



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 68A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 16 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 16 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Branch Report on spring runoff prospects as of May 16, 1983.

The Manitoba Water Resources Branch reports that while significant runoff is expected from last week's snowstorm in western Manitoba, overbank flows are not expected on streams in the area. Rivers and creeks flowing off the Riding, Duck and Porcupine Mountains will experience peak flows from the snowmelt runoff late this week. These peaks will be much lower than those experienced during April. The Branch cautions that the situation could become serious if significant additional precipitation were to fall in western Manitoba this week. The situation will be monitored closely and further reports will be issued as required.

The storm of May 12th and 13th produced 25 to 40 millimetres of precipitation in areas of western Manitoba from the United States boundary up to Mafeking. Adjoining areas of Saskatchewan and North Dakota received similar amounts. Most of the precipitation was in the form of snow. The snow is expected to melt gradually this week.

The Water Resources Branch reports that while streams are expected to remain within their banks, the additional runoff from the fresh snow will raise the water level of Dauphin Lake a further 0.15 to 0.30 metres during the next few weeks. This will result in further flooding of low-lying areas surrounding the lake. The additional snowmelt runoff will also raise the water level of the Shellmouth Reservoir by a half meter or so. Unless there is above normal precipitation the next two weeks, it will not be necessary to increase the outflow from the Reservoir.

The Branch further reports that last week's snowstorm produced heavy precipitation over the Souris River Watershed. This will result in a longer duration of flooding along the Souris River in Manitoba. Whereas flooding from the International Boundary to Hartney was expected to cease in late May, it will now likely extend well into June. While river levels may rise somewhat, peak stages will remain well below those of April.

The Water Resources Branch further advises that heavy precipitation during May in Northern Manitoba has significantly increased the flood potential of the Nelson River and the lower Churchill River. Spring runoff

has barely begun in these watersheds. Localized flooding problems are likely on the Nelson and lower Churchill Rivers and their tributaries later this month.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. J. PLOHMAN introduced Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 63 students of Grades 9 to 13 of the Bawating Collegiate of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, who are here as guests of the Windsor Park Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Elliot and Mr. Daniel. Windsor Park Collegiate is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

There are 80 students of Grade 9 standing from the Spring Valley School under the direction of Mr. Riches. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

There are 26 students of Grade 5 from the Cranberry Portage Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Neufeld. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Housing.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

National Research Institute - location

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

In view of the fact that there was an extensive study done during 1980 by the Manitoba Research Council and the National Research Council that recommended in September of 1980 that the task force recommends the establishment of a National Research Institute in Winnipeg to conduct applied research, development and manufacturing science and production technology on a national scale, and in view of the fact that the National Research Council recommended to the Federal Minister that it go in Winnipeg at that time; also in view of the fact that the report and study recommends the institute be located in central Winnipeg, now that the Federal Minister has announced the National Research Centre to be built in Winnipeg after extensive study done by the Manitoba Research Council and the previous provincial government under the auspices of the previous provincial government, can the Minister of Urban Affairs tell us whether the government has

decided or have they made any decision on their recommendation as to where the institute should be located in Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're pleased that the Federal Government has made the long-awaited announcement on the location of the facility in the Province of Manitoba; in particular, in the City of Winnipeg, and we are engaged in ongoing discussions with the Federal Government and it is our suggestion, our proposal, that the facility be located in the downtown inner-city area of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly happy that it's going to be where this report, which was done in 1980, has recommended it.

Development north of Portage Avenue

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs what group of private industry people, business people and residents of the downtown area will be involved in the decision-making on the upgrading of the north-of-Portage project, which they are presently going to work on.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There has been ongoing discussions with residents, resident organizations, in the north Portage area as late as last week, and I met with the representative of the formal organization that has been formed of residents and tenants in the north Portage area, and I would anticipate further discussion with them.

I am also pleased to report that there is ongoing discussion with members of the business community with respect to the further activity in the downtown area, and I will be meeting later tonight, as a matter of fact, with six or seven of the major land developers in the City of Winnipeg, who wanted to meet and discuss the private sector involvement in the north Portage development. So that process is continuing, Mr. Speaker, and I would anticipate that it will continue until such time as we actually see projects under way.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A further question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure the House that there will be research and extensive studies done as to the effect of any decisions that are made by the City of Winnipeg regarding this project, and can the Minister also assure this House that there will be more studies and research available to him to make decisions before he makes the decisions as he did with the first proposal that came forward from Mr. Axworthy? There are obviously no statistics or studies to justify that project whatsoever. Will there be studies and statistics available before decisions are made?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that there will be certainly a lot of further study done with respect to the kind of developments that are being reviewed for the north Portage area. The three levels of government have committed themselves to a task

force that has started meeting and is going to meet on a continual and regular basis until such time as we are able to finalize the proposals for development of the north Portage area. But I would hope, Mr. Speaker, those studies are not going to drag on, because it seems to me that it's obvious to anyone who lives and works, or goes through the City of Winnipeg to see that the City of Winnipeg, in particular the downtown area, is in somewhat devastated state.

If we allow for present trends to continue as they have for the last couple of decades in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have a city in Winnipeg that's going to resemble a doughnut where we are going to see the downtown area a desolate and unoccupied space and having all the commercial, residential and industrial activity on the peripheral. I don't think that any Manitobans, any residents in the City of Winnipeg want to see that.

So while we are going to review the projects in detail, use the expertise that's available from all levels of government and the private sector, Mr. Speaker, it's not our intention to have this kind of project bogged down in studies for any great length of time, because I think it's important that we do have focused attention in the downtown area sooner rather than later.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, just one further question, the Minister has mentioned that there will be the formation of a steering committee to make decisions. He did say that they would be having discussions with developers in private industry. Will somebody from that group be on the steering committee? Also, Mr. Speaker, will there be people from the City of Winnipeg on that committee so that the commissioners will not have to write a report in two weeks to let the Minister know what is wrong with it and what isn't wrong with it?

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

It might make things if the member is asking questions, and he asked a similar question last week, that if he would listen to the answer, because as I indicated to him in questionings last week, there is a task force that is being established with two representatives from each level of government, which does include the City of Winnipeg naming two representatives to that task force to review the planned projects and to do the necessary research and study that the member talked about. The task force has not set its specific terms of reference down, but I'm sure they will include consultation and discussion with a wide variety of people in the City of Winnipeg including developers from the private sector, so I can assure the member that process will take place and will include all the concerns that he has mentioned.

Saskeram - grazing and forage leases

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, it's the time of the year that livestock farmers and ranchers are turning their cattle out to pasture. I'm aware that the Minister

has a request from The Pas area farmers and livestock raisers to use some 60,000 acres of the Saskeram area for forage and grazing purposes. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the season is upon us, my question to the Minister is, is it his department's intention to issue grazing and forage leases on the Saskeram?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, for many years it has been policy to allow a continuance of agricultural leases that exist on the far side of the Carrot River. There are longstanding arrangements, and people continue to graze livestock on the far side of the river, and that portion of the land base is not included in the existing Saskeram Wildlife Management Area. It is a matter of concern on the part of farmers in Northern Manitoba to expand their agricultural base; that's well understood. It's also a matter of concern from the point of view of those who are anxious about the continued propagation of wildlife that the Saskeram Wildlife Management Area continue in existence.

That longstanding issue has been discussed on many occasions. My staff and I have had consultations with all interest groups in The Pas on two occasions, also in my office, and we have been considering the representations of all those groups and I can advise you, Mr. Speaker, that a decision will be made in respect to that before the conclusion of the existing Ducks Unlimited lease which expires on July 1st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of what the longstanding practice up there has been, and I'm specifically asking for the request that he has for the use of an additional 24,282 hectares or some 60,000 acres, that is in addition to the current leases of the Saskeram to be used for forage and grazing purposes. Is the Minister giving that request from The Pas area farmers serious consideration?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, The Pas Farmers Association have made clear their desires to see a larger amount of land available for agriculture, including an additional acreage in what is now the Saskeram Wildlife Area. That request is under consideration, as is all of the requests of others who are interested in the Saskeram area. A decision will be made in due course and an announcement will be made then.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the agreement expires with Ducks Unlimited on July 1st. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, we'll still be in this Chamber on July 1st. Is it the Minister's intention to renew the current agreement with Ducks Unlimited with respect to the Saskeram?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, while a decision has not been made in respect to renewal, of course that is one of the concerns that government has, to confirm arrangements in respect to any renewal, and of course that decision will be announced in due course.

Jobs Fund - staffing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise the House how many new staff have been hired to administer the Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there have been staff that have been hired to administer the Jobs Fund. They have been working for some number of weeks. I would have to take the question as notice in order to obtain the precise number for the honourable member.

MR. B. RANSOM: Would the First Minister also advise the House how many people have been seconded to assist in the administration of the Jobs Fund?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would take that question as one of notice as well.

Loan Guarantee Program - crop insurance

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate whether current crop insurance coverage holders, who own incorporated farms, will be refused crop insurance coverage either this year or next year by deciding not to sign the requested personal guarantee form?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, last week I reported on that matter, I believe, in the question that was raised by the honourable member, indicating that this practice has been in place for approximately four years. The question that he raises is one that I will have to specifically take as notice to find out whether such refusals by the corporation have actually taken place. I'm not aware of that, but I will take the question as notice and report back to the honourable member and will want to review that practice that he has raised.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister for that answer and I would appreciate if he would indicate not only the number of refusals, but indeed whether it is the intention of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation to refuse coverage next year, should an incorporated farm client decide not to sign the personal guarantee.

I have a second question for the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate how many approvals there are to date under the \$100 million Loan Guarantee Program and how many approvals have been refused by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to date?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the question relating to crop insurance that I've taken as notice, the

honourable member should be aware that the crop insurance contract remains in place unless there is a cancellation by either party, and I will check, as I've indicated, the situation regarding his question of cancellations because of the corporate nature. With respect to the Loan Guarantee Program, as of May 11th, the report that I've had, there were 152 applications received, totalling \$9.7 million, approvals of 116 for \$7.1 million, 10 were declined for \$590,000 and 26 were in process as of May 11th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Could the Minister provide information as to how many farmers in the Province of Manitoba have asked the assistance of the Credit Advisory Committee that the Minister has set up and having provided that information, could the Minister indicate whether any of those farmers, deciding they wish to use the mediation process available through that committee, how many of those decisions have been made by the committee?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice so I can get the information. As of last week, I had no further reports from the staff that I had given the honourable members earlier, indicating that there were approximately six, I believe, inquiries that were made, and whether they have been taken to the review panels, I will have to check that and provide the information for my honourable friend.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Chairman of the Provincial Land Use Committee. Could the chairman of the committee indicate whether the Provincial Land Use Committee is currently contemplating changes in provincial land-use policy No. 10, whereby mutual use of wildlife and agricultural land, the policy will be changed, thereby de-emphasizing agricultural use of multi-use lands?

A MEMBER: Oh, oh.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the policies that were recommended in 1975, which were then approved by his government, were reviewed by the new administration and have been approved in their entirety.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I take it from that answer then that the Minister is saying there are no changes being contemplated to provincial land-use policy No. 10?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time there are no intentions to change any of the land-use policies. Should there be an occasion whereby certain land-use policies should be reviewed from time to time, that will occur. But at the present time, there are no intended changes to be made to the land-use policies.

Broiler Board - Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Friday last, the Minister of Co-operatives took as notice for

the Minister of Agriculture a certain set of questions, and I'm wondering if I can pose the same questions or whether the Minister wants to respond at this time.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs took questions as notice on my behalf in my absence last week concerning the Natural Products Marketing Council's consideration of a request by the Manitoba Broiler Board to lower the exemption from 1,000 to 200 broilers. The honourable member should be aware that there is a concern nationally as a result of unregulated product. Primarily, Manitoba and the western provinces have been faced with the movement of unregulated product from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Manitoba, along with New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, are the only provinces in the national agreement that do have exemptions. And over the last number of years, there has been in Manitoba somewhat an increase in the number of producers who have been producing unregulated product. Albeit, the regulated product is a very small portion of the total national quota, which I believe is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 34 million pounds for Manitoba. As I understand it, the marketing board's recommendation to council is that these producers who are and have been producing unregulated product be issued quotas and be licensed so that their production rates be protected. However, this would of course limit the entry of new producers into the industry over and above the 200-unit limit as has been requested by the board.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate whether the government would support a decision that would come down from the Natural Products Marketing Council on that basis, because it seems to me that it's the basic right of individuals on the farm to supplement their incomes, if you believe in the family farm concept. I'm wondering whether, indeed, the Government of the Day is prepared to withdraw that right to any individual who wants to move in and raise broilers under 1,000?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that any provincial agreement, and in this case it was the Conservative administration that saw fit to enter the national agreement, which does impose along with it certain conditions in terms of the national relationship, and there are four provinces now only that do have an exemption. All the other provinces who are within the national agreement have no exemptions, so that ostensibly the only kind of production that can be allowed on a farm is for domestic use within the family. So that the only provinces that do have exemptions are New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Whether or not we support - we are awaiting the recommendations from our council - but what I do want to ensure is that the production rights of those producers who have been producing broilers for many years are protected and they be allowed to continue that practice.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to draw out that point. The former Tory

administration in their wisdom decided there should be that basic right of 1,000 available to everybody, and the fact that other provinces aren't doing it is not a defensible argument. So my question is: What rationale has changed, bearing in mind that "larger" is more efficient today, why is all of a sudden "smaller" needed to support the whole program, and what is the rationale for dropping from 1,000 to 200?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the recommendations and decisions have not been made. The honourable member should be aware, as I indicated earlier with respect to the national agreement, there is concern nationally within the agreement that there has been overproduction which has impacted on the price to producers who are in the national agreement. As a result of overproduction, we know that we've had product dumped on Manitoba and Saskatchewan markets, and there are provinces who are out of the agreement. If one is to join a national agreement, which his administration saw fit to do so, there are certain responsibilities in which one has to maintain their share of the bargain; and that is that the national agreement and discussions nationally are targeting on overproduction of unregulated product.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You hate the little guy, that's all.

Rentalsman's Office - work backlog

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Housing. What does the Minister propose to do as a result of a recent report that the Ombudsman's office has had double the usual complaints with respect to the Rentalsman's office because of his department's inability to deal efficiently and effectively with the affairs under their jurisdiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting side light to the real question. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, while there has been an increase in complaints to the Ombudsman's office, that goes beyond simply the Rentalsman's office. There has been a 90 percent increase generally. Clearly, the Rentalsman's office has been taxed thoroughly over the past number of years. There has been approximately an 85 percent increase in the number of complaints that the Rentalsman's office has been receiving.

Mr. Speaker, I did meet with staff this fall to discuss the problems and the prospects for the Rentalsman's office and as a result of that meeting, I was able to add additional staff to the Rentalsman's office in the number of four officers and a couple of clerical staff to deal with the backlog.

The reasons for the tremendous increase in the number of complaints going to the Rentalsman's office is, I think, self-evident. As the economy tightened up, clearly, individuals were not as willing to let a number of dollars escape from them. They went after them by way of complaints through the Rentalsman's office and to the Ombudsman and, certainly, we're cognizant of

the problem. We are confident with the new staffing at the Rentalsman's Office and with the increasing degree of expertise that the new members are acquiring that they will be able to deal with the significant backlog and to be able to deal with the complaints as they're coming.

The number of complaints going to the Ombudsman's office, numbering 20 thus far this year, while I think it is certainly a concern; it is not an overwhelming number. There are approximately 120,000 rental units in the province. If you work out 20 complaints over 120,000 units, I think that landlords and tenants have shown a remarkable degree of amiability and a remarkable ability to overcome their problems in another fashion.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister what he is proposing to do about it, and he just attempts to rationalize the situation with a simplistic response. We could take an equally simplistic response and say that the increase coincided with the change of government.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that one of the reasons for the increased activity is because the Rentalsman's office now declines to answer simple questions from the public over the telephone and instead requests that they formalize any questions or concerns so that a file can be opened and dealt with in a formal manner. In other words, they are soliciting complaints, which gives them a backlog and overload, and now they're not able to deal with the matters under their jurisdiction.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I object to the honourable member's premise. I did not rationalize it; I indicated to the honourable member that I had met with the Rentalsman's staff and I took the problem seriously. I indicated we had added additional staff. Those additional staff obviously require some period of adjustment and period of familiarizing themselves with The Landlord and Tenant Act and how to deal with cases. I'm convinced that those people are on stream, that they are building the experience that's needed to deal effectively with the problems that they are facing; that as they are more capable of assuming a full workload as the other more experienced officers had, that those problems will be dealt with. Certainly, we will be monitoring the situation and if additional staff is required, then so be it.

For the member's edification, the increasing number of complaints that are being experienced by the Rentalsman's office did not coincide with the election of the new government. If the member would care to confirm this with the Rentalsman's office, he will find that the increase in number of complaints was begun in early 1980 and, in fact, the years 1980-81 saw a 46 percent increase in the number of complaints, and the years 1981-82 saw a 26 percent increase. So the member's premise was wrong on both fronts, and although I acknowledge that there continues to be a number of problems that the Rentalsman's office faces, we will be dealing with them on an ongoing basis.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister would also like to take credit for the fact that in the first quarter of this year, there's an 85 percent increase

over last year in the complaints to the Ombudsman's office. So he can deal with that one; but what is he going to do about the matter which I brought to his attention and the matter that I brought to his Deputy's attention earlier this year of the Rentalsman's office clearly soliciting complaints; not dealing with simple questions over the telephone but saying, put it in writing and formalize it, otherwise we can't deal with it. They are contributing to their own workload problem, and what is he going to do about it?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, certainly, what the Member for Tuxedo is suggesting may have happened from time to time and, certainly, when you are dealing with experienced officers, they may wish to have something in writing because they don't have the degree of familiarity they should. Certainly, if there are ways to streamline the procedure; if there are ways to provide offhand advice that in some way can protect the parties that are involved, then we would look into it. But clearly we are providing, in some instances, a very detailed response and to provide those kinds of answers off-the-cuff is sometimes dangerous to the parties that are asking the questions.

Payment of Wages Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of answers for the Member for Turtle Mountain who asked last week again about the payment out of the Payment of Wages Fund for a number of young people who were due the monies in his constituency. I am pleased to share with him the information that those cheques have been written and tomorrow will be forwarded, some of them, to Brandon, a few of them kept here in Winnipeg, all the young people contacted to come in and pick up their cheques and sign the necessary documents. So that information, I'm sure, that he will be happy to receive.

The second item, just a few moments ago the member asked a question about the Jobs Fund Unit, which is the name that — (Interjections) — I wonder if the members want this information. I would be happy to just leave it as a question taken for notice. The Member for Turtle Mountain is listening, so I will continue. Obviously he is looking at his leadership over there as well, his leadership position I mean.

The Jobs Fund Unit is made up of approximately ten people. These people, with one exception, all come from inside the government. In other words, they were civil servants before who were sort of picked from the long list of people who wished to be a part of this Unit. We had quite a few people who indicated a lot of eagerness to be a part of this exciting prospect and project.

The Senior Manager formerly was with the Department of Education and through the TAP Program came to the Jobs Fund. I think that I covered that rather extensively during my Estimates, so I won't go into detail here. Two of the managers transferred from other departments to the Jobs Fund Unit. With the exception of the one short-term contract employee, who was hired for a specific, specialized task, the

balance of approximately six people come from within the Department of Employment Services and were redeployed to this task. This was made quite easy and possible during the reorganization of that department from Manpower to Employment Services.

Highway repair re oil industry

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Highways relating to the highway system in Manitoba, particularly the oil industry or how it's related. I, first of all, would ask the Minister of Highways if he would agree that the tremendous mini-oil boom that has taken place in southwest Manitoba and the delivering of that oil to the pipeline drop at Cromer is contingent upon the fact that we need a good highway system to deliver that resource to the market?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the member should be aware that we did take some initiatives in the area with respect to taking over some municipal roads into the provincial road system in order to accommodate the need for an upgraded road system for the oil haul. Now that doesn't mean that is adequate at this point in time.

The other point that should be taken account of, Mr. Speaker, is that there is some pipeline activity that is taking place which will alleviate the pressure on the road system once the pipelines are operative. An assessment has to be made of that before we decide how far we go with major road reconstruction.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister is not naive enough to appreciate the fact that while you're waiting on all this pipelinerwork and all the activity it would take to make a decision by the investors in that quantities of oil and the fact that easements of rights-of-way across private land holdings would be a necessity, is the Minister aware that in view of the fact that his department and his government has cut some \$10 million from the Highways Branch, has removed some of those funds from the southwest area of the province, that there are now some of the highways, specifically 256, are now impassable, because of the heavy weights of oil trucks and the total overloading of these highways with the amount of resource that is being put over those highways? Would he, today, check on Highway 256 particularly between No. 2 Highway and Cromer, as I was there yesterday and have had pictures taken, and have those bad spots repaired so that the oil industry could use that road as it is the shortest route, as well for the local residents for school buses, for people who want to seed their farms and to haul grain on those roads, that he do put a priority on that area and spend some money to upgrade the road that is there, Mr. Speaker, and not shut off the valuable flow of income that the Minister of Finance is so capably and ready to take to spend in other areas of this province? Will he upgrade that road, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that at this time of the year there are many roads that are not in good condition because of the nature of the thawing process and what it does to the grades throughout the province, and the fact that hauling any amount of tonnage over these roads at this time of the year is indeed very aggravating to the condition of the highway. I believe that our district offices are aware of the problem that the member is alluding to and that regular maintenance is always there, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we have short-circuited the maintenance program.

To the extent that there is any reconstruction required, that is something that will have to be looked at for the future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of provincial income or a large portion of provincial income is now coming out of the oil fields and in view of the fact that the road system will not help accommodate that, will the Minister of Highways resubmit to his Treasury Board and his Treasury Bench a request for the \$10 million that was actually cut out of his funds from last year and put it where it will do the only bright spot on the economy any good?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, of course, must recall that only 10 days or so ago we did go through the Estimates of the Department of Highways and have had ample time at that time to discuss these issues. I don't believe much has changed since that time.

Sherritt Gordon Mines - NEED Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Could the Minister tell us whether he has received a reply to his application under the NEED Program from Sherritt Gordon for employment assistance at the new Agassiz gold mine and, if he has, what his response will be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we did have discussions with Sherritt Gordon. We indicated that we were interested in the further development of Lynn Lake. We indicated that our preference was to look at the joint activity with them. They are considering that. We also indicated that we would consider a revised application from them with respect to the NEED Program and that we would consider it favourably if it met the criteria because the first one didn't meet the criteria.

That substantially-revised application from Sherritt Gordon Mines regarding the Agassiz Mine has been

received; we've looked at it from the departmental perspective; it meets the criteria from the provincial perspective and we'll be recommending to the committee, the Federal-Provincial Joint Committee that the province support this and I would assume then the Job Funds money will be allocated to the NEED Program to ensure that this particular program is underway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you. I have a supplementary question to Minister of Energy and Mines.

Even if Agassiz Gold Mine does reopen it'll only provide jobs for about one-third of the people who will be laid off when Fox Lake Mine closes. I wonder if the Minister can tell us what other activities he may have in mind for the future of the Lynn Lake area?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yesterday, the Minister of Northern Affairs, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and myself met with representatives from the Lynn Lake council, and other community representatives where we outlined a very large program that is being undertaken by the Province of Manitoba to try and look at the medium-term problems facing Lynn Lake when the Fox Lake Mine runs out.

We indicated to them that we have undertaken a three-year program of assistance through the Community Mining Reserve Fund which has helped the community weather this particular storm that they've had to face over the course of the last two years.

We've indicated that we've changed the priorities within the department to reallocate geophysical work to the Lynn Lake area. We also have reallocated funding through MMR so that we could undertake a more concerted effort, Mr. Speaker, with a number of private companies in the area for joint exploration and development because only one-third of the people employed at Sherritt Gordon would, in fact, be dealt with by the Agassiz development if it took place, and there are many ifs facing that.

We are at the final stages of negotiating a \$1 million joint effort between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government for increased activity on both our parts in that area.

So, Mr. Speaker, we've indicated to the local community a very broad deep approach on the part of the government to try and deal with those particular problems facing the community of Lynn Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the

Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. SANTOS: We are now in Item No. 1.(e)(1) Manitoba Horse Racing Commission. The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when we closed off last Thursday evening I was discussing with the Minister what appeared to be an overpayment of remuneration to the Horse Racing Commission. I want to make it very clear that there is no accusation being made on this side of the House that somebody has gone away with any money. I'd like that to be made very clear. But the fact of the matter remains that in November or December of last year, the existing commission paid themselves for a full year, and they had only started to work on April 31, 1982. The Minister explains that's the time they started so they paid themselves for a full year, and the Auditor confirms that's what happened. The overpayment is the three months of remuneration to the commission, which is basically a prepayment on the commission's remuneration because the calendar year of the Horse Racing Commission is December 31st, 1982 or the calendar year.

The Minister says it's kind of awkward, that it doesn't coincide with the province's calendar year. I don't think that really holds water because the commission could be changed at any time. It just happened that it was changed in March, somebody could resign during the year, and there could be a decision made to change the commission at any time. It's at the will of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

The Minister also said that the Order-in-Council calls for a yearly remuneration. I don't know whether the Minister has checked with the Auditor's Office, but I think she would find if she did, the fact that there is a yearly remuneration brought down by Order-in-Council, there is nothing to say that commissioners cannot be paid on a monthly basis. As a matter of fact, when I was the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the members of the corporation or the board made the decision to pay themselves on a monthly basis. I would like to suggest that shouldn't be done, because at the present time if we get to next December, then the paid commissioners then pay themselves for a year, we go onto another year where they are prepaid, and we won't be getting the remuneration of the commissioners into the calendar year of the Manitoba Racing Commission.

I don't personally think the commissioner should have taken it on himself, the chief commissioner, to pay themselves or approve the paying of himself and the other commissioners ahead of time or prepaying them without permission or some sort of authority from the Minister's office, and I would like to say, Mr. Chairman,

that I hope the Minister during the past couple of days has considered this situation and made the recommendation to the commission to get their remuneration onto the same calendar year as the Horse Racing Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: As the member has pointed out, it is the Act that states the level of honorarium and does not designate when it is to be paid, therefore, it is within the rights of the commission to determine when. They chose to go two-thirds of the year without any honorarium and then to take a lump sum and presumably go the next third of the year without any. I agree it would be more convenient for all of us if the calendar year of the Horse Racing Commission coincided with the fiscal year of the government. In fact, we are moving to do that.

It would also be more convenient if we had a common approach to remuneration which presumably would go on a per-meeting basis rather than a mixture of that and honoraria. Honoraria, as I have experienced them in some areas of the voluntary sector, it's a grant in lieu of out-of-pocket expenses, in some cases to enable people to take part in the activities, and it's often a lump sum prepaid. At least, that was my experience with it in a voluntary organization where I remember receiving the queenly sum of \$100 a year.

I do think it would be easier for all concerned when we get the standardization accounting, and I have noted all the suggestions from the member.

Just for clarification, the commission was appointed March 23rd, 1982, and the same commission was in place until the one resignation April 13, 1983, which was, in fact, over the year, although I do accept the possibility of some shortening of that term and some awkwardness that could come if there had been a prepaid honoraria. I suppose there could be a rebate situation, but I do note the fact that it's probably not as convenient as the other way around.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to still have the opinion that the Racing Commission cannot pay themselves on a monthly basis. As I mentioned, the provincial auditor would prefer, whether the Order in Council says 7,000 for the Chief Commissioner and 4,000 for the commissioners, does not stop them from deciding to take their honorarium on a monthly basis. I would like to suggest that they start that, and then we don't have any problem whatsoever with the calendar year and we don't have any problem whatsoever with the situation if somebody happens to resign and they have been prepaid, or if the government decides to change somebody. I wonder if the Minister is - I'm saying that it is possible and it is desirable that they pay themselves monthly or they do not prepay themselves at any time.

HON. M. SMITH: I have already said that I would undertake to review it, but there may be a different pattern of remuneration that's under consideration to get more standard decision across the board. But I have noted the points raised by the member and will certainly consider them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to pose a series of questions to the Minister regarding the sharing of revenues from some of the exotic betting and some of the events that transpired to the change in ownership of the track over the last year-and-a-half.

I am wondering if the Minister can tell me what agreement was struck, verbal or written, as to the sharing of some of those proceeds, some of the exotic betting proceeds as regards the Standardbred breeders and the Thoroughbred breeders.

HON. M. SMITH: The total was \$584.3 thousand, that's \$584,300, of which \$275,000 went into the Emergency Fund; \$100,000 into the HBPA purse overpayment; \$38,000 into the Sire Stakes Program; \$107,500 into the Breeder's incentives; \$46,700 into CTHS Administration grant; and \$17.1 thousand undistributed.

MR. C. MANNES: Not really understanding what all those classes are, I still pose the question: Was there a verbal agreement other than what was finally determined as far as division of the \$584,000? Was there a verbal agreement in existence that was different than the breakout that was ultimately achieved?

HON. M. SMITH: The amount in advance was not known and there was an agreement with the various parties on the proportionality so that the slight differences might be based on the number of races where the various groups were involved, but I can undertake to get a report in greater detail on how that agreement was arrived at and how it worked out.

MR. C. MANNES: I don't really have to know that. I suppose I would like to know though who has the authority to, first of all, reach a decision as to the sharing of these proceeds, and secondly, who has the right to vary them after the fact?

HON. M. SMITH: The commission has that authority with the approval of the Minister. Perhaps, if I could draw your attention to Page 2 in the Annual Report, there is a description of the process followed.

In March, 1982, the government amended The Pari-Mutuel Tax Act to provide for an additional levy equal to 5 percent of the monies wagered on three or more horse-feature pools, sometimes called the 5 percent surtax on exotic wagering. It was recommended by the horse racing industry review that was commissioned by the previous government in 1980, called the Industry Review Study. It was intended to address the need for increased purse levels and enhance programs for the racing sector.

The commission met with the five groups which constitute the racing industry in Manitoba - namely, the Thoroughbred horsemen and breeders, the Standardbred horsemen and breeders, and the operator of Assiniboia Downs - numerous times during April of 1982 with a view to reaching a consensus on the allocation of the proceeds of the surtax.

A unanimous agreement was reached and the commission recommended to the government that the

proceeds be divided equally between the horsemen and the breeders for a purse and breeder support, with a portion of the funds so divided being used for certain capital improvements to the backstretch area.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I thank the Minister for reading that to me. I had read that some two or three weeks ago, and I'm glad she brought it back to my recall.

I'm wondering then, looking forward as to whether a decision has been made, going into the new track here, as to what the split will be under the proceeds of this surtax.

HON. M. SMITH: The same deal has been worked out as last year, except that the horsemen have obligations respecting the emergency fund payment and purse overpayment.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, can the Minister be a little bit more definitive?

I think there was a formula laid down; at least there was one that was contemplated going into the former year, but because of the emergency, it was varied. I'm wondering what the formula is specifically. Or is it laid down on paper specifically what the formula will be for sharing of the proceeds?

HON. M. SMITH: We can either wait and get the information right now or I could undertake to table it with you at our next Session. There are details in the Auditor's Report that give the breakout.

I draw your attention to 3(b) where there is a comment on the Purse Overpayment. So that's with regard to Winnipeg racing. The No. 4 does give the detail on the Emergency Fund.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it is my problem in that I don't have a whole overall understanding of this particular area or not, but I guess I am trying to determine whether there has been an agreed-upon formula at this point going into the new racing year as to how these surtax revenues will be split. In other words, for instance, do the standard horse breeders know what share will be coming their way in this current year regardless of what the total pool is of proceeds?

HON. M. SMITH: It is a complicated area. I can get more detail for the next session, but basically the Standardbred are a different group. They are tied in with the winter racing, the harness racing. So it's the Thoroughbred where we have the split between the breeders and the horsemen. There is arrangement if they - and the Emergency Fund maintaining it at a certain level. If there is any imbalance in last year, the adjustment is agreed on for the upcoming year in the 50-50 splitting, but it's a negotiated settlement with them.

MR. C. MANNES: Then moving into the next season of the Standardbred season which would be next fall — (Interjection) — no, not the Thoroughbred season . . .

HON. M. SMITH: There is no exotic wagering with Standardbreds. Sorry, sorry. The same pattern, the 50-

50 split between the horsemen and the breeders where there is exotic wagering. That is where you are into the guessing end of the betting, the Exactors and that.

MR. C. MANNES: So the Minister is saying now that there is some form of exotic betting within the Standardbreds racing.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, we're gradually arriving at the point I want to arrive at. Is the Minister now saying that there is a formula that determines at 50 percent of the revenues under the exotic betting in the Standardbred season to start this coming fall - the fall of 83 - that will pay out to the Standard horse breeders some 50 percent of those proceeds.

HON. M. SMITH: It's still being negotiated for the Standardbred, so that I really can't report on the final arrangement. It's a negotiated settlement.

MR. C. MANNES: Are these negotiations being actively conducted at this moment in time, and what is set as a date for the completion of those negotiations?

HON. M. SMITH: I know there have been preliminary negotiations and the final will have to be, of course, before the next meet starts, but within that, I can't give you any precise timetable on it. I would assume that as the Thoroughbred season is moving along smoothly, that then the planning for the next session will be under way.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to also ask the Minister something regarding the Standardbreds, and probably it doesn't relate to the Assiniboia Downs at all. It relates to the rural circuit for this coming summer of Standardbred racing in Manitoba, and I believe it does come under the Horse Racing Commission. Is that correct? Could the Minister give me information as to the breakout on the purse structures there and the support for Manitoba breeding that comes from the province in that particular field?

HON. M. SMITH: I have this in the form of dollar amounts, not percentages. The Great Western Circuit, the purse support is 151,000; the breeder's award, 63,400; the sire stakes, 20,000; the capital improvements, 33,000; for a total of 267,400. The quarter horse activity, purse support in breeders, 11,500; capital improvements 25,000; for a total of 36,500.

MR. H. ENNS: In the quarter horse stakes, the 25,000 in the capital improvements, where does that occur?

HON. M. SMITH: I think we discussed the quarter horse meets last Session, and there are incidentals involved in operating those. It might have to do with starting equipment or something of that sort, but this last year,

we in fact spent around 7,000, 6,8, 6,800 for that. It's still under negotiation with the Standardbred as to what their needs are, but it is there in order to permit some upgrading of the . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mind you, we're talking quarter horse now, not Standardbred. Are we not?

You indicated there is 25,000 for capital improvements.

HON. M. SMITH: The amount of money, 25,000, is there, and then interested communities that wish to run a quarter horse meet apply for some of that if they require it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: To date, what applications has the Minister on file for that amount of money?

HON. M. SMITH: We've had one from McCreary and one from Rossburn.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Has there been a dollar figure attached to either one of them in their request?

HON. M. SMITH: No. I presume they have indicated their interest and would discuss with the Commission their requirements.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Last year the Minister indicated there were \$6,800, I believe, in capital improvements. Was that to the Rossburn quarter horse track?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: There was no money spent last year then on the McCreary track.

HON. M. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. H. GRAHAM: There is 25,000 available in this year's Estimates for capital improvements for quarter horse racing in Manitoba during the current fiscal year. Is that correct? That's subject to Ministerial approval, naturally. I would imagine the Minister would have to approve of the capital improvements before a grant would be made, or is it just a blanket?

HON. M. SMITH: The Minister approves the guidelines and criteria for expenditure on the capital side, and then the Commission would administer that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Has the Minister established the guidelines then?

HON. M. SMITH: No, that's part of a development process that the Commission will be undertaking in negotiation with the industry.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So there are no established guidelines. The Minister approves the project subject to the approval of the guidelines, and there are only two applications so far in the field. Is that a correct statement of the present picture in quarter horse racing in Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes. I think what we are getting is a developmental situation and we don't know - when we only had one or whatever, we didn't need much of a program. It could be a once-only recommendation but, as we are moving into more interest in the field, we'll be developing a more sophisticated program.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Has there been much dialogue between the communities of McCreary and Rossburn and their Quarter Horse Associations and the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission in the last six months?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes. They are in touch.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Has it been on a steady ongoing basis, or has it been sporadic?

HON. M. SMITH: My staff inform me, it's ongoing. I can get more precise information if the member requests.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, Mr. Chairman. I am just interested. I want to know if there is a sincere interest in the communities. We know there is 25,000 available. We're rapidly approaching the quarter horse racing. If the guidelines haven't been established yet and the communities are still in dialogue, I would hope that there are some parameters established very quickly so that these two communities can take part in the capital projects, because there appears to be 25,000 available to assist them if they know what direction they have to go and what criteria they have to meet to qualify for those grants.

So I would hope that dialogue is an ongoing one, and that there are not too many undue stumbling blocks placed before the Quarter Horse Association in McCreary and in Rossburn, because I believe it's a new, exciting field of racing that has moved up from the southwest of United States where it is very active and very strong and gets large support from the community at large. I see a growing interest in it in Manitoba here, and we are certainly going to be the pioneers in this area, aside from a small segment in Alberta. I think that there is a great future here in Manitoba for quarter horse racing, and the Minister is showing some courage in stepping out and putting forward a lump sum of 25,000 for capital improvements for the current fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on Schedule F in the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission Report, it has a list of incomes that the licence fees bring in to the Commission. I understand - in fact, I have some figures before me - that there has been a considerable increase in all of these licences. They went up for the Standardbred meet and then they went back down, and now they are in place again for the year of 1983.

I might say that I called the Commission Offices last week and asked if I could have a list of the previous charges and the new charges, and I didn't get it. When I phoned back, I was referred to the Minister's office. Rather strange that a public document of that sort

would get that reference, especially to a member. Also rather strange when there are probably 1,000 people out there working and I bet I could get the same information from 500 people. It seems rather silly that the Minister's office demands that. They tell the switchboard operator to call her office for this public information.

Nevertheless, the owners went up from 11 to 25, trainers 21 to 25 - that's the information I have - vets, 16 to 25; jockeys 16 to 25. All of these people probably are making a little more money every year and they can probably afford to pay more money.

I know that the licencing is just basically an identification for anybody that goes onto the track and the costs of film and pictures is getting fairly expensive. As a matter of fact, officials were \$3; now they're \$5, but they'll gain a dollar because it used to be \$3 for each meet. Now, if a person is an official behind the wickets for both, they'll be better off.

Trades people now have to pay \$10 instead of \$6 for their licence; sponsors go from \$5 to \$10. But there's one listed on the auditor's report and it's called backstretch, and usually referred to as grooms and people that clean the stables. Very often, in fact, they are a group of student employees, young people who work out at the track, and theirs went from \$3 to \$10.00. They have to pay a very large increase to work at the track. That doesn't seem fair to me when we want summer employment at the track, and I'm sure they'll all pay it, but it's almost another tax on their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister approve these increases, and why would we have an increase of that size on jobs that are usually summer jobs or unemployed people looking for work?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I'm sure the member recognizes the fact that we are operating a business at the track and one of the cardinal principles, I think, when one is operating a business is that one watches very closely both the outgo and the income.

The outgo costs have been rising steadily - materials, the film for photo licences - the charge for people to process the occupational licences has been going up at quite a steady rate and yet there has been no increase in the licence fees from 1975 through to 1982.

We felt that since our whole thrust this past year has been to put the track on a sound well-managed basis, that these increases were justified, and it is our reading that the people involved in working at the track want a soundly operated track. They realize it's in their best interest that we have such a track and we haven't had really, to my knowledge, negative reaction to these increases which admittedly look high on a percent basis, but in absolute terms, or if prorated over that period of time, are really very moderate.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is just telling me what I told her; that we fully realize costs have gone up, but it's hard to understand that the cost of films to take the grooms and the sweepers and everybody, those kids that work back in the backstretch, that the cost went from \$3 to \$10 to take their picture. I am also aware that when they have this particular licence, they bring the horses up and they can stay around and be not in the jockey club, but can be part of the racing activities.

I probably will receive the same answer from the Minister, but I think \$3 to \$10 for probably the lowest paid people at the track is not taking consideration of those people. I think the Racing Commission should take a look at that particular area of licence fees, because it took probably the highest percentage jump on the people that make the least money at the track. That does not sound like an NDP Government philosophy.

HON. M. SMITH: I think an NDP Government philosophy is to achieve balance and good management and, in our opinion, a prorated increase over eight years is that really we're caught in a catch-up situation and we want the track to run in a businesslike way. We want the decisions about how many people to hire and what wages to pay, and so on, to be made in full recognition of legitimate costs.

I think it's very poor business practice not to reflect some of that in the charges, and the longer one delays adjusting, the more serious it would be. I think if we were dealing with fees three and four times higher than that, a phasing process would be desirable, but I don't in all honesty feel that the commission has made too abrupt a change.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and I, neither one of us will win. The trainers, I can see if they're getting more money, they can pay more. They went from 21 to 25; that wasn't too tough on them. The owners can go from 11 to 25; nobody's complaining. Jockeys, if the purses are higher, they're going to make a better percentage; and vets, if their services go up, they go up. Officials are probably getting a little more money. But the group of people making the minimum wage out there, which is one of the largest groups of people on the track and usually summer employment kids, went up the best percentage of most. The Minister, maybe they feel that can be justified - personally, I don't think it can - but if that's the decision of the commission, we must just abide by it. Certainly, if the Minister agrees with it, it's there. I can assure you that it would be changed if I had anything to say about it.

HON. M. SMITH: I think the trick in good managing, as I understand it, is to keep these things moving in some kind of relationship to one another. We're dealing with a dynamic system.

The member opposite might recall that we do gradually increase the minimum wage and I think that if you looked at the total picture of the wage and the licence fee over that 1975-83 period, that you really wouldn't find too much imbalance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(1)(a), Operations, Strategic Planning: Salaries - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I wonder if I could ask the Minister the Strategic Planning - they were involved in in the departmental issues and program development, federal-provincial agreements. I would assume they are still taking on the same responsibility, but I wonder if she could give me an outline of what the Strategic Planning Department is zeroing in on, specifically in the department at the present time.

HON. M. SMITH: This department plays a role within our department and also in the Economic Resource Investment Committee for the economic activities of the government at large, and I guess that is an enlarged role from before in providing the approach, if you like, to do what we call strategic planning which is really the front-end planning one is required to do before zeroing in on planning the next year's work, trying to keep a watching brief, if you like, on the general economic conditions in the country and in Manitoba specifically, keeping us up to date on trends in the markets, keeping a watching brief on the changing programs and policy programs of the Federal Government and keeping us in a ready position to get the most we possibly can for Manitobans out of new federal programs, influence them in our favour, where we can, and I guess identify new opportunities in each of the sub-heading areas.

Because the mandate of this group has been expanded from the departmental activities to include the total economic activities of the government, we've been going through quite a transition where we review very carefully the things that have been done and identify those things which, in some cases, tasks that have been completed and can now be set aside, others which are no longer as relevant in order to free up time and resources to tackle the broader issues.

As we said last year, as a government we believe in looking at the full range of public, private and range of joint venture partnership-type activities and evaluating where we should put our limited resources to get the most gain in the area of jobs, quality of jobs and stronger economic structure for the province. We don't prejudge which is better, to sort of retain in the Crown corporation field, or which should stay in the private sector, or which should maybe move to some kind of partnership arrangement.

What we are looking at is the best return for the people of Manitoba, and whichever method is best designed to meet that end, that's what this group will recommend. So, in a sense, they provide the ears and the eyes for some of the broader economic issues for the government, and then help us focus in on our particular programs to see that we're getting the most effect for the dollars and time spent.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, that's an outline of what they're doing. I said, are there any specific areas they're investigating at the present time?

HON. M. SMITH: Each grouping is doing their future forecasts and recommendations for the coming year. So, they're in a sense, always a jump ahead of where we're at at the moment. The current changes that have resulted from work they did back awhile, as I say, staffing the ERIC Committee and, therefore, helping to plan out the studies for some of the energy and mines activities, Crown investment activities, forestry, field and then for our own working with industry and trade in the technology field, having provided us for the, I guess, building on much of what the member will remember was done in his time and which he referred to in the House today, the recognition that we must move ahead in our manufacturing and industrial technology.

They were largely responsible for recommending an increased allocation of resource to the technology

centre and the launching of the CAD/CAM Initiative, that's assisting local manufacturers to understand the relevance of technology and the application of it to their operations. They have helped in developing the Venture Capital Program, which is attempting to meet the shortfall in venture capital for small innovative companies here in Manitoba. They've helped develop the Buy-Manitoba Program, which is our approach to procurement policy, very little protectionism in it, but a lot of how to get increased access for local firms to government purchases, how to see that government procurement is designed in such a way to be accessible to local firms, how to explore on occasion when it might be desirable to give a preferential price to a Manitoba firm, but within very tight limits and never of a permanent nature.

The other side of that, of course, is the Trade Initiative, because one of the key things in building a stronger economic structure here is import substitution on the one side, which we can do by meeting more of our own needs ourselves, but also in trade promotion. They are helping to develop along with the trade group in the Industry and Trade section a thrust for a kind of focused use of our trade resources. They have helped to negotiate the extension of the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement and worked through the best arrangement we could to keep those monies flowing during the extension period. Of course, they are working with our federal counterparts on what are to be the replacements of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(1)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(2)(a) Technology, Salaries - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, is the Director - this usually has about three or four people in it or five people. There has been no change in the complement of staff. Just the one question, the Director of Technology is still working with the Manitoba Research Council?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I know that this will come up under 2.(e) very likely, Enterprise Manitoba, Manitoba Research Council, but are the boards of the Technology Centre and the the boards of the Food Centre still responsible to the board of the Manitoba Research Council?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well I can discuss it further along, and the Director works with the Manitoba Research Council. In this section of Technology, we have the Technology Centre and the Food Centre. That's fine, pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(2)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(3)(a) Industrial Design, Salaries -

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Minister was questioned on Industrial Design in the House. I'm sure she was referring to the Enterprise Manitoba agreement when she said

the money was running out or had run out. The Industrial Design agreement is still in force with the Federal Government and there are still funds there, aren't there?

HON. M. SMITH: The applications that were on hand when we negotiated the extension are really enough to use up the monies available in that program, so we really don't have monies there. I would remind the member, and he would probably remember it better than I, the establishment of a lot of the design assistance work was an attempt, (1) to raise the awareness of firms here of the importance of good design; (2) to give them some experience with a good design program; and (3) to not make them dependent or keep them dependent on the support of a government design program. To a very large extent, that has been successful.

I am just reminded here that our best estimate of what remains in the program over and above the work that we have committed is around 38,000.00. So it's definitely in a wind-down condition.

The other valuable work that has been done by this group is helping our firms access federal monies support for design, and we have managed to lever a great deal of money there quite successfully.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Isn't this the section where we had the Premier's - it is the section where we had the Premier's Awards and we had all kinds of - we had a separate board to administer the applications for industrial design funds from the Federal Government? Is this going to end? Does the board go and we will not have an Industrial Design Section?

HON. M. SMITH: No, every other year the Premier's awards have been held. We are recommending a repeat of that, but I guess we will be having it on a somewhat more modest scale. The Design Institute is still in place and, as you well know, they have been very active in educating their own member groups or perhaps acting as a conduit between their own specialist design groups and the business public as to the role they could play. They will be in charge of running the Premier's Awards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(3)(a) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the board is still going to be there and, of course, the board is administering applications which does make use of a tremendous amount of federal money. The board also does make recommendations on how the director would operate. There was, as the Minister says, counselling, all kinds of counselling being done, recommendation and - well pardon me, counselling and education as to the value of good packaging, good advertising; in other words, making your product presentable to the market. The board also worked with the director on making the suggestions as to possibly what seminars should be held and what industries they would be focusing on at any given time.

Now I am just a little confused in this respect that the board is still going to be there. There is still going to be federal money there, and you have a budget for the Industrial Design to still advise small business on

the advantages of good design. Where is it ending? What is ending in this whole process?

HON. M. SMITH: The direct funding for the actual design project under the DASP program. The other activities will be continuing. — (Interjection) — Will be continuing. It's the direct grants that won't be occurring, but their goal and the reasonable expectation of federal money that will be accessed through the counselling and existing groups to identify their needs and make application is about \$4 million. That goal has been set looking at the past experience and it's within that ball park of monies that they've been able to secure in the past.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Fine, that's what I was interested in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(3)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(3)(b)—pass - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I just have one comment on (b) Other Expenditures. It's about one of the few Other Expenditures that has an increase, so I imagine that they will be giving I believe the services they gave before, versus nearly all the Other Expenditures are down.

HON. M. SMITH: That increase is attributable to the Premier's Award which occurs every other year, so it was down last year and up this year but, as I say, it is a more modest undertaking than in previous years. We thought in keeping with the times that an equally sincere recognition of good design, but a more modest public event was appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(3)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(4)(a) Human Resource Management, Salaries - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: There's an increase of one person here or one SMY. The salaries are up - excuse me, just one second, Mr. Chairman, pardon me. That's correct, the salaries have increased which the Minister has explained on several occasions, but you've got an increase in salaries of \$23,500.00. When you take the increases of the salaries of the people that are there now, what type of personnel was hired to Human Resource Management? It doesn't seem that there's a lot of money left for an SMY when you subtract the increase in salaries from the \$23,500.00.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, there is a straightforward explanation here. There was a secretarial position transferred in from the Regional Benefits area, and so that accounts really for the increase; there's a director, a secretary and a consultant. In fact, that secretary had been withdrawn last year and we found that the workload was such that it made more sense to have that person in this group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(4)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(4)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(5)(a) - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it had been brought to my attention that there were two people that were

no longer with this department and the SMY's haven't changed. Has there been a change in the personnel of this department?

HON. M. SMITH: There has been a cutback in the activities of this department, but we have a couple of people on a redeployment list and so they remain here until we have them redeployed.

The purpose of the cutback in this department was that some of the activities, we checked through the regular reports and analyses that were being done and some could be done less often or had outlived their usefulness. We wanted to increase our allocation in the technology field in the MRC and that's really where the new thrust, if you like, is being put.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(5)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(5)(b) - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, how can you have a \$10,000 drop in Other Expenditures if you have the same amount of people? I know the Minister has mentioned that the activities of the department are not as great, but a \$10,000 drop in Other Expenditures when you have the same number of people. I'm well aware that if you have the people in that department there's lots for them to do as far as research is concerned. I don't suggest for one minute, or I wouldn't think for one minute, that the people that are on redeployment are sitting around doing nothing. How can you have that type of a drop in Other Expenditures? The Salaries - there's a lot of people in that department. The Salaries are basically the increase, but Other Expenditures I can't understand that kind of a decrease and give the same service.

HON. M. SMITH: When we reviewed the output of this department, each item or each area of work was looked at: (1) in terms of its current benefit; (2) had it completed the task originally set out for it? (3) could it be done less often?

What we concluded was that those were very important and useful community reports. I know the member will be familiar with them. We feel that a good base has been established for those reports and that they can now be updated every two years and continue to serve the purpose for which they were intended.

There are other smaller areas where we made the same kind of judgment. The peoples' time will be devoted to providing more tactical research support for line branches, and in some cases doing some anticipatory work rather than doing a lot of service type projects on request. In our estimation we will have a tighter operation there and that we can in fact manage within the figures as recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(5)(b)—pass; 2.(b)(1)(a) Industry and Trade, Administration, Salaries - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I notice the Administration has gone up by one in this department. Are we looking at support staff, or are we looking at increased executive staff?

HON. M. SMITH: We added a strategic planner to this group to work in conjunction with the Strategic Planning

Department in both the industry and the trades section. We are taking a targeted approach on the industry side to attracting new investment here. We know that we cannot compete on a dollar-for-dollar or incentive-type plan, so we knew that we would have to refine our information in a much more targeted way to go after companies that would be interested in coming here. To prepare a lot of that material and assist with the focusing, we've put a planner in that position. We have been carrying out the same type of activity in the trades section.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You mentioned there is a strategic planner with this group. Earlier in the Strategic Planning Department, you mentioned working with them, and I can see the value of having him there.

Is the strategic planner doing analysis of the type of business that would be suitable for Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: I would say that the strategic planner has helped the people in the industry side focus in on how to go about identifying businesses that would likely be interested in Manitoba, looking at our comparative advantages, the types of companies where there would be a high probability of investment here, and then in a sense making the - rather than having the sectoral people sort of covering the waterfront, it's producing a targeting.

That is not to suggest that hasn't been done before, but one thing about strategic planning is you can't base this year's plan on last year's awareness of the world out there, because the world out there is changing in the economic sphere. It has changed very rapidly in the past year, so we feel that we have to make sure that we are assessing changes in the broader world against that background, focusing our own activity as well as we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)(a) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the strategic planner be the person in the department working with the Strategic Planning Department that would decide, say, if there was somebody walked into the offices as sometimes happened and says, we're interested in Manitoba? Would they be in the position of advising the development officers whether to proceed with that particular program, or not?

What I am saying is that there are lots of times when people should take the advice of the provincial Industry and Trade Department as to what has proven to be successful in Manitoba and what has not and what they feel could be a bad investment. There can be a lot of time wasted on projects that are not going to end up being desirable or geographically right for this province. Does the strategic planner make the decision as to whether the development officers proceed or not proceed?

HON. M. SMITH: No, I think the operational staff deal with the firms that come knocking on our door and say, we're interested, what do you think, or what can you tell us to help us come to a decision. They are involved in a co-operative process of sharing what

information we have, listening to the special needs and interests of a potential investor and then helping them plan the next steps. In those cases, it's the investor that is going to make the final decision, but we certainly lay out the red carpet and assist them in whatever way we can.

The strategic planner is really enabling us to have another dimension to our activity and that's an outreach, a going out and looking for firms which we can entice here. Then, since you can't just send people out, go forth and seek out willing investors; you have to do some advance work. You have to select what size of firm or type of firm or type of sectoral activity might indeed have an opportunity here, fit well with our particular geography and cost structure, the whole thing. It's assisting with that sort of analysis and then in a sense helping to plan the outreach program. That's really in the industry side.

On the trade side, of course, it's helping provide some of that knowledge of the opportunities that are out there and the particular difficulties involved in trade, the support programs that are around, and then trying to make a proper marriage of people with potential to sell with countries or other firms with potential interest to buy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Just one question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. Who would share it before it goes on between the provincial planners and the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce economic development planner? Do they move in isolation of each other, or do they co-ordinate any of the planning together?

HON. M. SMITH: The co-ordination comes through having our people attend, available to provide information. There was a luncheon today which I would have liked to be at. The ADM from that section sits on the Winnipeg Enterprise Development Board. I know I get their regular reports and read them very carefully. I think we both, along with the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, all like to take a little bit of credit for the NRC lab because I think we all did our part in our respective roles to promote it. So I would say that the information-sharing and the co-operation is there.

MR. R. NORDMAN: When I was on City Council, I sat on the Economic Development Board for a number of years, but it just seemed that we were moving in our own circles. My experience was that there was only one time that there seemed to be some co-operation between the province and the city to get something in. It's just interesting to know that they still move almost in isolation to each other.

HON. M. SMITH: I was with you up until the last comment when you said that they move almost in isolation, because I think it was the opposite impression that I was trying to . . .

MR. R. NORDMAN: Well, it certainly has improved then.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, and I would hope that we find better ways to collaborate, because our role has to be

to try to help the private sector to do a better job. Sometimes we're taking advice from them and sometimes they are getting some thrust and help from us; I think that's as it should be, but I think the informal contact that goes on is quite extensive too. I think if we noted the number of times we've rubbed shoulders in various business shows and meetings - certainly, I give every encouragement to the staff to maintain sound contact and make every effort myself to do likewise.

A MEMBER: Thank you, Madam Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)(a)—pass; 2.(b)(1)(b)—pass; 2.(b)(2)(a) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the increase in salaries, first of all, is I imagine attributed to the standard increases and there has been another two SMYs added to this group. Are these two SMYs new development officers?

HON. M. SMITH: No, one of the persons is an administrative secretary; the other is a director of business evaluation and assessment.

We found ourselves increasingly dealing with companies which were having severe financial problems or were facing very difficult decisions for the future, and we felt we had to increase our own capacity to deal with this end of things. So many of our consultants were used to dealing with the development, the start-up end of things, and what we were facing with quite a few companies was the imminent danger of bankruptcy and receivership. So we felt that putting a person on staff who had special talents in this area would be a great boon to us and also could help increase the skills of our own staff.

I might draw your attention to a news release that came out recently when John Buhler, the President of Farm King, identified that he had been introduced to the opportunity to acquire Standard Industries. I think it was called, through the efforts of Bill Kinnear, who was a senior economic development officer - actually, it was in the Small business Development Branch of our department. I guess when we meet some of these cases, we need a good financial analysis in order to give good advice. Occasionally, when they're also looking for government assistance, we just have to be more familiar with the whole receivership bankruptcy, refinancing end of things, and that's why we've put that person on.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us who that person is and what his experience was? Did he come from the department or the government?

HON. M. SMITH: It was Bill Kinnear, who was a chartered accountant with a lot of industrial experience. I think the little note I just read you from the news release probably was inaccurate in saying he was with the Small Business Development Centre. Really, he was our business and evaluation assessment officer coming out of this particular branch, but since we do make available among our divisions the expertise we have available, that's why he was so helpful to use in that particular negotiation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(2)(a) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And the other person is a support staff person?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, an administrative secretary. As you know, we have very busy senior consultants in that department, roughly allocated to main sectors; and for their work to be effective, having the administrative support, is really worthwhile.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Was Mr. Grant's salary in this department?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes. He was a consultant in the aerospace area.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. Grant's contract hasn't been renewed and what I'm looking at is a \$230,000 increase in Salaries. Now, if the new people even were at \$100,000 - I doubt if they're at that - we'd be a little bit out of line. Can the Minister explain that increase in salaries? You've lost one person.

HON. M. SMITH: Maybe, I'll address the loss. We do have a senior development officer in aerospace who is sort of on staff. Mr. Grant was an extra consultant in the aerospace industry and, as you know, if there is enough work in an area, in a sector, to have a staff person, it works more economically to have them on staff than on a straight consultancy basis, although, Mr. Grant did do valuable work for us when there was a certain volume of work. You might recall that he also served us very very well as one of the two people who moved into Winnipeg racing and helped operate out at the track during the interim period after the receivership.

The reason that the salary total is so high, apart from the fact there are two new people on staff, is that what we have in this branch is probably one of the most powerful - and I use it in the sense of skill and ability - senior consultants in the government. Each one is responsible for a particular sector of the economy, and in order to act as advisors to government and consultants to industry in a sector, they are people with wide experience and they do command a very fairly sound level of salary. They have a high classification and, as the member knows, we are dealing with people who made their way in the private sector for the most part. I guess for government to retain people of good quality we must, if not match the best of the private sector, which we probably can't aspire to do, nor can we go too much beneath it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't questioning Mr. Grant. I know his contract wasn't renewed, I know him very well, and I know that he's very satisfied with what he's doing right at the present time. I'm aware that these fellows are highly paid employees of the Provincial Government. As a matter of fact, there are people in the government who wonder why they should have the salary they have, and I'm sure the Auditor's Department raises their eyebrows sometimes at their expenses, but they do have a specific job to do. But

if the increases had of been 20 percent, which I doubt that they were in one year, that would have been around \$100,000, and there's still about another \$90,000 for another two people. You know, I'm going to the extreme. I'm aware that these are well-paid employees, but an increase of 230,500 in their salaries with only one administrative staff and a new development officer status, or close-to-it status, plus the fact that there has been one person dropped seems to be an excessive increase. I'm aware of the fact that the staff sitting behind you are accurate people and don't make that many mistakes, but that seems like an excessive increase.

HON. M. SMITH: I should just correct one thing. The consultant fee for Mr. Grant did appear in the expenditure column before. Our reason for preferring the staff position where the volume of work merits it is just our general preference for that as a more efficient way of organizing our activities. We were very pleased with the work done by Mr. Grant, but the volume of work just did not merit ongoing consultant work. Should there be an opportunity or a particular problem arise where our sectoral person was unable to handle the task in the time frame where we needed the work done, we would, of course, move to the consultancy field again, but we didn't feel that was a regular staffing pattern we wanted to adopt.

The increase does look high, but I remind the member that if you take the two salary increases that occurred in that time frame, plus the 27th pay period and realize that you're dealing with one of the highest - 13 of the 17 people are very highly placed in the civil service range - it does, I assure you, come out to that total. I think it's been quite accurately arrived at.

The chief value, as I said, of these people in this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, we are breaking the proceedings of this committee for Private Members' Hour. We shall be back, hopefully, at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of the Environment and Workplace Safety and Health. Item 6. Worker Advisor Office (a) Salaries - Mr. Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: Just a couple opening remarks on that; the Worker Advisor's Office was originally formed last year in response to what we believed was a need for assistance for claimants involved in Workers Compensation claims. It's a major program of this government and one which we believe will serve injured workers and the Workers Compensation system in this province extremely well in the future.

We have opened offices over the past year in Winnipeg, Thompson, Brandon, and an office serving the Flin Flon-The Pas area. Those offices have been made available to injured workers, and we believe we have had a sufficient or an encouraging response from workers in one respect and discouraging in the other.

It is encouraging to know that the office is so needed and that it has gained such widespread acceptance in its short history. At the same time, it's discouraging to note that there are so many workers who believe they have claims with the Workers Compensation Board which have not been dealt with in a satisfactory fashion.

The advisors have received since their inception - the opening of the Advisory office in September, 1982 - over 6,350 phone calls. They have opened 310 new cases and had a number of files reactivated, and they have finalized 108 cases since that time. So it's been a fairly active program over the last year and one which we think is serving the public well and will continue to serve the public well.

There are no anticipated changes in staffing levels or in the delivery mechanisms for the upcoming year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister rises out of his statement that the worker advisors have settled 108 cases. Could he indicate how many cases have been finalized favourably to workers?

HON. J. COWAN: We believe they are running on average about 70 percent that are finalized in favour of the workers, or where the worker is satisfied that the claim has been finalized to the degree to which they had wanted and expected it to be finalized; 30 percent, therefore, are not finalized in that manner, and the worker still has some disagreement as to whether or not they had received their full and just service from the Workers Compensation Board system.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get down the full figures. How many cases have they dealt with during this period of time?

HON. J. COWAN: The most recent figures I have, as of the end of April of this year, indicate that they have assigned new cases to a total of 310 and have reactivated 11 files. They have finalized 108 of those.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise how many - or perhaps he can confirm for me. I'm working from his press release of last September. It would appear that there are a total of seven worker advisors in the province, four in Winnipeg and one each in Brandon, Flin Flon and Thompson, and that there is an overall director. Is that the case?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, that would be the total number.

MR. G. MERCIER: Have there been new offices opened in these various locations? My understanding is, I believe, that Workers Compensation Board had offices in these localities. Are these all new offices?

HON. J. COWAN: There was not an office of Workers Compensation Board or the government in any of those areas previously, except for Winnipeg, to deal with cases of this nature. There was an individual in Thompson who was doing some Workers Compensation Board work; there was an individual in the Department of Labour who was doing part-time work as a worker

advisor, but they were not working out of Worker Advisor offices per se, so this is an entirely new program in that regard.

There are offices in those locales which I mentioned earlier. However, they are using existing locations and areas for the most part except for the city. In the City of Winnipeg, there is a new office complex itself.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise whether the total sum shown here, \$347,000, for worker advisors includes all of the salaries and compensation to the advisors, the directors? I assume there is some secretarial staff. Does it include the furnishings, rent, office supplies, all of the expenses of the worker advisors? Is all of that included in the total figure of \$347,000.00?

HON. J. COWAN: I understand the only item that isn't included is the rent which is covered by Government Services. I guess that's the way in which that is done, I understand, or practised.

I also apologize to the member. I have to revise my figures. When I gave you figures previously, I was doing it on the assumption that they had been from September 17, 1982, to April 30, 1983. What I did in fact give you due to an oversight on my part was the 1983 figures. The total cases that have been assigned for 1982 and 1983 is 913 in total. I would have to find out how many have been finalized and reactivated in that regard.

MR. G. MERCIER: For clarification, the Minister has indicated the 913 cases for 1982-83. Is he saying the figure of 108 being finalized is not the correct figure for that total number of cases for 1982-83?

HON. J. COWAN: I do apologize. The wrong figures were my fault. There have been about 200 cases finalized, and there have been about 913 new cases assigned in total and then a number of files reactivated, but it would be a minor number in comparison to the 913. It would be in the area of 10 to 20, I would imagine. So using 900 as a rough figure, out of the 900 new cases that are cases they're working on in an active way, about 200 have been finalized.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain the delay then in not finalizing the other 700 cases?

HON. J. COWAN: There are a number of reasons for the delay, but I think the most prominent one is the fact that the Workers Compensation Board is handling a large number of cases right now. They do not have the capacity to move more cases through their system in order to expedite this. They are working on ways of making their operation more efficient, and I'm certain we'll have an opportunity to discuss that under their particular section. In the meanwhile, some of the cases are taking longer than they would like them to be and longer than we would like them to be.

It must also be noted that these are in a large part the most difficult cases. These are the cases that have defied satisfactory resolution to both the board and the claimant in the past. So there has to be a considerable amount of research done on them; you

are almost always involved in an appeal process, and that takes a great deal of time. So it's been a matter of trying to deal with a backlog of cases going back to - well, going back several generations at least - and I can get you the date of the oldest case that they are working with, but it goes quite far back - trying to review those cases, get all the necessary documentation together, developing the briefs, presenting the briefs and taking them to the board.

So you're dealing with the most complex cases, firstly. You're dealing with a board that is trying to deal with a large backlog and develop some new policy in other areas. That combination has resulted in what we consider to be a response time that will be improved over the future, and one which we would seek to improve over the future, as soon as we can get part of the backlog out of the way.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the usual procedure that a worker advisor would follow in dealing with an average case?

HON. J. COWAN: They would most likely be contacted by either the claimant or a representative of the claimant. They would then have an interview with the claimant either by phone or in person if possible. They would then take down the necessary detail on that claimant's case as a result of that interview. They would then go to the Workers Compensation Board or request from the Workers Compensation Board the file on that particular claimant. They would review the file.

Sometimes those files are four, or five, or six, or seven inches tall; perhaps even thicker in some cases going away back. They would, on the basis of that review of the file, work with the claimant either to develop new material to go in the file, and that may include a new medical report, or a new report from the employer, or just new documentation on the part of the claimant himself or herself. If they felt that it was appropriate, they would prepare a brief if necessary to take to the Board of Commissioners.

In some instances, they will go directly to the Claims Department and present the case there. If, in fact, it's accepted at that level, then that's been an easy case. That is a rarity to date because you're dealing with very complex cases in the first instance, but in the end they could end up going before the board with the claimant and preparing a brief and presenting that brief on behalf of the claimant.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain, how do the worker advisors deal with the medical information?

HON. J. COWAN: The worker advisor does have access to the medical information. The instructions which I have given to them, and I think those instructions are contained somewhat within the legislation itself, does in fact provide for them to see the medical file, to review it, to advise the worker if they believe there are any inconsistencies in it by way of indicating that perhaps they should see a specialist in this regard, or perhaps they should see a doctor to look at this particular area and then have a medical report submitted to the board from that new doctor.

They do not share the file with the claimant himself. They've been instructed not to share the file with the claimant himself or herself. They can use the materials in the file in respect to a submission to the board as long as that submission is only given to authorized persons. By that, I mean persons who are authorized to see the medical files under the existing legislation.

So that's the way the system should work. That's the instructions which I have given to the worker advisors in regard to access to medical files. They can use it to provide information of a general nature, to provide direction of a general nature, and they can use it in a presentation to the board if, in fact, unauthorized persons are not seeing the file itself.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested. Is the Minister saying that the worker is not entitled to see the medical reports?

HON. J. COWAN: That is my instruction to the worker advisors, yes, that the worker does not, as a normal course of action, get to see those reports.

Now, what we want to do over a period of time, and I have been involved in discussions with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the different associations in regard to opening up medical files to the claimants themselves, so that they don't need to rely upon the worker advisor to give them direction or advice in regard to the medical file.

What we would have in that instance, if we proceed in the way which we may, would be a worker being able to go in and see their own file. Then, of course, it would be a matter of the worker advisor not having any difficulty at all in providing the medical file to the worker once they had received the necessary authorization from the worker.

Now, workers can see their own file by obtaining it from their own doctor as it stands now. In other words, a worker can go to a doctor and say, I would like to see my file which you submitted to the Workers Compensation Board, or the report actually - I shouldn't use it to interchange with - I would like to see the report which you submitted to the Workers Compensation Board on my claim. And the doctor then can give access to the report in that way.

MR. G. MERCIER: To use an analogous situation, Mr. Chairman. In a normal claim that is not brought forward by a worker advisor, is the claimant entitled to look at all of the medical information?

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I'm bringing a new outlook to a particular problem. Can the Minister explain why the worker is not entitled to look at all of the medical information?

I raise it, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to me, as one who has had some experience with a personal injury claim in the normal course through the courts, that there is an obligation on both parties to exchange all of the medical information. I'm interested to know the rationale for this type of action.

HON. J. COWAN: The rationale is historical and longstanding. As well, the rationale is something that I have some difficulty, as I think the member himself has some difficulty in accepting.

I indicated earlier that I had been reviewing this matter with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, with the Manitoba Medical Association and with other representatives of other organizations who have expressed an interest in access to medical files in the past. I've also had discussions with individual claimants who feel the fact that they cannot get access to their medical files prevents them from being able to present the case that would be best suited for their defence.

I believe there are a lot of reasons to justify access to the medical files. I think we would agree on most of them. I also know that, historically, access has been denied not only in this province but across the country. As of the last number of years, court cases in British Columbia and I believe in Quebec have opened the medical files held by the Workers Compensation Board to the claimant. In other words, the courts have come in and said you have no reason to keep this information from the claimant. So it's not only what I perceive to be your opinion and my opinion, but it is also the opinion of the courts in those two provinces, at least, that workers should have access to their files.

There are a whole number of reasons they should. Firstly, they would want to know if in fact the medical profession or their doctor is saying the same thing to them that their doctor is saying to the Workers Compensation Board; in other words, they have obviously had involvement with their doctor. They have discussed the matter with their doctor, and in fact their doctor has most likely indicated to them that they believed their case to be either compensable or not compensable. They would want to make certain that same information was being given to the Workers Compensation Board. More importantly, they would want to make certain that opinion was being given to the Workers Compensation Board. That's one reason.

The second reason is that doctors are not infallible. Sometimes they have opinions, and I underscore and quote that word, "opinions," that may not be shared by another person of the medical profession. When working with those types of concerns, there is room for honest doctors to differ in their opinions; it would be difficult to tell which doctor has a correct opinion. So if a worker does not have access to see his or her medical file, they don't really know what opinion that particular doctor has given to the board. Therefore, they don't know if they should go to another specialist or to another doctor. They don't know if they should seek a second or a third or a fourth opinion as the case may be, so they have to build a case around incomplete information.

Thirdly, that file is their property as far as I'm concerned; it belongs to them. It is about their body; it's about their medical condition, and there is a general philosophy that says they should have access to it. There are relatively few other instances, if any, where an individual would be denied access to those files if they requested those files.

Now, they can always get the files from the doctor, if in fact the doctor permitted them to have those files. Sometimes the doctors charge for those files - or charge for those reports, excuse me - and they charge a significant amount of money for them. There was one instance in the paper just the other day where a doctor was charging \$300 for a report. Doctors have to make money and they have to do it in a way they know how

best, but at the same time those same files are already at the Workers Compensation Board. So should the claimant have to go outside, to their own doctor and pay \$300 for them when they could go down and see all the rest of their file, but not be able to see that particular report?

In other words, the doctor has already said, I'll give you the report, but it's going to cost you a sum of money which I feel equivalent to the amount of time which I have to put into the process of developing a report - when in fact the report that they really want to see is already there. So there is an inconsistency there.

Now, why is it that the files aren't accessible to the claimant? We are talking only about the medical files. The record should be clear that all the other files are accessible to the claimant, but in fact it is the medical files that aren't accessible. They are not accessible because at some time in the past Workers Compensation Boards and the medical profession across this country decided that they would not be accessible. I don't know the rationale for that, but I do know the Workers Compensation Board is very old and it might have been what we consider to be today an antiquated philosophy about the possession of those files.

Perhaps it was that none of the file was available to the claimant at that time. I don't know; I haven't researched the history that carefully to be able to say. If that was the case, perhaps over a period of time other parts of the file opened up and we have the situation now where there is one section of the file which is still inaccessible to the worker.

Whatever the reason is, the fact is that they were inaccessible and that created a difficulty. The difficulty is that the doctor would give a report to the Workers Compensation Board with the knowledge that that report was confidential. Therefore, the doctor might write things in those reports that he or she would not write into a report normally if they felt the report was going to be made available to the claimant. That's not my theory; that is the theory of the medical profession whom I have consulted on this matter.

As well, they may have written things in such a way as to misinterpreted not from a medical perspective, but from a different perspective by the claimant. They may have written something harshly, knowing that another doctor would see it and the other doctor would be able to interpret it correctly, but they would not want a patient to see it if in fact they had written it in that manner. What they would far prefer to do is have an opportunity to write it in a somewhat different manner, perhaps say the same thing but make it more acceptable to the claimant. So they gave those files to the Workers Compensation Board on the basis that they would not be shared.

When I discussed this with the Manitoba Medical Association and with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, they indicated to me that in 90 percent of the cases or more - and it's a guesstimate as to a percentage - this wouldn't be a problem. The file could be very easily shared with the particular claimant. They also said to me that they would have no objection in the future to all files being open to the claimant. In other words, on a certain date, you say the files are going to be open to the claimant, and from then on

in, given a bit of lead time where you can notify the medical profession that might in fact happen, the doctors would then begin to write reports in a way that they know would be acceptable if reviewed by the claimant.

So there is no problem in going forward in history in making the files acceptable to the claimant, but that creates a bit of a discrepancy. As a matter of fact, it creates a discrimination. Those claimants who have medical reports submitted after the date of that change, if it were to be made, would have full access, and those claimants submitted previous to that date would not have full access. So we discussed that a bit further with the medical profession. They said, look, in 90 percent of the cases, it's not going to be a problem.

So it's a matter of the claimant going to the doctor and saying, will you write your signature on this authorization form giving me access to the medical files, I will take it into the board and I'll look at my medical report that you provided to the board there. It doesn't cost anything; it doesn't mean rewriting a whole new report. It doesn't mean the doctor going back and searching through his or her considerable files to pull out everything on this individual. It means that individual can go right to the board, hand in a piece of paper and say I would like my medical report, here's the authorization and get it. That's fine.

That's leave two anomalies existing. The two anomalies existing out of that are: What if the doctor doesn't want to give the report, and what if the doctor is not available to give the report? Let's deal with the second one first. What if the doctor died, moved or quit practice and didn't want to, you know, interface with the claimant for whatever reason? Then there should be some way for somebody to review that file and to indicate to the board that file should be made available.

What if the doctor said I don't want to give that file because I have written things in that file that I don't think you should see. Well, that breaks down into two particular circumstances: One is, something was written in that file that the doctor doesn't want the claimant to see, because the doctor doesn't want the claimant to see it and there is no justifiable reason other than that. The other is, the doctor wrote something in the file that the doctor doesn't want the claimant to see because it may have a detrimental impact on the health of the claimant. In other words, what if the doctor wrote in the file, this patient is suicidal? I believe that suicide is a result of depression arising out of an injury, which is worker experienced on such and such a date, which has prevented this worker from participating in society in a meaningful way - depression has occurred. You know, they could write off the whole synopsis of what had occurred. In fact, it would not be something you would want to hand to somebody on a piece of paper and say, here's your report, it says you're suicidal, but it might be something that's germane to the case. That suicidal tendency maybe is a result of a, partly at least, worker's compensation claim for injury. So that's one situation.

The other, the doctor may have been in a bad mood. You know, this guy comes in and he may have seen him four or five times, or her four or five times, he's just fed up, writes out the file and at the bottom writes something like, this person is a malingerer. It could

happen. You wouldn't want the individual to see that, because it really wasn't something the doctor would write if in fact the doctor had thought that individual was going to have access to the claim - not germane to the case at all.

So what you need is a mechanism whereby, when you have a doctor who does not want to release a file, someone can review that file, and can take a look at it and can say, okay, the claimant really shouldn't see this because it could be injurious to their health - most likely mental health, in most instances - but it's still germane to the case and, therefore, the board should be able to review it in their consideration, or secondly, the person shouldn't see this because it's not germane to the case, and it really was written under the assumption by the doctor that it was never going to be seen by the claimant, therefore, let's just strike it from the file and give the person the rest of the file and leave that out and give the board directions that they're not to use that as part of their case, just as many times people are given directions that they're not to use a particular item of information as part of a decision-making process.

We've had discussions like that, and I would hope that we'd be able to finalize those discussions in the very near future to be able to enable changes like that to be put in place, and those changes would provide for access to medical files by claimants under those conditions.

I've had a fairly good response from all the parties to whom I've discussed this in a very general way, and we're now reviewing, in a way by which we hope to make a final determination very shortly, how we would proceed in this instance, but basically those are the reasons why the files haven't been accessible in the past, those are the reasons why I believe, and I would suggest, I don't want to put words in the mouth of the member opposite, but I would suggest that he would most likely agree that they should be accessible to the claimant, and those are the activities we've taken on over the past year to try to sort out a mechanism which would, in fact, resolve this longstanding difficulty.

As it stands now, the Act is very explicit in that the medical reports are privileged and therefore they can be seen by the board or civil servants that are part of the Worker Advisor Program, but neither the board, nor the Worker Advisor Program can share them with that individual. If, in fact, we brought about changes that we just discussed, then that would be a new problem at that stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier in personal injury cases, and I think that's a reasonable analogous situation that medical reports are done on behalf of a claimant by his doctor and by a defendant's doctor, and both of those medical reports are available to the plaintiff, to the injured party, and I would suspect that the injuries dealt with in personal injury cases over a long period of time would not differ significantly from workers' injuries cases. There may be a greater number of a certain number of cases. I would suggest to the Minister that the consequences

of a great deal of those cases are not much different either. There will be injuries that flow that might affect a person's mental ability. He has referred to suicidal tendencies that might result in, I'm sure, a very small number of cases, but that has probably occurred in personal injury cases also.

Mr. Chairman, I see really no difference between personal injury cases and Workers Compensation Board cases, and I haven't had an opportunity to talk to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, maybe they would raise some arguments that might change or affect my opinion, but on this basis, as I look at it, I see no reason why the medical opinions should not be available to the workers.

Now, as the Minister has stated, many doctors may very well have filed medical reports up to now, on the basis that they will be confidential documents under the current legislation and because of that, they may have taken certain liberties in making comments that they wouldn't have otherwise made if they knew that the report was going to be made available to the injured worker. Many of those comments will probably be irrelevant to the real issues.

In any event, some of these other aspects that we've talked about are dealt with in personal injury cases, but I can see the physicians and surgeons of the Manitoba Medical Association's position, they say that doctors have filed medical reports up to now on the basis that the reports are confidential and in a certain number of those cases doctors will not want to make that information fully available because of some liberties or comments they made on the basis that they were confidential. But from here on in, Mr. Chairman, I really see, in principle, no reason why all of the medical information should not be available to injured workers. I think that is the right principle to follow, and I think it's one that, in view of the Minister's report on his discussions with physicians and surgeons, they see no difficulty in doing that from here on in.

I see no reason why the Minister shouldn't introduce a simple amendment to the Act at this Session of the Legislature, at least doing that for the future, and if there are particular problems with reports which have been made to date, which the Minister perhaps would like to see made available to injured workers and I have a great deal of sympathy with that position. There are some details to be worked out later on, and it has to be dealt with legislatively, that could be done later on, but I would think in general that it is a gross injustice to an injured worker that he doesn't have that information available to him.

You know, there's a great deal of talk about freedom of information and about the rights of individuals, and this just seems to me to be a most fundamental right, to have access to a medical report, which is made about yourself. I feel very strongly about that. If a doctor said to me that I've done a report on you, but I can't give you all of the information, I would be incensed that I couldn't obtain that information about myself, and I'm sure that is applicable to each and every injured worker.

So, I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should seriously consider whether or not, in those 35 or 45 bills that the Attorney-General said he's going to introduce before the end of this Session, there should be at least an amendment introduced with respect to this Session

which would, for the future, make all medical reports available to injured workers. At least right that wrong and then as he and his department look at what has gone on in the past, consider ways of dealing with that situation.

Mr. Chairman, that might very well, if that information is made available to workers, allow the Minister to, in fact, reduce the expenditures of his department. You know, if you make information available and a person knows what he has to deal with, and he can answer it one way or the other, or he can attempt to get his own medical opinion on another medical opinion, then it seems to me that at least a person knows what he's dealing with.

I would suspect that in a lot of the cases that the Worker Advisor Board deal with them and perhaps the Workers Compensation Board also; the problem may very well be because the worker doesn't know what he's up against. The fact that he or she has all of the information might very well allow for a more expeditious settlement of claims.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Minister to advise me whether the \$347,400 for workers' advisors is recovered from the Workers Compensation Board or is the total cost of this program paid out of the usual Consolidated Fund?

HON. J. COWAN: The board is providing for 100 percent of the funding of the Worker Advisors Program to answer the last question.

But I want to go back to the comments which the member just made in respect to access to medical files. He indicated that if he went to a doctor and found that he was not going to be able to have access to his file, or is he went to the board and found that he could not get access to a file which a doctor made in response to an examination of him, he would be incensed, he'd be angry. Well, people have been angry for a long, long time on this. This is nothing new. The legislation has been around for a long, long time. A whole succession of governments have had an opportunity to change the legislation. — (Interjection) — Well, the member opposite says he just become the critic. That's fair comment. And I've just become the Minister at the same time, or about the same time he became the critic.

I can indicate to him that it is my intention to resolve this longstanding difficulty, because I agree with what he says now. As a matter of fact, I'm certain that what he said now was said to his previous government on numerous occasions. It was said by way of brief; it was said by way of presentation; I'm certain it was said by way of individual claimants coming forward, because the angry feeling that one experiences as a result of this didn't just happen at the time of the last election. As a matter of fact, I can indicate to him that there were probably suggestions for this change previous to his administration having assumed office in 1977.

This problem goes back through a number of administrations. It's a longstanding problem. Over the past year, we have been giving considerable thought to how to resolve it and undertaking consultation with the parties that are going to be most affected by any decisions in that regard. I think we've been able to discuss and approach which will provide for the fairest

equitable system possible, and I outlined that approach to the member opposite just a few moments ago.

That approach came about as a result of taking the time to consult, and taking the time to discuss these matters with the medical profession. That was necessary because if the medical profession doesn't support the changes, then we have a difficulty on our hands. The medical profession is instrumental in making this work, so if you can get them to work with you to develop a solution which is satisfactory to them and they agree to it, and you agree to it, and it seems to be fair in all other ways, then in fact you have resolved the issue.

I think I can state fairly categorically without fear of contradiction that we are on the verge of resolving the issue. If it requires legislation to resolve, then I think I can give you an indication that legislation will be forthcoming. If it requires other mechanisms to resolve, then I can give you an indication that those will be forthcoming.

In essence what I can say to you is it's a very old problem, it's been around for a very long time and I think we now have a solution to it. That solution has come out of consultation and discussion of the problems and of the possible solutions. I think we have come up with a very workable process, which I outlined earlier, that will resolve the issue for not only all cases in the future but as well for cases going back in the past in most instances.

That is not to say there might not be some concerns about it expressed, but I think overall it will be the most practical and most efficient way to deal with the problem and it will have the acceptance, by and large, of the medical profession and of injured workers and claimants.

I very seldom indicate that I take great satisfaction in things that we have been able to accomplish, but for the record I take great satisfaction in the way in which this issue has been dealt with over the past year. I think we've taken a very tough issue, that has only been able to be resolved by the courts in other areas, and we've come up with a workable solution and we're now in the stages where it might be possible to implement it in the very near future.

Of course, there are amendments that would be forthcoming most likely this year in respect to pensions, because every second year the pensions are updated by legislation. This might very well find its way into that package of amendments either in the form which the member just outlined, which would be an initial step, or on a more complete form if we can finalize discussions and consultations in time to get the drafting done. But I can give you an indication that it's something we believe is wrong, and it's something that we are prepared to correct.

I appreciate the support which the member opposite has provided for not only the general principle, but I think for the process, for the mechanism. I also appreciate the fact that he has urged us to act expeditiously in this. This matter has been outstanding for far too long and the anger which he says he would feel, and I know I would feel, must no longer be allowed to exist.

So I hope that categorical statement of intent and that broad outline of generalities indicates very clearly that we will take action in this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that the Workers Compensation Board finances the total operation of the worker advisors. I had, when we discussed this in Estimates last year, I think, taken a position, at least for argument's sake, that although the Minister in our government had initially started the Worker Advisor Program with only one person, but it was a start of this particular program that the whole function of workers' advisors could be operated simply under the Workers Compensation Board itself by appropriate direction, etc.

How does the Minister justify asking the Workers Compensation Board to fund the Worker Advisor Program and not the Consolidated Fund? I understand that in some provinces, where there are workers' advisor areas like there is here, and a number of other provinces have them, that the Consolidated Fund, the government pays for the Worker Advisor Program and not the Workers Compensation Board which, as we know, is financed through assessments on employers in the province.

HON. J. COWAN: It may be an injured worker. To clarify the matter, the Consolidated Fund does pay out the funding for the program, but that funding is reimbursed to the province by the Workers Compensation Board.

The member indicated last year that he felt perhaps this could be done under the Workers Compensation Board. Perhaps it could; I'm not saying that he is wrong, but when we took office the difficulty was that the Workers Compensation Board was felt in some ways to be not serving the best interests of the injured worker, and that was a very real feeling on the part of the injured worker and on the part of different organizations and representatives throughout the province.

So we looked at that and we said, well, if there's that distrust - and it was a distrust in a lot of ways - of the system, and then you say to an individual that we're going to provide you with assistance, but we're going to provide you with assistance by pushing you right back into that system, they might, in fact, reject that approach. As a matter of fact, many did reject that approach. It's just the same old story over and over again.

So we looked at what was happening in other jurisdictions, and there are Worker Advisor Programs in other jurisdictions. Some are financed in different ways than others, and I can get you that detail over a period of time; I don't have it before me. But, in fact, we looked at what was happening and we saw that most jurisdictions had in fact opted for a Worker Advisor Program that was independent from the Workers Compensation Board. That independence gave it a credibility which it could not have otherwise. We have made that very clear in all our statements about the Worker Advisor Program. We have made it clear that it operates independently from the Workers Compensation Board as a program of the government.

At the same time, we have also made it clear that it's funded by the Workers Compensation Board. There is no suggestion that otherwise was the case. But we did that to allow it to have that credibility which comes out of independence during difficult times.

There may be a point in the future when the files are opened up completely; when we have gone through

this backlog; when we've got the Workers Compensation system functioning to the extent to which we want it to function; where there is a sense of confidence and trust in what it's doing, that we can then either wind down the program or diminish it significantly, or we can have the program assumed by the Workers Compensation Board and let them run it in a fashion which they consider to be appropriate. But right now, we think this is the best course of action. We are not precluding what suggestions the member has for future actions, but in the meanwhile we think we need to have that separation in order to provide for credibility.

It probably costs no more to have it run in this way than it would to have the Workers Compensation Board run it. So, in fact, the cost differences would not be significant, so it's a matter of them paying the money to us and the program being run by the government. I think that's workable now; I am not saying that's the way it will always have to be.

The member indicated they had started a Worker Advisor Program in the past. Well, the Worker Advisor Program in the past was a workers' advocate housed in the Department of Labour, one individual who also did many other duties. He was only a part-time advisor and really, in spite of his good intentions and his considerable skills in the area, could not provide the type of service which was necessary at these times. I don't believe it was started by the government opposite. I believe it's been a program of some longstanding nature. I don't think the government opposite, in fact, did anything to diminish it. They may, in fact, have even said, spend more of your time on Workers Compensation Board stuff and less of your time on your other duties and enhanced it in that way. I'm not certain, but the fact is it's been a standard approach; it wasn't working for a very long time, and we now have the new program.

It's my understanding that in B.C. the Advisor Program is paid for out of the Ministry of Labour, general revenue. In Ontario, part of it's paid for out of the Workers Compensation Board. In New Brunswick, it's independent where it would receive its funding from. They just started one up. In Saskatchewan, it is also separate from the Workers Compensation Board and I will find out where they receive their funding from in Saskatchewan.

So most of them have been independent from the Workers Compensation Board itself. That seems to be standard practice, and it's one which we are supporting at this time, but certainly we will take into consideration the comments which the member opposite has taken for future activities.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's answer raises two questions. One, he wants to work his Worker Advisor Office to be independent from the Workers Compensation Board, but he is the Minister for the Worker Advisor Office and for the Workers Compensation Board, and he indicated earlier about how he had sent a memorandum or instructions to worker advisors with respect to the use of critical information. So there is a problem there; I think certainly a question as to whether or not there should be a separate Ministry responsible for worker advisors different from the Minister who is responsible for the

Workers Compensation Board, if he really wants to follow through with that independence concern.

The second question is: Does he feel, in view of the fact that - I don't want to impinge upon the Workers Compensation Board, but I have to refer to it. We had a board where there were equal representatives of both labour and management on the board. That no longer exists. The whole operation is funded by employers' assessments. We supply separate advice to workers through the Worker Advisor Office. I don't disagree with the concept; I think perhaps there is another way of doing that. But where, under this system, who looks after the employer's interest?

HON. J. COWAN: The employer would have access to the Worker Advisor Program, and I have indicated to staff of the program that if they get inquiries from the employers, that they should handle them in the most appropriate fashion and provide whatever assistance they can. The employer also has direct access to the Workers Compensation Board, and there are ways, I believe - and we may have to wait until we get the staff down here in front of us to determine if I'm correct - for them to appeal decisions by the board, and I have not been given any indication in the past that they felt the appeal system wasn't working. If, in fact, that was brought to my attention, I would take a very serious look at it and then determine if action was necessary.

Secondly, I disagree with your assumption that the new Board of Commissioners does not have representation of different interests on it. I believe it has representation of industry through one of the commissioners who has a background in industry and has owned his own business and has been involved as an employer for most of his working life. It has background of labour in one of the commissioners, and it has a commissioner who, in fact, is out of a professional background, having been a nurse and having some knowledge of the medical profession.

I have not heard specific complaints from employers on the individuals. I have heard, quite frankly, specific complaints from the employers and employees and others on the way by which they were appointed. I have heard that criticism, and they said that they were probably - the fact that they were appointed in the way that they were made them uncomfortable. That goes right across the board; that came from employees, employers and others. Perhaps it was a mistake to appoint them in the way in which they were appointed; however, I will defend that action on the basis that it was necessary to take very quick action. It was necessary I believe to have a new board in place, and it was necessary to ensure that new board had a wide representation of interest on it and a great deal of expertise in different areas on it and that's what we did. It was also necessary to do that in, what I felt, an immediate way. It had to be done quickly because the problems with the system were so severe, so urgent and so demanding, that action had to be taken right then, so we took the action.

If I had it to do all over again or had I had more time to do it in the first instance, we might have looked at appointing the board in a somewhat different fashion. We always hold that option available to us in the future, to look at ways by which you appoint the boards. But

in saying that I want to make it very clear that I have every confidence in this board. I think it's doing an excellent job, and I think the decisions that it has made in the past and the way that it has approached a very difficult problem has substantiated, in large part, the need for a new board to be put in place and, in large part, has indicated that we did the right thing. Whether or not we did it in the right way is a question that will remain open because we will have criticisms of that from all parties as long as that system exists.

At the same time, I would like the record to be clear that we've had support for the way in which it was appointed and that support has been significant in itself. So it's not a matter where all parties say it was the wrong way to have done it or all parties say it was a right way to have done it. It was a judgment call, we made it, and I think that the experiences since having made it indicate that we did the right thing.

In reply to the first item, which the member brought forward regarding ways by which this program could be structured in the future, we'll certainly take those into consideration. As I indicated to him earlier, you know, we feel the program is serving a need right now. If the need should change, then we'll be prepared to look at ways by which we could change the program to make it satisfy that need in a more appropriate way if we felt that was necessary. So we're not locked into this program for all time from now on, but we do believe it's serving a useful function now, and we see it serving that function at least for the period of the next year because we have provided for an extension of it through these Estimates. But if in fact there is a better way in which it can be done, then we'll take a look at that.

Your comments respecting whether or not the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation Board and another Minister should be responsible for the Workers Advisor Program are interesting and certainly we'll give them consideration. We haven't provided for it in these Estimates this year; I believe it would stay under that area of responsibility for this year. But, again, if it were found upon review and discussion that it might be better perceived as being independent under another ministry I would certainly not object to that.

The Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health is in no way wedded to that program. It just fit at the time we put it together, but if it fits better somewhere else then I would have no objection to it moving to another department if an appropriate department could be found.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that the worker advisors will assist employers if they ask for assistance. I would ask the Minister if employers have been informed that service is available to them should they have concerns or require assistance. If not, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that employers should be so advised by the Minister that worker advisors are there not only to assist workers, but to assist employers with any concerns, or questions, or information that they might require if that is the route they feel they should follow.

HON. J. COWAN: We certainly haven't made it a priority initiative of the Worker Advisors Program to date, but

if in fact it is felt to be necessary we could certainly extend the program in that way. I think we could do it without having to call upon on extra staff or an expansion of the program.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions on the Worker Advisor Office. The Minister had agreed that before we go into salary, we could deal with the Workers Compensation Board.

HON. J. COWAN: I'd like to make a few opening comments in regard to the discussion that is about to take place on Workers Compensation Board.

This, to my knowledge, is the first time that Workers Compensation Board staff had been present during the discussion of the Estimates. I certainly know from personal experience that during my years in opposition that was never the case. I also know that last year, as Minister responsible for the portfolio, I did not have staff present. The reason that staff have not been present in the past, to my understanding, is that there is no line in the Estimates for the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation Board for that particular activity; that is, because it's a fund that operates on its own.

The member who is critic for the area and myself have had discussions over the past week in regard to how we can make these Estimates better serve not only his purposes, but the purposes of the government and the purposes of those individuals who, listening to and reading about these proceedings, are making themselves more aware about the Workers Compensation Board, what services it provides and how it provides those services to both employers and employees in this province. I believe by having staff present we will be able to have a much more informed dialogue; I hope that the members opposite agree. They have indicated that they think this a more appropriate way to proceed with these Estimates and so we are proceeding in that manner. I know there are a number of items which the members opposite wish to address in regard to changes to the Workers Compensation Board, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time in opening statement.

I do want to have the record be clear though that there have been significant changes made over the past year, year-and-a-half, in respect to the Workers Compensation Board and how it serves this province. Some of those were urgent and extremely necessary in an immediate fashion; some of those that are less urgent are being dealt with at the present time. There are many other changes that must be done. Those changes will be discussed over the next while, and I believe if one is to be realistic they must indicate that it's going to take many years to have all the changes which are necessary to the Workers Compensation Board and system in place.

For example, we talked about the Worker Advisor Program, we talked about the new board of commissioners, we have talked about how we want to improve access to medical files for workers in the most appropriate way possible. We have discussed numerous other things which are as a result of recommendations of reports, committees and individuals in regard to changing the system. We have presently a Section 100

Advisory Committee struck to work with us to ensure that rehabilitation practises and procedures are reviewed in a very open way and are discussed not from a critical perspective but from the perspective of how to best make that system work for injured workers. A report will be forthcoming in the near future on that.

That report will provide a framework around which we can discuss in a specific way changes that are necessary to that particular section of the legislation and the policies of the board. Once that report has been provided to us, again, we will be sharing it in an open way with any individual who'd wish to see it. We will be asking them for their comments, and we'll be devising strategy, policy and program in the legislation as a result of those comments in the initial report.

Following that, we believe that the entire Workers' Compensation Act has to be reviewed. It has been a long time since any review of the Act in a comprehensive way has taken place. It's a very complex Act; it's an Act that has to be developed very carefully over a period of time. So I would hope that we would be able to implement a series of public hearings that would review the entire Act over a period of time once we have brought forward the changes to the rehabilitation practises and procedures which we feel are necessary. That will, in my opinion, be mandated to review everything from the sexism in the language of the Act; the use of the word "workmen" which was an item which I brought up in opposition, which the critics have brought up in opposition in regard to the wording of the Act; to the way by which the entire system is structured.

We need changes. We need changes in a consistent and comprehensive and well thought-out way. I believe for the past year we have been providing those changes; we have been providing the direction for those changes and we have made considerable progress. Having said that, I believe we have a long road yet to travel. It is a difficult road; it is one that has to address many traditional and historical ways of doing things in a consistent fashion. So I look forward to the comments which will be provided to us today by way of suggestions and criticisms on the actions which we have taken. At the same time, I think there are areas that we are going to disagree. While I don't look forward to that disagreement, I recognize that it is a reality and accept it as a fact. We have different approaches although I think we are finding that we have more in common than we ever thought before, but we do have different approaches and we must exercise our different approaches as we see best.

What we are attempting to do with those changes in the end is to make for a better service for workers of this province. We hope to do that, we intend to do that, and we look forward to whatever assistance we can have in resolving longstanding issues and developing innovative and imaginative approaches to this area which is in so much need of change.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, G. Lecuyer: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My first comment is a simple question. I understand the minutes of the board are available and I would ask if the Minister could arrange to have the minutes sent to me?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, I will arrange to have the minutes transferred to the member who has requested them and, as well, make certain that he receives them on an ongoing basis.

This is one of the reforms that we brought forward last year in respect to openness of board. We said that the board makes decisions which are extremely important to the public. It makes a decision based on criteria which it applies in a hopefully consistent way, in a meaningful way. By making those minutes available to anyone whom requests them we are providing an overview of the boards activities on an ongoing basis, so that if there are questions or there are concerns or there are suggestions which should come forward, people know what the board is using as its criteria and people know what the board is doing in respect to its operation.

There are two sets of minutes that are kept; I must be quite honest with you. The first set includes names and claim numbers. The second set is essentially the same, except it does not include names and claim numbers and it has removed any specific items which would identify an individual's claim. Now, the reason we have done that is the board wants to keep minutes based on the claim number and the claim individual's name that they can use by way of precedent and by way of referral, if necessary. On the other hand, that information between the board and the claimant is privileged information, and I'm certain that the claimants do not want the exact details of their case with their name identified with it being circulated to whomever should ask for it.

So the decisions are the same except for the modifications to remove the name, the claim number and any specific items that would identify that particular claim. What is attempted in the public minutes is phrase it in such a way so as not to provide for the identification but provide for the exact decision and the criteria upon which it was based. So that's one way in which we've opened up the process.

There are other ways as well; the having of staff here is one. Also, we are reviewing right now our option of having the Workers Compensation Board report to a committee of this House. In the past, that has not been the case although other agencies of a similar nature do report to committees of the House. That provides for an opportunity for members opposite to have a dialogue with the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board and have a dialogue with the representatives of the board itself in a way in which we have a dialogue on many different Crown corporations that presently exist.

Just the other day, we had committee hearings of the Standing Committee of Economic Development on Moose Lake Loggers and Channel Area Loggers on the Communities Economic Development Fund. I would hope in the future that we would be able to have Standing Committee hearings on the Workers Compensation Board, and we are reviewing that option in a very serious and optimistic way right now, so we want to make the process more open. I will make certain that the member opposite receives copies of the minutes on an ongoing basis as can any individual who so desires.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for making those arrangements.

With respect to having staff available, Mr. Chairman, I discussed this with the Minister and pointed out to him that when I served as Attorney-General and was the Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission we ran into the same problem in that there is no line for that particular item. But we made arrangements then, and it's traditionally been carried on by the current Attorney-General now, that under his Estimates, at some stage the staff of the Liquor Control Commission do come in and are available to assist the Minister and the members of the committee in providing information in response to the questions, so it is of assistance to the Minister and to the members who wish information. Perhaps there should be some better arrangement made through a committee of the Legislature to deal with that, with areas like the Liquor Control Commission and the Workers Compensation Board, but certainly in the interim these kinds of arrangements that have been made on an ad hoc basis certainly are sufficient. I suppose the problem would be, if you had a Minister who was somehow stubborn or for some reason said, no, I don't have to bring staff and I'm not going to bring staff and the heck with you, you would have a problem, maybe for that reason, some more formal system should be set up. For the time being, this should prove satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he can now confirm that Workers Compensation Board have paid approximately \$66,000 to Mr. Norm Hiebert, the former executive director of the board, in lieu of compensation for severance pay and damages for wrongful dismissal.

HON. J. COWAN: Those are essentially the correct figures. I can confirm that they made those severance agreements. I cannot confirm that it was in any way tied to or connected to an allegation or an admission of wrongful dismissal, but that in fact those severances were awarded on the basis of standard procedure now in respect to severances of senior level executives. The decisions that are made by courts now in regard to awards in lieu of notice where no wrongful dismissal has been in fact provided for is of a similar nature.

Basically, what is being said is that an individual should receive some acknowledgment in a financial way of long service. So we have a number of court cases over the past number of years which indicate for individuals with lengths of service of about that period of time, anywhere from 15 months to 21 months of notice is appropriate settlement for a severance in lieu of notice.

In the instance of the two individuals who have been released in that fashion, they were both given 15 months' award in lieu of notice. We believe that it is fair; We believe that it was legitimate. I certainly had no preknowledge of the amount, nor made any comment on the amount, but that was a decision taken by the Board of Commissioners. I am informed that they based that decision on standard practice in industry as a whole. They wanted to be fair to those individuals who had provided long years of service to the board.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the board may have wanted to be fair. I hope they would have wanted to

be fair. The fact is that they would have had no choice, because the law, as it stands now, would require them to pay in a legal action that amount of money as damages for wrongful dismissal and severance pay.

Can the Minister confirm then - I believe he has, but I would ask him to for the record confirm that Mr. Dyer, the former Director of Assessments and an employee for some 29 years, was paid \$57,000 as damages?

HON. J. COWAN: I can confirm that is the case. I also want to make certain the record is clear that it is not law that provides for that, but it is a review of the case history that indicates that would be an appropriate severance. There is no legislation that says you have to give a number of months in a senior executive level of that extent for years of service. The courts are reviewing it, and they are saying that there is an obligation to pay severance in lieu of notice. There are other systems that are reviewed as well, but in fact it was not a piece of legislation which indicated they would get so many months of severance for so many years of service.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is right to the extent that there is no legislation, but there is a body of cases of jurisprudence that have built up that entitle an employee dismissed under those circumstances to that range of damages.

Mr. Chairman, the news report of last Friday indicated that Mr. Cross has been dismissed by the board. Can the Minister indicate what the amount of damages is in Mr. Cross's case?

HON. J. COWAN: I cannot confirm that there has been a dismissal. As a matter of fact, to my knowledge there has not been a dismissal and, therefore, there has not been any award granted in lieu of notice in that regard.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what terms were agreed to between Mr. Cross then and the board, if that is the case, with respect to compensation upon his leaving the board?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that no terms have been agreed to.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, has Mr. Cross's solicitor then written to the board or communicated to the board, or has Mr. Cross indicated himself that damages will be sought?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that there has been communication between the board and Mr. Cross and solicitors of Mr. Cross, and probably solicitors of the board, but it is also my indication that no settlement has been reached, no award has been awarded, and that no dismissal has taken place.

Now I want to on the record very clearly state that I am prepared to answer these questions in regard to individuals. I don't feel good about having to refer to specific individuals, because they don't feel good about being bandied about in this particular arena. However, I will answer the questions to provide you with the best information possible.

So before I do that, I want it to be clear. There have been dismissals. There are dismissals in every operation

from time to time. Those dismissals are based on a large number of factors. Those dismissals are not always because that individual was not a good individual. Those dismissals are not always because that individual did not do a good job. Those dismissals are not always because there was something wrong with that individual. Sometimes those changes in employment are brought about in changes in direction in the organization; changes in direction which the executive managers of that particular organization feel are appropriate.

So I want the record to be clear that because there are dismissals, it does not mean in fact that these individuals were in any way incompetent or wrong or providing unsatisfactory work or were not good people. The dismissals come about as a result of a change in direction of the organization.

I talked about reforms earlier. Those reforms were necessary. I think the member opposite, even in his role as critic, would confirm that there were problems with the system; that there needed to be a different approach to the system. That different approach, in some instances, has indicated that we need to have different people doing it, but the individuals who were doing the job in the past may well have been doing a very good job in the provision of service to the organization. They may well have been doing the type of job which they thought was necessary to be done, and it's just that the mandate of the organization is changing and the thrust of the organization is changing, and they need new people to be able to provide new initiatives and new innovations to the system.

We all get locked into our history. Every individual gets locked into their history and so sometimes you need to remove a person to provide for new ways to be undertaken. Sometimes you need those new ways, so I want the record to be clear on that. I would ask the member opposite if he can possibly avoid referring to them by name it might be helpful to the individuals. However, I will be prepared to answer any question to the best of my knowledge with full information if he requires it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates he would prefer not to talk about individuals. Mr. Chairman, I can assure him, too, that I would prefer not to talk about individuals. I would prefer not to talk about these individuals, Mr. Chairman, two of whom have served the Workers Compensation Board for 25 and 29 years respectively, and the Minister stands up and says, well, these are changes that occur in any organization any day.

Mr. Chairman, we're talking about a board that has served the public of Manitoba for many many years and individuals who have served that board and the public for many years and to reach that length of service in a public organization, to be dismissed and fired arbitrarily and without reason, and the Minister is saying, we're not saying they were incompetent, we're not saying they weren't good people, we're not saying they didn't do a good job. The fact is they were, in spite of that, dismissed and fired. And they, fortunately, through the protection of the law, recovered some compensation for that action, but that, Mr. Chairman, is not full compensation and in no way can compensate them for what the Workers Compensation Board under this

Minister, and through his board that he has appointed, has done to these people as individuals.

I'm sure he doesn't want to talk about it because he should be embarrassed about it. He should be very embarrassed about it; he should be ashamed of the action that has been taken.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise this House and assure this House that no other employees of the Workers Compensation Board will be dismissed, fired and released because of these so-called changes in organization that he refers to in the future?

HON. J. COWAN: Let the record be clear, I did not say I did not want to talk about the circumstances. I did say I did not want to single out any individual's name in this Chamber, if at possible. So let's not make it appear that I'm embarrassed or ashamed by the actions. I am not embarrassed nor am I ashamed by the actions.

I believe those changes were necessary because I have been informed by the board that they felt those changes were necessary for the operation of their organization and, if the changes are necessary, then the changes will be made, just as the changes are necessary in respect to access to medical files and we're looking at making those. Changes are necessary in respect to other legislation; we're looking at making that. There are changes that are necessary from time to time in personnel, and they will be undertaken from time to time in personnel.

So I certainly cannot give the member opposite any assurance that there will be no more changes in personnel by the means that he outlined. I have made it very clear in the past that these are decisions that are made by the Board of Commissioners without influence or without consideration by myself. They make those decisions based on their beliefs as to what is necessary to make the operation function properly. So if they determine that there are more changes necessary, and as long as it's not done in a wrongful way, as long as it's done with compassion and courage, then I will support them as long as they are necessary. So, no, I'm not ashamed, I'm not embarrassed, and I don't back away from it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, then, how many more people are going to be dismissed by the board to effect the so-called changes that he refers to?

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated earlier, that will be a decision of the Board of Commissioners. If they feel it is necessary to change personnel in the future, they will undertake to do that. As long as it's done in a way by which the organization is enabled and allowed to change in a positive and productive way, I will not impact myself on that decision. As long as it's done with regard for the law and regard for common decency for individuals, I will not impact myself on those decisions. Therefore, I can't give him the assurance which he would seek.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to register a few remarks for the record.

Mr. Chairman, what we are seeing here is something that the Manitoba average citizen is coming to understand and know full well from this government. When in opposition, they say one thing; when in government, they do another. Many of us on this side realized the things that were said by members opposite when we took over government. When there were a few senior civil servants, Deputy Ministers released, oh, how they cried; oh, how they screamed; oh, how they protested; oh, how they wrung their hands and decried the release of some senior civil servants. Oh, what are they doing now, Mr. Chairman? They are now releasing civil servants of long-time standing in this province, and the Minister is now saying, if there is more required, we are going to do more.

Well, I just want to have the record show clearly that he was a member of the opposition when he chastised the former administration for removing some people who were of a high political nature, not long-time civil servants. These were people that were appointed by Order-in-Council, by the former NDP government and released by the Conservatives. The members opposite were all part of that opposition, all part of that opposition who decried and demoted the terrible treatment these people were getting. Now, we are seeing exactly what these members opposite do when they're given the authority. At least we had the guts and the intestinal fortitude to say we were doing it; we believed in what we were doing. They had the other tact which they took, namely, say I won't do it, and then when I'm there do it. The people of Manitoba are seeing that this particular government say one thing in opposition and do with another thing when they're in government. They will remember.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise me of the present salaries of the chairman and the two members of the board?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, the chairperson is a Senior Officer VI at \$57,000 per year; and the two other commissioners are Senior Officers II at \$47,000 per year.

Earlier, I took as notice in the question period a question for the member who is now a critic in the area in regard to Workers Compensation Board Offices, renovations and cars. I can tell him that the carpet was replaced in five administrative offices on July 29, 1982, which included the commissioner's office, and it was done at a total cost of \$2,175 or \$435 per office. One commissioner's office was repainted on January 21, 1982, when it was vacated. The office had mainly those types of marks an office would have on it from picture hangers and chair scuff marks, so that repainting was done. I don't think any exotic paint was used in that particular instance, nor do I think it was lead-based, but I can certainly find out those details. The other commissioner's office was repainted July 19, 1982, and again for much the same reasons.

The individual also asked about cars. Each of the commissioners has a car; they are three-year leases effective July 7, 1982, and the monthly lease cost - I'll

have to find out what the totals are in the monthly lease costs for them. I want to review with the Board of Commissioners the need for them to have cars. I am not certain that it is an appropriate benefit, and certainly we'll discuss with them ways by which they can remove themselves from the lease if possible and ways by which they can have a more appropriate benefit provided to them in the necessity of transportation being required.

So I have no disagreement with the renovations to the board. They seem to be necessary and of a low-cost nature. On the other hand, I do want to take a look at the provision of automobiles to commissioners.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister stands up at one stage and says he's not going to review firings by the board, the board has full authority to do that, and now he's going to review the cars because he feels - Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the Minister delves in when he wants to. When it's a bit too hot, he doesn't want to get involved; it's all the responsibility of the Board.

Can the Minister, Mr. Chairman, confirm that under the previous board, only the chairman had an office and none of the commissioners had an office?

HON. J. COWAN: They were part-time commissioners and they had access to different areas of the building, but they did not have an office. I can also confirm that the chairperson had a car under the previous administration.

When I indicated that I was prepared to discuss this with the Board of Commissioners in respect to the provision of cars, I did so stating very clearly that I was not convinced that it was an appropriate benefit for them, and that is why I would like to discuss it with them. I didn't say I was going to impose upon them or reject the benefit. I said I would like to discuss it because I'm not certain that it's an appropriate benefit and I would like to advise them of it.

When I mentioned that I would not interfere with hirings and firings, I said that I would not do that as long as they were done in an appropriate fashion. So what we obviously have here is a difference between what I consider to be an appropriate matter and an inappropriate one. So there is no inconsistency whatsoever. I wish the member also would not imply that, because it's definitely not true.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister advise as to the type and cost of cars that are being leased for the benefit of the commissioners?

HON. J. COWAN: There is a 1982 Pontiac, mid-size; there is a 1982 Ford Mercury Cougar station wagon, mid-size; and there is a 1982 Buick Century Limited, mid-size. The rentals total on a yearly basis \$5,339.16.

Now as I said, in the past, the chairperson had a car issued to him. I am not certain that was appropriate, but I had no control over it. I'm certainly not certain that these cars are appropriate and, therefore, can give you an indication that I will be discussing with the Board of Commissioners to advise them of my concerns.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise what other benefits the commissioners have in

terms of expense accounts or memberships or anything like that?

HON. J. COWAN: I'll have to get that detailed information for the member, probably for this evening's session.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, he has staff available. Could he indicate what the total expenses were up to the end of the last fiscal year for the period since the new board took office? What were their expenses?

HON. J. COWAN: I can indicate that the total cost related to the Chairperson and Commissioners in 1981 was \$101,000.00. In 1982, we'll break it down from January 1st to June 30th which, I believe, was the old Board of Commissioners and from July 1st to December 31st. It was \$55,000 in the first instance, and \$94,300 in the second instance. In 1983, it is projected to be \$184,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister break down the 184,000?

HON. J. COWAN: I'll have to provide that detail to you later on. I can do it, but it will take me some time to break it down.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the \$184,000 include secretaries for each of the commissioners?

HON. J. COWAN: No. There would be one secretary included in there. In my understanding, there was one secretary included in that amount and that would be the same as before, but I can get the detailed information for you. If you want to ask a series of detailed questions in the few minutes remaining, then I will try to get the detail back to you later on in the evening Session if at all possible; if not, at the earliest convenience.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, then when we return at 8 o'clock, I would like the Minister to give me the detail for the increase from the cost of operating the board in the sum of \$55,000 from January 1st of 1982 to the end of June, 1982 compared to the amount of \$94,000, I believe is the figure he referred to, for the first six months of the new board, and then the details of the \$184,000 for 1983, which I gather is for the calendar year, 1983.

HON. J. COWAN: I can give you a broad breakdown, if you wish, into three categories — (Interjection) — Okay, you prefer it at 8 o'clock, fine. But I can give it to you in three categories, or probably in 15, 20 categories. I just ask what level of detail you want. I can give it to you now in respect to salaries, auto and travel.

MR. G. MERCIER: It's 4:30.

HON. J. COWAN: Okay, I'll give it to you in those same three categories at 8:00. Would that be sufficient, or do you want it broken down more?

MR. G. MERCIER: Broken down more.

HON. J. COWAN: Into what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour on a Monday is Private Members' Resolutions. On a proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

The Honourable Attorney General who has 14 minutes remaining.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution, as I was speaking last time, I had been speaking of my own personal recollections of having, as a young lad of 12 or 13, distributed handbills for meetings to be addressed by Dr. Norman Bethune. of selling door-to-door, not always successfully, even at a nickle a copy, a magazine entitled "Against War and Fascism," and in other ways, seeking to support, as a young boy, that historic struggle against fascism in Spain.

I'd just to move briefly to the historical perspective which is drawn so well in the speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and reference has already being made to the immense contribution of Dr. Bethune himself in developing the concept of mobile blood transfusion units. It is literally, and not simply metaphorically, true that literally hundreds of thousands of lives of allied soldiers, including Canadians, were saved by that contribution of Dr. Bethune; a person who is a revered throughout the world.

It was also in Spain where the loyalists were deprived of arms and ammunition because of a scandalous policy of non-intervention which, in fact, was a policy of intervention by allowing the fascists to be armed and supported by the Italians and the Nazis with the most ferocious weapons, including modern bombers, while depriving the loyalist of arms that within these circumstances that concepts of gorilla warfare; indeed, I think, virtually the name gained notoriety or importance during that war, were developed and were later used by the partisans of France and other parts of Europe living under the yoke of fascism during the course of the Second World War.

It was also during that war that the, again, heinous concept, coined by Franco of the fifth column, when he said that he had four brigades, or four columns, marching on Madrid and had one column inside. Indeed, he had and that was the fifth column and it was supported, regrettably, by all too many in other parts of the world who supported the policy of non-intervention.

Perhaps what's the most important fact to note, I would think, in terms of the historical prospective, is what I would view as the demonstrable fact that no amount of force, Mr. Speaker, no amount of brutality, no amount of savage repression can turn back the clock of history. Gradually, inexorably, the world is

moving and has been moving in our time to a more equitable and, one hopes, more democratic forms of society, and the two relate one to the other.

In Spain today, Franco is gone; a Social-Democratic Government under Phillippe Gonzales governs, and so it has been worldwide in terms of the defeat of fascism; the gradual, sometimes not so gradual, ending of imperialism. And the two, fascism and imperialism, are not too dissimilar. Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, indeed I think it must be said, that it is not possible, even with all the sophisticated weaponry of a modern industrial state, to hold back, for example, the movement in Latin America, by the people, for land, for peace, for bread for the starving families of the dispossessed. The cost of the vain attempts to use a military mike to stop the historic movement towards equitable and co-operative societies is a cost measured we now know in the millions of lives. It may gain here and there a little time, historically speaking, but it gains little else.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, begin to conclude my remarks which have been addressed in some to the indivisibility of the fight for freedom, wherever it might be waged, by quoting first from one of the great songs of the Spanish Civil War, a song entitled Freiheit, freedom, a word that will be recognized by the Member for Lakeside. It was the signature song of the Ernst Tillman battalion of the 15th International Brigade, the brigade to which the Mac-Paps belong and the Abraham Lincoln battalion from the United States and many others. The English words were fighting and winning for you, Freiheit, freedom. The German words were wir kampfen vnd seigen furdich, freiheit, and indeed that is what the brave men of the Mac-Paps and of the others of the 15th International Brigade were doing. It is now clear, as we take the historic perspective which was denied this for so long. That is why this resolution and what it calls for deserves widespread support.

As a final quote, Mr. Speaker, I think I can do no better than quoting a few of the words of Delores Ibaruri. She was known better across the world as La Pasionara. She was one of the great dynamic leaders of the Spanish people, throughout the Spanish Civil War and for years after. She lived to a ripe old age and was able to return to Spain when Franco had gone. She said, among other things, before I quote the passage that I have in mind, that it was better to die on one's feet than live on one's knees. In speaking to the farewell of the International Brigade, and I won't quote at length, but I will quote the last paragraph. I think this is to be addressed as much to members of the Mac-Pap as it is to any other members of the 15th International Brigade. Indeed, some of them are sitting in the balcony today, and some who were here last week and Joe Shayne who was not able to be here when this resolution was last addressed.

In any event, Delores Ibaruri said, as the bad farewell to the now defeated, as it was then, Members of the International Brigade, "You can go proudly, you are history, you are a legend. We shall not forget you and when the olive trees of peace put forth their leaves again, entwined with the laurels of the Spanish Republic's victory come back - and indeed that victory is there - come back to us. Those of you who have no country will find one; those of you who live deprived a friendship will find friends; and all of you will find the love and gratitude of the whole Spanish people, who

now and in the future will cry out, with all their hearts, long live the heroes of the International Brigade.”

I would say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Amen to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to refight the Spanish Civil War, but I particularly want to bring the facts to the floor that the resolution that we're basically concerned with is the veterans, the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, who are seeking eligibility for the benefits and privileges as veterans of Canadian Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, it has been established that these men were not recruited by the Department of National Defence, because Canada was not at war. This battalion was recruited in spite of the fact that Bill 23, which received parliamentary assent in April of 1937, made it an offence punishable by a \$2,000 fine or a two-year prison term for any person accepting any commission or engagement in the armed forces of any foreign nation. In spite of that, these men were recruited and went over to Spain to fight in a civil war that was not of our responsibility.

Victor Hoar, the author of the book, the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, makes very good reading. He states that the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion in Chapter 3 of his book, that there were many reasons why the men did join up, simply, first off, for the Spanish Republic. The threat of fascism, it was there, I'm not saying it wasn't; it was there all right. Some were adventure seekers, and then there were those who were unemployed. If you want to go a little further than that, it was part of when Canada declared war in the Second World War, many of the people in the First Battalion were in that position. They were unemployed and they were seeking something to do with their time and they did join up as a last resort.

Mr. Hoar, in his book, cites that the unemployment relief camps of the '30s were the breeding ground for discontent and despair. He states that the radical left became involved and organized, the inhabitants of these camps. The principal instrument was the Workers' Unity League, the Canadian arm of the red international of labour unions - it's right here in this book. In '37, the communists began to seek out volunteers for Spain, and they found the largest response was from these people that had been involved with the relief camps and from the on-to-Ottawa marchers, and they were the nucleus of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion that was originated here in Canada.

I don't know whether it would be before 1980 that the Mackenzie-Papineau Regiment had made submission to the Federal Government for the amenities of the Canadian Armed Forces. What I'm looking at here now - and if you have to document it, it's fine, I can put it in - dated Ottawa, 20 May, 1980, and it's signed by Len Norris, National President; Lionel F. Edwards, National Secretary-Treasurer; Walter Dent, Secretary, Eastern Section; Ross Russell, Chairman of Eastern Section; and Mr. W.A. Kardash, Conference Chairman, for the consideration that they are asking in this bill. It was submitted to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Reading from a letter from Mr. Daniel J. McDonald, who was the Minister of Veterans Affairs at that time, he states that he would seek legal opinion from the Department of Justice as to the viability of amending The Foreign Enlistment Act or to excluding them from these provisions. He goes on to say that in his initial response to their request for recognition under The Veterans Affairs legislation was that you would bring the matter to the attention of his Cabinet colleagues and seek their advice. However, it has long been the practice of this government and previous Ministers of Veterans Affairs to seek the views of veterans' organizations in matters that directly affect them, as we all strive to serve to the best of our abilities, the same clientele. With this in mind, I would ask for their advice of the Royal Canadian Legion prior to the government reaching a decision.

Further to that, we have documentation from the City of Winnipeg who have also submitted to the Minister of Veterans Affairs as to how they should move on this. I was part of City Council at the time that we went along with the motion. I don't recall it but I must have been, because it was during the time that I was sitting as a member on City Council.

Again, on October 17, 1980, a letter from Giles Lamontagne who was then the Minister of Veterans Affairs: "In terms of the question of recognition of the survivors of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion under the Veterans Charter, I must maintain the government's policy, the legislation which provides benefits for Canadian veterans, specifies that these benefits are available to those who served in Canada's Armed Forces and in some instances to allied veterans. This legislation was enacted by Parliament in recognition of those who answered Canada's call to arms."

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I do have here a letter dated May 6, 1983. It's signed by Executive Secretary A.K. Baker of the Royal Canadian Legion, Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command. In this letter, the Legion has made their stance, and they do not concur in the request to have the same rights and privileges as veterans of the Canadian Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with the gentlemen that are left, the veterans of this horrible war, but I cannot concur with the motion. I know there was hardship and suffering as there is in every war. I know personally a man, who as a young boy, I know of a man who went over and he fought in this war and when he came back to Canada he was a very, very sick man. not only physically, but mentally. I know that they went through hell, but I still cannot concur with the motion as it stands.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to say a few words on this resolution to indicate my support of it, and I really mean my wholehearted support. As a veteran, I can quite readily understand the horrors of war, having been there. Unfortunately, or fortunately, I wasn't old enough at the time that the Spanish Civil War started, or possibly I would have been there, too, because generally people join the

armed forces because of principle, because they believe in something. That is the reason why, I am informed and I'm aware from the ones that I have met, the members of the MacKenzie-Papineau battalion joined that particular conflict. They felt, and I concur - in hindsight, we can all concur - that they were fighting for democracy against the fascist hordes, and that is one of the sad things that now we are learning and what it has cost us.

I just read recently where it was estimated some 15 million soldiers died in World War II; but this doesn't tell us the fact that there were also civilians who were bombed, people who were put through the concentration camps, and the other horrible aspects of the Nazi and Fascist atrocities that took care of another 15 million, or maybe even more. There are 30 million lives, approximately, were sacrificed on the altar of fascism, because we didn't have the foresight to stop the Nazis and Fascists when they first started to use the Spanish Civil War as a testing ground for their weapons. If we had been intelligent enough, and forthright enough, to fight and stop them there we may have saved millions and millions of lives; never mind the amount of property and other damage that was incurred during that war.

There's a principle also involved in the fact that we're asking for recognition for these people. It is not as if there's many of them left. I understand there's something in the neighbourhood of a hundred. This country has recognized others veterans from other countries who are now Canadians for having fought in World War II. I see no reason why we cannot stretch it to these members as well.

Further to that, I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that these people if, as the Member for Assiniboia indicates, were unemployed, there were millions of people who were unemployed during that particular era. I don't think that was a stigma that they should live with, just because they joined up because they were unemployed, so I really think that I couldn't understand why that was brought into the question, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate that not everyone is against these people having recognition for what they participated in. I agree that it took a long time for the Spanish Government to recognize them, but we must also remember that there was a price that was paid by the Spanish people for Franco having won. They had four decades of totalitarianism and if those who think that was a good thing out of that particular civil war, I certainly don't appreciate their friendship.

Let me go on and say, as well, that we, today, are recognizing those who we fought against and indicated that we have new enemies. We are now friendly with the Japanese; we are now friendly with the West Germans; we are now friendly with many people that were on opposite sides during that World War. Why can we not give recognition to our own Canadians at this particular time? So, again, I say we cannot have a double standard when we are starting to recognize people who have fought for freedom, who have tried to preserve democracy. I think that's one of the questions that is basic to our free society, and sometimes we overlook and take things for granted and don't appreciate the people who go out there and do the work and make certain that we do have the freedoms.

Yes, we may have our differences politically, but I think we all believe in freedom and it's just a matter of degree and as to knowing when and where we should fight it. As a youngster, in my own household, through my parents and not being a native Canadian, having been transplanted from another country, I appreciated freedom and I went and fought for it during World War II as soon as I became eligible and was old enough; and consequently I appreciate anyone who fought for that particular kind of freedom, the democracy that we enjoy here in Canada and here in the western world, and I want to salute all of those members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion of the 15th International Brigade. Some of them I know personally; I have known a few others, some that are already dead, some that even served with me during World War II, that were capable of doing it because they were still healthy. But many that came back from that conflict had been wounded, were not able to join, otherwise, I'm sure that many of them would have.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I'm wholeheartedly in support of this resolution. I'm aware that it's been debated in the House of Commons and that the former Minister of Veterans Affairs - I believe it's MacDonald - had indicated that this was an anomaly, that it had to be looked at. Unfortunately he passed away and I don't know whether the present Minister of Veterans Affairs has had the subject brought up before him and whether he's had any chance to consider it, but I see nothing wrong with this House, who appreciates people who fight for democracy, people who fight for freedom, passing this resolution and asking, requesting Ottawa to give this matter consideration.

If you do not ask, if you do not venture, you cannot gain anything and I do believe that these people need recognition.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate only to register my opposition to the resolution and to the inspiration that is behind it, and to state a few of the, I think, well-known reasons that are being either obfuscated or deliberately overlooked by some of the exponents of this particular proposition from the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that the first organization that one should look at with respect to whether or not a fellow Canadian is deserving of a pension for services in support of his country would be the Royal Canadian Legion of Canada and, as my colleague has just pointed out to you, the Royal Canadian Legion on a number of occasions, having studied this particular proposition which emanates in large part from the left in Canada, has turned it down for the very obvious reason that the persons in question were following their own particular lights at that time in our history. Those persons were not acting in any way, shape or form on behalf of Canada, but were rather following their own instincts, political or otherwise, with respect to what they chose to do with their individual lives at that time in our history. I would say, first of all, that there has

been established in any of the speeches that I have read, in the proposition itself, in the supporting material, which I have read which was attached to the submission that was first made to the then Minister of Veterans' Affairs signed by the petitioners on May 20, 1980 - having read all of that material, I cannot see that there is a tittle of evidence in support of the proposition that the persons who fought in the Spanish Civil War should be deserving of any reparation or payment of any sort at all from the taxpayers of Canada at the present time.

I think that there is an opportunity for propositions of this sort to be pushed through city councils, to be used on an emotional basis in arenas such as this Legislature where, I daresay, if it were not for the temporary majority that is held by the NDP, we would not be seeing the resolution at all. You won't see it, I daresay, in any other Legislature in Canada unless introduced by a New Democrat and you won't see it passing either in the Parliament of Canada or in any other Legislature if indeed it manages to pass this Legislature with its temporary majority, as I point out, of New Democrats. That, Mr. Speaker, I suggest speaks volumes in itself as to the origins of the resolution and the motivation behind it.

It is not my purpose, Sir, to try to rewrite history, to try to talk about "left speak" which we hear as we look at the facts surrounding the proposition that is before us. All we should be aware of, Sir, is that there are those, not only within our society, but in other parts of the world who are prepared to try to rewrite history and to try to attach noble motives to inspirations which at the time perhaps did not have all of the nobility that is now attached to them.

I do not question the individual motives of surviving members of this so-called brigade who are in this country at the present time. That is for them and for their own consciences. I merely say that the taxpayers should not be asked to subscribe to those motives, whatever they may have been at the time. It was no war of ours; it is now conveniently described by the proponents of this resolution as an anti-fascist brigade. There are those who were there at the time who would describe it as a pro-communist brigade with equal validity and that is no business of ours. The ideological fights between the communists and the fascists in Spain was no matter in which the Canadian Government was to be involved by way of troops.

A far different situation arises because people from time to time say, well, if we're prepared to pay pensions to those who fought in Korea or to those who fought in different parts of the world during World War II, which were perhaps were not right at the centre of things either in the European theatre or in the Asian theatre, then why should we balk at a resolution of this sort. Well I think we balk, first of all, Sir, because of the ideological underpinnings which prompt it, underpinnings which have indicated in the past that this resolution has always its germination in the left, in whatever form it has come to being before our country. The New Democratic Party, Sir, is apparently on record nationally as favouring this resolution and that by itself, as I suggested before, speaks volumes about the resolution in terms of its ideological bent.

Sir, the precedent that would be established if we were now to start passing retrospective judgment upon whether or not this man or that woman should have

been fighting in this war or that war when there was a law in Canada with respect to this particular war at the time, and the persons who saw fit for either ideological or personal or mercenary reasons - and "mercenaries" is the term which has been applied by many who have studied the history of this period better than I. "Mercenaries" is not a term that need be apologized for as was suggested by the Attorney-General when he spoke the other day.

No, I'm sure that some of the persons themselves who were involved would say that were mercenaries in the true sense of that word and that they went to join an alien brigade which had nothing to do with Canada and that they themselves then became part of that alien brigade in an alien country, quite different, Sir, from the situation of our troops in Korea which was a United Nations action in which Canada participated as one of the powers against the North Korean communist invasion, ultimately the Chinese communist invasion of South Korea. Those men and women who were in Korea were there with the full sanction and authority of the Government of Canada.

There is, perhaps, a grey area that one might consider that would be, although not ideologically founded as this proposition is, one might consider it on the same basis as utilization of Canadians in a foreign war. That, of course, Sir, would relate to the war that was fought by the people of Israel in 1947-48, the war which saw established the State of Israel and there were Canadian who were deeply bound up in that struggle and who wished to see the establishment of that country. But that was not Canada's war either, Sir. I don't recall that any of the men and women who went from Canada to fight on behalf of the Israeli cause have ever had the presumption to come along 30 or 40 years later and say, well, I went to fight in support of a cause which now all of the people of Canada support. All of the people of Canada support the State of Israel. We have diplomatic relations with the State of Israel, it is commonplace that in our history at the present time although not certainly among the P.L.O. or among some of the Muslim countries, that the existence of Israel is for the good of mankind. With all of that background, what would the reaction be if somebody who fought, in support of Israel, were to come now and ask, 30 years later, for the support of the Canadian Government for pension purposes? They would be turned down, but I think they would they would be turned down on the basis that it was not of Canada's doing, that war, even though we are vastly in sympathy with what resulted from that war.

Well, Sir, one need not extend the examples to indicate how inappropriate it would be; first, for this Legislature, contrary to the advice that has been received from the Royal Canadian Legion, to be endorsing a form of qualification for pension for men who chose, of their own volition, to go and fight in a war that was none of Canada's doing. You can embellish that war with all the knee-jerk terms of the left that you wish, that it was an anti-fascist war and so on, but the fact remains that it was not our war. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that, as is quoted in the brief that was made by the petitioners in support of their proposition for pension, on Page 3, Article 11, and I'm quoting: "At this point we come to a most important type of recognition that we have already received. It consists

of the following actions taken by one or other arm of the Canadian Government," and I ask you, Sir, to pay particular attention to what is then cited. "No. 1. The National Film Board made a film about us called "Los Canadienses." This film is shown frequently on the government-owned CBC. The National Film Board gave us a new copy of this film to present to Filmeza (phonetic) Nacional Espanol when we were in Spain in 1979."

I pause, Mr. Speaker, to say, well, isn't that interesting; but how does that strengthen the cause to receive pensions? If you go and can inspire somebody at the National Film Board to do a film on Mickey Mouse, does that mean that you're going to put Mickey Mouse on the federal payroll? I hardly think so.

Mr. Speaker, "No. 2. The Canadian Embassy in Madrid held a reception for our delegation when we were there in 1979. The reception was held in the home of the Ambassador, who was away at the time. The senior official at the embassy spoke of the men of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion as heroes. The officials at our Embassy invited the President of Filmeza (phonetic) Espanol and other dignitaries to the reception and screened the picture, Los Canadienses."

That's No. 2, Mr. Speaker. Because the Canadian Ambassador, or his officials, in Madrid show a certain amount of hospitality to Canadians traveling there is no reason, by itself, to support the proposition that the taxpayers should be underwriting pensions for these people who chose to fight in a foreign war for their own particular causes. But do you notice the similarity, Sir, between the kind of stimulation and effect? We stimulate something to happen; when it happens, we then claim that that is something that supports our cause. That's an old trick of the left, Sir. It happens fairly regularly. We've seen it.

The third one, listen to this: "Your government granted to our organization in Ontario, \$16,900 as a New Horizon grant. The purpose of the grant is clearly spelled out. It is to make it possible for us to write a book that will set out and preserve the record of our achievements in Spain. Needless to say, books have been written both about the war in Spain and about the role of the Mac-Paps there; however the book that is being written with the assistance of the government is being written by us, the Canadians who fought in Spain."

Again, Sir, I ask what kind of frivolous evidence is this upon which to support an application which would set a very very bad precedent for the dispensing of veterans' pensions in this country? My God, Sir, we've got in this country, as I stand here today, veterans who fought in wars in which Canada was involved, root and branch, who are not receiving enough. If my honourable friends need any evidence in that regard, let them speak to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, Stanley Knowles, who along with many other Canadians in the House of Commons over the years has been fighting on behalf of legitimate Canadian pensioners to get greater benefits for legitimate Canadian pensioners who fought in Canada's wars.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose at this time, like the Attorney-General or others who want to rewrite history and get into some form of revisionist, emotional situation or cloud, whereby people of goodwill will just go along with the gag, so to speak, and say,

well, why not, you know, there are only a few left - without regard for the precedent that is being set, without regard to the ideology which inspired, in many cases, some of the people who fought in that war and without regard, Sir, to the other legitimate considerations that the people of Canada and the taxpayers of Canada must have with respect to other wars that may be taking place.

For all we know, at this time, there may well be Canadians somewhere in Africa, fighting against Cuban soldiers and they would be mercenaries of some sort, and there would be many who would say that they were fighting the right cause. But I would, Sir, not support their application for a pension any more than I would support this application for a pension, on behalf of people who claim now, in the fine mist of history, that they were just there as anti-fascists.

Well, they happened to be on the USSR communist side and that's what motivated many of them to be there in the first place. One of the people who signed that petition, W.A. Kardash, came back from that war and later served - and may I say, Sir, served with distinction - in this House as a Member of this Legislature, representing the Communist Party of Canada. Sir, I make no observations about that fact at all, except that the Communist Party in 1939-40 and so on, was outlawed as a subversive party in Canada.

MR. D. SCOTT: Why?

HON. S. LYON: Well, if my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, has to ask why, then he'd better go back and read a little bit of history, Mr. Speaker, about the pact that Mr. Stalin and Mr. Hitler signed together in August of 1939, and how pretty well all of the members of the Communist Party in Canada, at that time, saw fit not to support the anti-fascist war against Hitler. Do you know why? Because, Mr. Speaker, if Stalin was in a pact with Adolph Hitler, that was good enough for the Communist Party of Canada, that's why.

And if my honourable friend wants another little history lesson, we'll give him some history lessons about the so-called loyalty of the Communist Party of Canada, which was a subversive party at that time in the minds of many, I would say the majority of the people of Canada, remains a party dedicated to the subversion of democracy and the parliamentary system in this country today. So we need no lesson in history, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for Inkster, for the current overt and covert members of the Communist Party of Canada, and we know, Sir, the inspiration which largely is behind this resolution which is before us today.

It is not a matter, Sir, like the resolution that has been introduced by the Member for Roblin-Russell, for the release of Yuriy Shukhevych, a citizen with whom we can all identify, and a kind of oppression against which we can all - or I hope we can all - identify in this House. This, Sir, comes from a different corner of the ideological spectrum. It's an attempt by people who are now trying to rewrite, in a sense, their own personal histories to say that what we did at that time, although illegal, although not in the interests of Canada, is, as the Attorney-General tried to say today, against the perspectives of history; it deserves support by the people of Canada. I say, Sir, against the perspective

of history, it does not deserve the support of the people of Canada by way of pensions to these people no matter how well-motivated, no matter how non-ideologically they may have been motivated in their efforts.

I think, Sir, that this resolution owes its genesis to the left; it's a resolution that is knee jerk with them. If they want to try to rewrite history, let them do it on their own time with their own money, but not with the money of the taxpayers of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not pleased to have to follow the words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have no intention of misunderstanding history; we want to understand history. We don't attempt to rewrite history nor do we try to confuse history as some Conservatives have done in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we remember the Great War; we remember the Holocaust; we remember the peril, the suffering. Mr. Speaker, I hear an honourable member chattering and really, the subject matter for which I speak is not one that should be considered lightly. We remember the devastating loss of human life. Why, Mr. Speaker, why do we remember this? Because we hope that these things will never happen again in our society, that we will never forget, we will never rewrite history, we will read it, understand it and ask that we never make the same mistakes again.

Mr. Speaker, the world made a mistake in 1936 - not everyone - Members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion recognized that evil. The world everywhere was suffering from depression, and in Germany, Hitler had come to power. Mussolini had taken power in Italy. Spain was one of the first testing grounds; Ethiopia was another. There it was a fight. It wasn't a fight by the Soviet Union sending troops in. No, where did the troops come from? They came from Nazi Germany; special advisors, assistance, guns. That's where the menace came, Mr. Speaker, and these men volunteered as an international brigade.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition didn't call them mercenaries but he didn't disagree with the definition "mercenary." Mr. Speaker, he talked about the money it might cost, I suppose, to associate these veterans with veterans' legislation, Mr. Speaker, a precedent. Well, you know, I don't think the veterans here in Manitoba are crying out for money. They are not mercenaries; they're crying out for recognition that they fought Nazism. They bear the scars of war. Many of their comrades died and that's not a dirty word, "comrade," because I know that the people in the Legion use it and they recognize the significance of that word, because people were dedicated to one another in the fight for survival, the survival of democracy in the world, Mr. Speaker.

This wasn't a pro-Communist fight; it was a fight of a fierce ideology, one that would enslave the world and free people came to help a democratically-elected government. Mr. Speaker, these veterans do not cry out for money; they cry out for justice, and for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to say words on

their behalf are knee-jerk terms of the Left sickens me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, who does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition call Communists? Well, let's look at the historic record. The friends of this battalion, who were they? The record indicates that the group was formed in 1937. The sponsors of the Friends of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, people who were trying to help that group, who were they? Let's list the communists that were supporting them. Who were they? Who were the sponsors of this Friends of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says were all Communists? Well let's read the list: Reverend A.S. Smith, the Moderator of the United Church; Wally Dent; Hazen Size (phonetic). Well here's a good one, Ernest Hemingway, another Communist I suppose. Do you remember Ernest Hemingway, Mr. Speaker, the author of the novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*? Do you remember that tremendously moving movie picture of the same name, and Hemingway, in his line said, "Do not ask for whom the bell tolls; the bell tolls for thee."

Mr. Speaker, millions of people died because they didn't listen to the bell tolling, the bell tolling about a maniacal desire to enslave the world. Very few people listened, Mr. Speaker, and those that did listen and that were prepared to sacrifice are now denied a measure of recognition by the Leader of the Opposition. They don't ask money; they ask to be recognized, recognized for the valiant, dedicated people they were. Who else, Mr. Speaker, the friends then of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion? Albert Einstein, a dedicated man; Upton Sinclair, H.G. Wells, Eugene Forsey, now Senator Forsey. He's changed, well the honourable member's babbling some idiocy of change. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is not wrong for a man to change and I still have hope that the Leader of the Opposition one day will see some light.

Let's review a few more of these friends. Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas, a man of the cloth; he's still a member of the church, a dedicated Democratic Socialist, one who I'm proud to say was leader of our party, retired now, who fought endlessly in this country for a better way of life, for all our people, fought valiantly for democracy. Does anyone suggest that Tommy Douglas is a Communist? They dare not say that to his face. Another one, Mr. Speaker, Judge Louis St. George Stubbs, senior member of the Stubbs firm, once a judge in this province, a judge that dared to look upon the law as somewhat imperfect and publicly decry it. He was removed from the bench, Mr. Speaker. He was a man of principle, a man who was prepared to recognize the need for people to stand up and fight fascism. Another one, E.J. McMurray, a famous lawyer in this city, Mr. Speaker, all of these people had principle. They all recognized the threat to mankind and womankind by this devilish philosophy developing overseas. They saluted, they assisted, they tried to help that valiant group.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that this group were all a bunch of communists, really, as my honourable colleague says, is a knee-jerk reaction from the right. Mr. Speaker, anyone that isn't an anti-communist and is not actively opposed to everything that is in any way associated in the past with communism is obviously a fascist in the books of the honourable member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, everything is so black and white. Mr. Speaker, in this country in the 1930s we had hundreds of thousands of people without employment, desperate for work. We had work camps, Mr. Speaker, set up by Conservative Governments. All that men and women wanted was work. — (Interjection) — They got relief, Mr. Speaker. In those days there was no Unemployment Insurance; there was no positive action by government. There were relief camps

HON. A. ADAM: Conservative dole.

HON. A. MACKLING: That's right and dole. That was the philosophy of the day. Mr. Speaker, in our present day Conservatives are repeating the same kind of philosophy. Government should have nothing to do with the economy; stand back and let private enterprise work. That's what Conservatives were saying in the '30s, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't working then. It was only, Mr. Speaker, when people like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that leader of leaders in the United States, initiated that New Deal, that finally the private enterprise capitalist system started to take some responsibility for doing something, for doing meaningful public work and putting people to work, men and women that wanted work, they didn't want relief.

Where did these young men and women of Canada have to turn? They finally found work in the great war. That is the shame, Mr. Speaker, that we didn't organize our society in a way that would give people work. Many people, Mr. Speaker, and I know many of them - I was just too young to join the armed forces myself, but people, almost my peers, went to war. They didn't have jobs. They'd been waiting and waiting for jobs and they were so proud at last to have a decent set of clothes, a uniform and a regular job. Yes, they were prepared to die for their country, but their country hadn't done much for them in the past.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that these people who saw the danger earlier and prepared to give their lives should not be recognized. Mr. Speaker, it's a shame. Mr. Speaker, these people who foresaw the need for brothers and sisters in the world to take a common responsibility in respect to hate, in respect to a menace anywhere, that we are our brothers and sisters' keepers. Mr. Speaker, it was this kind of philosophy that coming out of the end of the Second World War, men and women, governments everywhere said we will not let this happen again. We will set up a United Nations. We will agree that we will not allow governments to interfere

with democratically-elected governments anywhere. That was the common will and purpose after the Second World War, a recognition of the kind of philosophy that members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion had. They were democratic socialists; they were trade unionists. Yes, there were some communists, but they were people, Mr. Speaker, who were concerned about the threat to our civilization that Nazism brought. Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition continues to rant. Mr. Speaker, it's the kind of bigotry, it's the kind of reluctance to recognize positive good, wherever it be, that breeds the kind of totalitarian thinking that the honourable member now decries.

Mr. Speaker, in areas of the world today where people do not have sufficient food, they don't have clean water, they don't have sufficient clothing, will turn to try and get help. Mr. Speaker, if communism promises that help, will we fault those people for daring to listen? Can we deliver what they need? Because if we don't, Mr. Speaker, we are preparing the base for the very threat that the honourable member talks about.

Mr. Speaker, we can't just lie back and do nothing; that's what happened in 1936. That's when people said when the Nazis were taking people away, breaking the trade unions, they were saying, well, it's not me. Why should I be involved? They kept coming and, as Martin Niemoeller said, finally, it was me, but there was no one to protest. Mr. Speaker, the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion members protested. The Government of the Day amended - listen to the words, Mr. Speaker - The Imperial Foreign Enlistment Act. We were still using imperial terms in those days; we didn't have a free-flow foreign policy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. When this resolution next comes before the House, the Honourable Minister will have five minutes remaining. The Chair will accept the motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, subject to the committees meeting this evening at 8 o'clock, I move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, this House do now stand adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).