards:** What was that recommendation?

**Mr. Cummings:** They approved of the principles of what we were trying to do, but they felt there should be more clarity on conditions attached to entering into an agreement. It was very short. I believe the other comment they made was that the strictest or the highest level of assessment would be what would be adhered to.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is the Minister prepared to table those recommendations?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not have them with me, but I can certainly share them with the Member. I was hoping that they would have given me a little bit more clarity on how they approached it. In my personal discussions with the members of the council, I felt that I had a very good understanding

about what we were doing and how we were getting there, and that their support would be there in a fairly large sense. The letter that I received however does not necessarily convey that.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 3.(b) Manitoba Environmental Council: (1) Salaries \$62,500—pass; item 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures \$13,800—pass.

Resolution 45: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$488,800 for Environment, Environmental Advisory Organizations, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

\* (2310)

Item 4. International Institute for Sustainable Development \$800,000.00.

**Mr. Edwards:** On November 8 of this year, in a ministerial statement, Premier Filmon spoke in the House and indicated that the contribution of the federal Government was \$18.9 million.

Madam Chairperson, I recall when this announcement was first made about the International Institute for Sustainable Development. The commitment at that time was \$100 million. What has happened that the commitment now has shrunk to \$18.9 million?

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Cummings:** There was never a statement that I am aware of that was made in terms of the amount of money that would be made available that the Member just referenced.

The fact is that the institute is well equipped to raise additional private funding after having received seed money from both Governments, and I believe it can develop a very credible program by aggressively pursuing private industry. Private industry has, to the best of my knowledge, been responding positively, is prepared to respond. That does not give me a great deal of cause for concern.

The major thrusts going forward from here will become evident as the institute proceeds to lay out its work plans, but to say that this has somehow dropped from a \$100 million commitment is not correct because I have never seen, unless the Member can show me anything other than media speculation, I have never seen where it was conceived that that amount of money would be attached to it.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 4, International Institute for Sustainable Development \$800,000—pass.

Resolution 46: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$800,000 for Environment for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

We will now ask the staff to leave the Chamber so we can revert back to the Minister's Salary.

Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary \$20,600.00.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am going to take this opportunity to make some concluding remarks. I think that it is appropriate at this time to indicate up front that I certainly do not intend to oppose this Minister's salary. As he has quite correctly pointed out, it is a very small portion of the overall budget. While I think that as we have gone through this process we have often, in my experience, raised more questions than we have answered, this Minister has I believe answered with frankness and candor the vast majority of the time. I appreciate that.

I do think that as we go through the term of this Government, my colleague, the Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), and I will become more acquainted with the details of the department. It has been an important, I think, first Estimates process, certainly for myself as the Environment Critic. I cannot speak for the Member for Radisson.

I do appreciate the detail with which the Minister sought to answer on the vast majority of occasions, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Minister. We are not always able to agree. In fact, more often we disagree, but I think that is politics, that is what goes on in this Chamber and I think the Minister understands that.

I do want the Minister to know that we certainly do not question his integrity and his capability as the Minister of Environment. What he does with the authority that he has is something which we quite properly question in this House and have through this Estimates process and will continue to. It is in the spirit of co-operation to seek the higher good, and we all know that we have our roles to play.

I want to thank the Minister for his answers during this process and commit to him our good faith if not our agreement on the issues which come up. It tends to be an issue area that brings passions to the floor. We all know that it is a very sensitive issue in the public forum. It is important not to abuse that, but

on the other hand, people are interested to know the answers. It is an issue of particular importance, as it should be for this province, as we move forward to protect and enhance the environmental riches with which we find ourselves and which all of us want to pass on to future generations.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 1. (a) Minister's Salary \$20,600—pass.

Resolution 43: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,953,800 for

Environment for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** The hour being after 10 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow (Tuesday).

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**Monday, December 10, 1990**

**CONTENTS**

**Concurrent Committees of Supply**

<b>Family Services</b>	<b>2748</b>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>2765</b>