

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 3 May, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

SPEAKER'S RULING

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. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as members are probably aware, May 5th to 11th is National Forest Week and before them, of course, are a new species that we are presenting for the benefit of our members, the Japanese Elm. These Japanese Elms are being presented to you by the Manitoba Forest Week Committee to commemorate Forest Week 1985.

Japanese Elm is a native of northeast Asia, was introduced by Dr. F.L. Skinner of Roblin to the prairie region of Manitoba. This grafted selection is a seedling grown at Morden which was considered superior in growth, form and stem straightness. Japanese Elm is almost seedless, unlike Siberian Elm, so must be propagated by grafting. It is considered to be resistant to Dutch Elm Disease.

I would recommend that you find the most favourite spot in your backyard and plant it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

I'd like to take this occasion to thank the Minister of Natural Resources for the annual treat that we get here. I always looked forward to this in the past, and the first tree that was presented here, I have that one growing at home plus a number of others. So I always look forward to these things and I appreciate that; I think everybody does. I had some concern walking in here today and looking at the tree itself. I hope that once it gets out into the environment it can straighten out and grow to be a nice tree or shrub, and I hope it's not necessarily a reflection of the government in power, because I anticipate that they will straighten out anyway.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. M. HEMPHILL introduced, by leave, Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

HON. A. MACKLING introduced, by leave, Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, I have a statement for the House.

On Wednesday, May 1st, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert raised a matter of privilege concerning remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Labour.

I am satisfied that the matter was raised at the first opportunity and that it concluded a substantive motion as required.

After receiving the advice of several members, I took the matter under advisement.

I have perused Hansard and given careful consideration to the matter.

In his motion, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert speaks of "incorrect allegations" by the Minister of Labour with which he takes issue. Beauchesne's Citation 19(1) makes it clear that a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

Since allegations of facts are not a matter of privilege, there remains the use of the words "misleading" and "false." Both of these words have been ruled as parliamentary at some times and unparliamentary at other times, probably depending on the context. It is therefore valid that they were objected to as being unparliamentary. Beauchesne's Citation 323(1) makes it clear that unparliamentary words are a matter of order and not a question of privilege.

There is therefore no prima facie evidence of a breach of privilege.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MTS - cost of bill enclosures

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. It's regarding what appears to be a blatant misuse of a ministerial prerogative in sending out a message with this Minister's photograph in every telephone bill in the province.

Can the Minister indicate how many of these were sent out and what the cost was?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that every telephone subscriber in Manitoba will get a copy of that message. It is a similar message to the message that was sent out by the Minister responsible for the telephone system in Saskatchewan, our sister province, that like Manitoba owns their own telephone system, and is concerned to inform all of the users of our system of the threat to it by the application that the Canadian Radio and Television Commission has under consideration, the application by CNCP.

That is a very serious matter for all Manitobans and for all Western Canadians where we own these resources, where we have over 4,500 workers, where we have a very significant industry at stake in this province. We want everyone to know what the issue is.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, assuming that the message is a valid one and that concern ought to be expressed on this particular issue and attention called to it, why could it not have been sent out under the signature and photograph of the CEO of the Telephone System, Mr. Holland, for instance?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I suppose one could have involved the Chief Executive Officer of the Manitoba Telephone System in such a submission, but I think that would be at risk. The Chief Executive Officer should not be involved in what is essentially political representation. It is a political matter that governments have to decide as to the protection of our industry.

In this instance, the Minister in Saskatchewan, other Ministers, have spoken out to try and protect a vital industry of Manitoba. It is certainly a role for this Minister to carry out.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a political matter, and this is a desperate Minister and a desperate government looking for re-election. That's the politics of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, why would the Minister choose to denigrate the message and to take it off the logic and the reason of the message and onto the politics of his picture and his government being promoted throughout the province in every Manitoba Telephone System bill at taxpayers' expense?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear a question from the Leader of the Opposition. I heard a harangue, and obviously he is not concerned to protect this industry. He is not concerned to make representation to members of Parliament in Ottawa that this vital industry, vital service that was established over 70 years ago in this province under a Conservative Government now is in jeopardy. He is critical of us speaking out to protect this industry. That's the obvious suggestion the honourable member is leaving with the people of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is concerned about having my message on the record, then would he agree to have my picture go out with my message in the next bill of the telephone system to support his position?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, his would-be government, but heaven forbid that he ever be government because he really doesn't concern himself with protection of rights of Manitobans. He wants to play politics in every issue, and on this issue if he had his way and we didn't do anything about this issue, telephone rates in Manitoba would follow the path where deregulation is taken in the United States and telephone rates have gone up by leaps and bounds, Mr. Speaker.

That's the kind of position obviously that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would follow. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the honourable leader says, would you put my picture on it? Well, the former Premier Lyon certainly used his picture to great advantage in respect to other issues including the constitutional issue. No reluctance at all, no reluctance at all.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: No reluctance at all to use an opportunity to inform Manitobans on issues, and now they're concerned that I as Minister want to inform every Manitoban as to the threat to our telephone system. That's shame on that leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Release of prisoners - recommendations to Federal Minister

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. It follows upon questions I have asked in past years to the Attorney-General and the Minister on this subject regarding the automatic release of prisoners upon completing two-thirds of their prison sentences, and it follows upon the inquest into the death of the mass murderer Kenneth Steingard of Brandon. My question to the Minister is this, Mr. Speaker, what recommendations, if any, has she made or does she intend to make to the Federal Minister of Corrections with respect to this policy or legislation of automatically releasing prisoners from jail upon completion of two-thirds of their sentences?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the member raises an important point that probably nothing should be automatic in the system, that what we want is a process to ensure good judgment and flexibility with regard to the individual situation. I think that's a wise approach but it is never easy.

Human beings are not able to foretell the future and the best they can ever do is to make an informed judgment, trying to balance the rights of the individual against the obvious need of society for protection. Now,

I think where a more flexible and appropriate process can be put in place I think should always be under review. I would be happy to raise just the general issue and take part in a further debate as to how the dual protections can best be achieved.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a report on this subject, it's at least four years old. I have asked the Minister in previous years to consider this matter and consider making recommendations.

I would ask her this, Mr. Speaker, what assurances can she give to residents of the Province of Manitoba that within the provincial jurisdiction in the field of Corrections - those prisoners serving sentences under two years - that dangerous prisoners like Mr. Steingard will not be given automatic or early release in situations which I suggest are very easy where parole officers and psychiatrists report in memos that the person is a dangerous person?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I really already answered that question. I said there is no 100 percent guarantee. People may say that someone tends to have a disposition to act out, but they cannot in advance predict what that person will do. As in all other areas of corrections and justice, there's a balancing between the rights of the individual to fair process and the need to protect society.

Hopefully, over time, we'll become more able to make even more safe decisions, but I think the goal of absolute safety and prescience just is not within human grasp.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Steingard was apparently allowed to stop psychiatric treatment which was prescribed as a condition of his release. The reports indicate that his treatment at the Brandon Mental Health Centre was put on hold when the centre decided to restrict its outpatient service to critical cases.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Health, who I believe is responsible for the Brandon Mental Health Centre, to explain and investigate what occurred and give the House and the residents of Manitoba the assurance that psychiatric treatment in situations like this would not be restricted in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very pleased to investigate and report to the House.

Private and Parochial schools - increased aid to

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Bearing in mind the reaction of teachers and voters in Ontario in yesterday's provincial election, does the Minister plan to introduce legislation this Session to increase aid to private and parochial schools?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that question has been raised several times in the House, and each

time I have indicated that any grants to any educational institutions outside of the public school system will be announced when my Estimates are up. As much legislation is under way and under consideration, it will be clear what legislation will be tabled at the time it's tabled in the House.

Versatile Manufacturing - employee layoffs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the other day, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry asked me, in connection with the problems that Versatile Manufacturing were encountering, for details in respect to layoffs. I indicated I would take the question as notice. I did so.

Regrettably, last night a reporter from the Free Press phoned me and asked me, I believe, in connection with the rumours that the Member for Elmwood was circulating as to layoffs at the Manitoba Telephone System. I indicated to that reporter, or the representative of the reporter, that there were no layoffs and both the board of directors and the management had assured me that any changes there would not involve layoffs. Regrettably, the story comes out in the Winnipeg Free Press this morning indicating that my remarks, and I was attributing to the situation at Manitoba Telephone System, were ascribed to me as referring to Versatile.

The information at Versatile, and I'll give that information to the Member for Fort Garry and the House, is that at the end of March, 1985, Versatile employed 1,388 people of whom 861 were hourly paid and 527 on salaries. They have provided notice that 274 employees are being laid off indefinitely and a further 530 employees will be laid off until May 13th. The reason for these significant layoffs, Mr. Speaker, is a very substantial reduction in sales that has taken place. We regret that and we hope that the company will be able to restore its sales record of its excellent equipment and re-employ those workers.

Westeel-Rosco - date of agreement to consolidate plant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Could the Minister advise this House, when he entered into the agreement with Westeel-Rosco to consolidate their plant in the St. Boniface area, not the exact date, the approximate time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was during the early part of the winter of this year, but I can take that question as notice and get the exact date.

MR. C. BIRT: Could the same Minister advise if the government has agreed to purchase the Dublin Street property from the Westeel-Rosco Company?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'd defer to the Minister of Government Services with respect to that question.

There was no part of the agreement that we entered into with respect to the development agreement that had anything to do with any purchase of any property of Westeei-Rosco.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the whole question, but if the reference is to the purchase of the Westeel building that was made on Dublin Avenue for the Highways Department main garage, a replacement for the old Midland Street garage that has existed for about 60 or 70 years and was in very antiquated shape, we have made that purchase and that has been announced, of the Westeel-Rosco facility there, but that was not tied in in any way. It was completely separate from any other agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: A question to the Minister of Highways. Could he advise when the decision was made to purchase the building and how much it was purchased for?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the total purchase price was \$2 million. Our estimates are that for a comparable facility it would be in the neighbourhood of \$4 million to 6 million to construct a comparable facility for the Highway's garage. The decision was made around the end of March.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. If the government was contemplating buying this building, why was it necessary then to give supplementary aid to the company? It seems to me that if you were going to buy the facility that would have been sufficient funds to allow the company to consolidate its operations in St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, the question of purchase of the building was not part of any discussions that I, or to my knowledge, that any of my staff had with Westeel-Rosco with respect to their expansion plans in the Province of Manitoba. Our discussions and the agreement that we entered into with Westeei-Rosco through the development agreement process was with respect to their modernization and expansion plans in the City of Winnipeg, the moving of work from Toronto and from other locations to Winnipeg. The question of what was happening to the building was not discussed at any time to my knowledge with respect to Westeel-Rosco.

Road maps - lack of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Highways and would ask

the Minister of Highways to confirm that the Department of Highways does not have any maps available for tourists or for any citizens who want maps and that the government has virtually cut out the printing of road maps in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been no decision made to reduce the number of maps available. They were going to print a rerun of the previous maps, so that we would not have to incur the added expenses of a new map at this particular time - it's an '84-'85 map - and sufficient copies were ordered so that the tourism requirements would be met and all of the requirements would be met for the distribution of this map. If it isn't out and it hasn't been distributed, I will find out why.

It is also our intention to look at the revision of the map, and the format, and that is being done for subsequent years but, at this time, the existing map is being reprinted. I expect that it is out; if it isn't, we'll find out why.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the tourist season is on us and that tourists are asking for maps, and members are asking for maps, and the officials both at the Tourism Department and the Highways Department say that there will be no maps available till the end of June, and the government has cut back from ordinarily printing 650,000 maps to 150,000, how can the Minister justify this type of cutback at a time when we're trying to encourage tourism in this province and now when the tourists hit our borders, we are spending money on government advertising and other things rather than essential things to promote tourism in this province?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of errors in the statement made by the member. Firstly, when the previous government was in, they printed 600 maps whether they needed them or not. We have determined that 600,000 maps - we need 500,000 to meet the requirements - 500,000 maps per year - and that was what was printed last year.

This year we determined, because of the desires to redisplay the map and to revamp it with a different format, that we would postpone the printing of a new map until approximately July or August. At the same time, we would increase the number of last year's maps to tide us over till that period of time.

There has been an additional 250,000 maps ordered and the contract was let in March, I believe. So I am not aware that there is going to be a delay till June, and I will certainly find out. If there is, that's not acceptable. We expected those would be out on time and that was the assurances that I received from the staff and we will certainly find out about it.

French translation of statutes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, on April 15th the Member for Elmwood asked me for an update on statute

translations. The following figures are as of April 23, 1985 and deal only with the statutes which appear in the continuing consolidation of the statutes of Manitoba - that is the main public statutes. Whether or not we will be required to translate the approximately 3,500 to 4,000 other statutes will depend on the decision of the Supreme Court.

With respect to the public statutes then, those that are published in the technical sense - that is those that have been translated and passed - this includes the statutes which have been passed in the Legislature in the three bilingual Sessions we have had; and includes as well, The Public Schools and Elections Acts which were deposited with the Clerk and then published as consolidations - these constitute about 11.3 percent of the total.

Ready to publish in that same sense - that is, statutes with respect to which there is the French version and they have been revised but require a renumbering of sections - those sometimes can be a fairly lengthy process - those constitute about another 21 percent of the total.

Revised - that is those that have been translated and have been revised by a senior translator - these constitute another 10 percent of the total.

Awaiting revision - that is, they've been translated but require the work of a senior person to bring them into shape - this is being done in-House and on a contract basis. In terms of process, this constitutes our major problem because senior legal translators are very hard to come by and this constitutes about 31 percent of the total.

In progress - that is, line translators are working on them now - it's another 21 percent of the total.

Unassigned - about 6 percent of the total.

So considerable progress has been made since last fall, and we are now in the process of attempting to hire an additional four translators.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given the present pace of translation, and all things considered, does the Minister have an approximate time/year when this task would be completed?

HON. R. PENNER: There are a number of variables, Mr. Speaker. If we are able to hire the four additional translators and retain, either directly or on a contract basis, the revisers who are presently working with us, we ought to be able to complete the public statutes within two to three years at the present pace or perhaps a little less, but I don't want to be overly optimistic.

The main problem then will be twofold. One is the statutes which aren't in the consolidated statutes, the 3,500 to 4,000 statutes, some of which are very vitally important, and the regulations. That really is the main problem which concerns us at the moment and we are taking every step we can to line up translation services should the need be there.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question. What would the minimum period of time be to complete the task of translation if all systems were "go" and the Minister ordered a crash translation. Can the Minister indicate what is the absolute minimum as he sees it at this time?

HON. R. PENNER: If we include the public statutes in the continuing consolidation and those not in the consolidation, and the regulations, I would think that we would need on a crash program about 10 years.

CNR Western Regional Office - downgrading of Winnipeg position

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. The Federal Government recently announced that the Western Regional Vice-President for the CNR would have his office located in Edmonton. I am wondering if pursuant to the Minister's recent meeting with federal officials regarding the Port of Churchill and the boxcar rehabilitation program for Transcona, whether or not the Minister has received any assurance from the Federal Government that the location of the Western Regional Office in Edmonton will not result in a downgrading of Winnipeg's position in the CNR system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we raised this very important matter with the Federal Minister of Transport, as well as the President of C.N. at the meeting in Ottawa on Wednesday evening. We have a number of concerns with what's been happening with regard to CN in this province, certainly with the rail industry, the VIA centre cut that was made here.

There were many layoffs that have taken place in the Transcona Shops, some uncertainty about the diesel shop that was to be put in place at the Transcona Shops and then, of course, the move of the senior vice-president to the Mountain region, these all added up to ominous signs that were of great concern to us, Mr. Speaker.

However, we have received from the Federal Minister assurances that there is no grandiose plan to downgrade the role of Winnipeg as a major railway transportation centre and, as a matter of fact, he sees it growing. I can say that we have some reason to be dubious about this and we'll be watching it very closely and getting involved in ensuring, wherever possible, that there are no reductions in staffing as a result of this move and this announcement of the senior vice-president to the Mountain region. We intend to make representations at every opportunity to ensure that there are no cutbacks, Mr. Speaker.

Welcome to Manitoba signs - removal of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and ask the Minister why this government removed the "Welcome to Manitoba" signs on various entrances to the province, especially from Saskatchewan? I ask the

Minister, was it because they were coloured red, white and blue; or was it because they were not bilingual? I wonder if the Minister can tell us when we can expect the new signs to be put in place?

A MEMBER: When he gets his new picture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: My colleague suggests I'm getting my picture on it, but that is not the case.

The signs, Mr. Speaker, are currently being repaired and I appreciate the member's question because I think that one of the issues that has been raised by tourism associations over the last number of years is the question of the appropriateness of the entrance points with respect to tourism; and I expect that we will be seeing an upgrading, not only in terms of the current signs, but an upgrading of the signs generally, so that it supports in a more appropriate way a welcome to Manitoba.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister can be more specific and tell us when we can expect the new signs to be put in place.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I expect that will happen very shortly.

Manitoba Hog Stabilization Program - daily payout to producers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the somewhat depressed hog prices in Manitoba, could the Minister tell us what the daily payout is from the Manitoba Hog Stabilization Program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there was a quarterly payout made recently. I'll take the question as notice and provide the details, as was announced by the Chairperson of the Hog Stabilization Committee.

The committee handles the program and the province provides the guarantee to the program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, my concern is with what would appear to be massive payouts this last period of time. Will there be any danger of the program not having sufficient funds to sustain the hog industry?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've answered this question a number of times before and when I spoke to the Annual Meeting of the Manitoba Hog Producers, I indicated to them that we put in the program as a long-term program of income stability and the province, during these difficult times, now is not the time to pull away from producers.

We intend to continue the program and there's, as I understand it, in terms of budgetary requirements, ample funding to provide the guarantees there are. If that is not the case we will, of course, have to likely ask the Federal Government to cost-share 50-50 on any stabilization program.

MACC - loans approved

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on another subject. Some time ago I asked the Minister to indicate to us how many loans had been approved under the \$20 million program - the 9.75 percent program - has the Minister got that information available at this time?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, no. I asked the corporation to get the details. I know that there were somewhere in the neighbourhood of 50 loan applications at the time but, as I indicated to the honourable member, those loan funds were in terms of a priority of the corporation; our priority, because of the limited number of staff, is to provide the loan guarantees for operating credit that have come through in the institutions, and those funds will be put forward throughout this whole year.

But I don't have the details and I'm sure the member will raise it during our Estimates and we'll have the staff here to deal with those questions.

Plan Winnipeg - change in policy

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House if the government has changed its policy with regard to the city's long-range development plan, Plan Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: To the same Minister, how has the Minister planned to resolve this issue?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend is speaking about the Plan Winnipeg? Oh, that is practically resolved, it should be announced fairly soon. There has been some discussion and I think everybody is in agreement.

Interest Rate Relief Program - notices of collection

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate how many collection attempts, or how many notices of collection for the repayable portion of the Interest Rate Relief Program

have been mailed out to farmers who qualified and receive benefits under that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MACC - number of uncollectible notices of repayment

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is taking that question as notice, I wonder if he might also find out from MACC how many of those notices for repayment are uncollectible.

HON. G. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member - and I will take that portion as notice - the honourable member should be aware, as well, that there is an option in the process of the portion of the Interest Rate Relief Program that can be put forward as a five-year loan in terms of the repayment; that there is not the requirement that the monies be paid immediately if monies are not forthcoming. So there is an option provided to producers.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, Mr. Speaker, I trust from the Minister's last answer he'll provide that information as well.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll ask the corporation for those details.

Dairy farming regulations - possible change

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the Minister of Agriculture. Sometime ago the policy was changed on the allocation of dairy quota, the partial transfer of herds and quotas, has the Minister reversed his decision to eliminate any transfer of policy; or, Mr. Speaker, is he continuing with the policy which he has recently implemented?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it appears daily that members of the opposition don't remember what their policies were when they were in government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the Honourable Member for Arthur that there's been no change in dairy policy in the Province of Manitoba vis-a-vis the policies that they put forward. We are attempting to enforce the policies that he put forward, Sir.

We are, in discussion with the producers and with the board, and are endeavouring to come up with some options in order to make the system flexible and, in fact, attempting to preserve the principle of no value for quota.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Agriculture to tell the truth on this matter, and I would ask him, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, I will rephrase my question and withdraw my last comment, Mr. Speaker, if it is somewhat upsetting to you, Sir, and to the House.

I would say to the Minister of Agriculture, would he reimplement our policy that was in place, Mr. Speaker, where the dairy farmers can transfer - or could transfer partial quota and partial dairy herds, as was our policy?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we certainly are looking at that option, but the Member for Arthur, while we allow that transfer to go, we may have partial herds, the condition that we placed that if quota were transferred and there was valuable quota that the quota be cancelled and they didn't enforce their policy and that's what created this whole mess that's been building over — (Interjection) — the last four or five years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister table in this Legislature a directive that went from the Natural Products Marketing Council to the Dairy Board during our term of office which clearly states what the policy was and it is different than what he said? Will he table that document in this Legislative Assembly? I think it was signed by Mr. Craig Lee.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the minutes that were tabled in the House by the Premier is at the Minister's directive.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked for the directive from the Natural Products Marketing Council Secretary who was Craig Lee. I'm asking the Minister if he will table that letter which was a directive to the Milk Producers' Marketing Board.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table that document. Because it was in that document, in case the member doesn't recall, the provision that the transfer of those quotas can be reverted back to the Natural Products Marketing Council at any time. But it's very clear that there was no intent, or if there wasn't it was through neglect by the former Minister of Agriculture to enforce the policies that are there, and that's why we have the problem today, Sir.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 14 students of Grade 12 standing from the Wild Rose High School in North Dakota. They are under the direction of Mr. Graham and Mr. Binde.

There are 28 students of Grade 11 standing from the Edward Schreyer School. They are under the direction of Mr. Grant and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

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

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

The Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources has not yet completed consideration of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System, so I would like to call a further meeting of that committee for next Tuesday morning at 10:00 a.m.

Sir, if at that meeting the report is finished, I would propose to call a meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for next Thursday. I'll just provide advance notice now. I would not ask the Clerk to place the notice on the Order Paper until we know next Tuesday whether MTS is complete. The Standing Committee on Economic Development would consider and report on the Annual Reports of the Communities Economic Development Fund, the Moose Lake Loggers, and Channel Area Loggers.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4 of today's Order Paper, there is a notice in the name of the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Sir, there is an error, and I would ask leave of the House for the Clerk to correct that and replace that name with the name of the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security for the first reading motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Mr. Speaker, would you please call the three bills that are standing on the Order Paper for second reading in the order in which they appear?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 21 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Ransom, the Member for Turtle Mountain, we have perused this bill and are prepared to allow this bill to proceed to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, I would look for some advice from the Member for Lakeside or from the Clerk as to whether or not we are by announcement by the Member for Lakeside removing the right of another member to speak. I'm concerned about the precedent we might establish. I know we've had some difficulty on this point in the past. I'm certainly agreeable to see the bill moved to second reading, but I do not want to preclude the right of the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's of no consequence. I agree, I suppose we can leave it till when next the bill is called. It's just that the Member for Turtle Mountain had to leave the Chamber for a previous engagement and just indicated to me that he was prepared to let the bill proceed. I suppose we can always do it by leave without setting a precedent. — (Interjection) — Well, then, I indicate to the Honourable Government House Leader that the opposition is prepared to allow Bill 21 to proceed to committee stage.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Can I get some indication of whether you wish to pass it or leave it stand in the name of Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain?

HON. R. PENNER: Pass, by leave.

MR. H. ENNS: Pass.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, Bill 21 passes at second reading.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are considering Item No. 4.(d)(1) Manitoba Police Commission: Salaries; 4.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - Mr. Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Before we proceed with that, Mr. Chairman, I have some of the information requested by the Member for St. Norbert yesterday.

First of all, members of the Board of Review, the Chairperson is Caroline Cramer, Q.C. The lay person is Patricia Desjardins. The psychiatrists are Dr. Maralyn MacKay and Dr. Fred Shane. There was a member from the Neepawa area, I believe, who resigned some months ago and has not been replaced. That's the Board of Review.

With respect to the B and E stats, questions were asked about the disposition. The record keeping system which we have at the moment, that the police have, will give us - and I'll furnish in a moment - the number of persons charged but were not able to give a statistical analysis of sentences handed out. We might, but it will take some time, a sort of a random pick, to get some idea.

The member will recall that the number of break-ins reported or which came to the notice of the police in 1984, were 12,171. The number of persons charged, both adults and young offenders, is 1,465. I can break those down between adults and young offenders: adults, 764; young offenders, 701.

With respect to impaired driving stats, I gave the member the provincial ones. They showed a marked decrease. Regrettably, that is not the same for the City of Winnipeg. The year over year figures, City of Winnipeg for the 234, 235, 236 sections of the Code: 1983, 2,189; 1984, 2,228. That figure has been relatively within the same range since 1981. The average of about 2,200 cases approximately in that period of time is significantly higher than the average for the preceding four years from 1977 to '80 which was approximately 1,725.

With respect to the statistics on spousal abuse, we're not able regrettably - because they're still using a manual system - to break out in terms of the progress of the cases which is given in terms of charges, we're not able to break out at that point how many individuals are involved. We only have that compendiously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that information. I'm sure during consideration of the Liquor Control Commission Estimates, you'll recall rural members always raised the discrepancy between rural impaired driving charges and city, and it would be useful information for him then.

Mr. Chairman, on the Manitoba Police Commission, obviously with the new legislation in effect, I take it the Attorney-General sees quite a diminished role for the Manitoba Police Commission?

HON. R. PENNER: I see a changed role. I've begun discussions with - in fact I began discussions some time ago - the vice-chairperson of the Commission, and at one time with the board as a whole, concerning his changed role and it will now begin vigorously examining its mandate and making recommendations. What is being looked at is a role for the Commission; it has a statutory role of course with respect to the Law Enforcement Review Agency. It still has a continuing statutory role with respect to appeals where the disciplinary measure complained of does not involve

a third party who comes within the scope of LERA. But, beyond that, which is a diminished role of course, they are looking at questions relating to recruiting standards training, safety measures for police officials, safety equipment for police officials and crime prevention, that range of activities will be where the focus shifts to.

MR. G. MERCIER: Who are the two persons employed at the Police Commission?

HON. R. PENNER: Lorne Gregorash, Officer Ahle (phonetic) and the support staff, Michel Dupuis.

MR. G. MERCIER: So, Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Crime Prevention Programs would generally continue under Mr. Gregorash's direction?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. The focal point for the Crime Prevention Program, Mr. Gregorash is carrying that out in his usual vigorous and imaginative style, but we have been working with project prevention and lending some assistance to project prevention which is still located in an office in the Tuxedo complex, and we're also, in terms of our preventive role, continuing to carry a mandate with respect to drinking and driving with respect to which a lot of the preventive focus has shifted.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, they have been expanding for the past number of years. I think there have been expanded crime prevention responsibilities assumed by the RCMP and the Winnipeg Police Force. Mr. Gregorash, I take it, in carrying out his job acts in co-ordination and in consultation with those two main forces.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I'm glad that the member raised the issue of crime prevention as carried out by the RCMP. Indeed the RCMP has been carrying out an increasingly vigorous crime prevention program.

I just yesterday received its report, and I'll make a copy of that available to the member. It's an extensive report which indicates a commendable level of activity. We do know, because we've discussed that with the RCMP at our regular monthly meetings, that on its own initiative it has allocated some of its repriorized and some of its staff to put more emphasis on crime prevention.

We also know that a number of the programs have demonstrably worked in showing some reduced levels of specific activity where specific programs run in conjunction with municipalities, towns and villages.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, on April 22nd, the Executive Policy Committee of the City of Winnipeg - pardon me - the Finance Committee of the City of Winnipeg considered the report of the Manitoba Police Commission on the Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report and rejected the recommendations that criminal charges against the seven demonstrators be stayed; the recommendation that no further charges be laid against any other person; that no internal proceedings be taken against any police officer as a consequence of these events, and referred the matter to the city's official delegation for discussion with provincial

representatives in the hope that the province will reconsider its position with respect to the issues involved.

Has the Attorney-General met with officials of the city's official delegation to discuss the Police Commission report and the Attorney-General's decision to agree with these recommendations?

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, I have received nothing official from the city. Apparently the member has, or at least received something.

MR. G. MERCIER: I gave a report.

HON. R. PENNER: I think that's a regrettable lapse where, in fact, the city is communicating to me, as it were, through the front pages of the press. I would express the sincere hope that if they have something to communicate to me that it be done. I think they know what my address is.

In terms of meeting with the official delegation, there is a meeting with the official delegation coming up some time within the next two or three weeks. I, as a member of the Urban Affairs Committees of Cabinet, do meet within those meetings and, of course, the matters placed on the agenda will be discussed.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I must say with respect to this recommendation of the Police Commission and the Attorney-General's concurrence with those recommendations, it is one that I must disagree with. I would ask the Attorney-General if he could explain to the committee his reasons for accepting the recommendations?

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, I think that, given the basic mandate of the Inquiry Commission as contained in Order-in-Council 1214, November 9, 1983, one should not isolate one or two of its recommendations from the recommendations as a whole.

I would like to put on the record I think that, looking at the recommendations as a whole, those that particularly addressed the primary concerns having to do with training of police officers, responsibility of demonstrators, the way in which events of this kind should be dealt with, all of these recommendations I found particularly helpful, and would certainly hope that one of the things that can be done by the Manitoba Police Commission in terms of its ongoing mandate is to work in a co-operative way with the Winnipeg Police Commission and the Winnipeg police officials to see what element at least, if not all, of those recommendations can be dealt with.

Secondly, I considered the fact that there had been lengthy hearings. The hearings covered many many days; was presided over by three members of the Commission, in particular by its Chairperson, a very experienced counsel who in my view appears to have conducted the inquiry rigorously and fairly; during the courses of that inquiry had to make some pretty tough rulings on the process and procedures. He seems to have done so and, I think, done so credibly. I think he earned the respect of all of those who appeared before the Commission.

The Commission itself was represented by counsel. Various persons who appeared, the Winnipeg Police

Association, the Winnipeg Senior Officers Association, the City of Winnipeg, individuals and organizations were represented by counsel. There was presented to the Commission of Inquiry evidence that, in terms of its extent - I'm talking both as it was presented directly and on the basis of cross-examination - the visual evidence was far more extensive than anything that might be presented in a criminal court.

On the basis of its viewing of that evidence and its hearing of that evidence, both in direct and cross-examination over 27 days, the Commission unanimously in most respects, not always unanimous in terms of its reasons, made recommendations. So that was the basis upon which I proceeded.

I also proceeded with this in mind, that it seemed to me on careful reading of the material, the evidence did not support the allegation made, I thought rather irresponsibly at one time in the press, that in fact we were dealing with street thugs. There was no suggestion that those who were involved in activities which were the subject of criminal charges or which might have been the subject of criminal charges whether police or counter-demonstrators were persons about whom it could be said that they presented an ongoing menace, that they were people with criminal records, or people with a disposition to criminal behaviour. None of that emerged at all from the record.

What emerged from that record was that there had been what was, as described by the Commission of Inquiry, initially a peaceful demonstration that was disrupted and I will not make a value judgment on that. In any event it was, objectively speaking, disrupted. A consequence of that disruption was that a number of people, a substantial number of people, overreacted one way or another.

It is clear that there was overreaction of a kind which cannot be commended in any way, and indeed cannot be the subject of anything else except criticism. But to say that this is behaviour, whether of those charged, those not charged, of the police in some instances is subject to criticism and even severe criticism. That necessarily should be resolved by the blunt instrumentality of the criminal law doesn't necessarily follow and it seems to me, on occasion - the occasions will be rare - it is the better part of wisdom, as a matter of the administration of criminal justice, that charges be stayed and I felt that this was such an instance.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, would the Attorney-General not confirm that these prima facie cases of assault were committed by demonstrators and police?

HON. R. PENNER: I would agree that there is in fact a prima-facie case of assault against demonstrators, counter-demonstrators and police, not all of them, of course, but in each category.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that what has now happened is that we have - no one is entitled to commit assault under these circumstances, whether they be demonstrators or whether they be police officers, and that as a result of the decision by the Attorney-General we now have essentially what is a ridiculous situation. Because the Attorney-General has refused to proceed with the charges against the

demonstrators, the Chief of Police does not wish to proceed with any internal disciplinary proceedings against some police officers who at the same time would appear guilty of assault on some of the people involved in the demonstration, and it certainly leaves the impression in the public's mind that the public interest is being neglected by the lack of enforcement of the Criminal Code with respect to the assaults that were committed both by the demonstrators and by the police.

I would ask the Attorney-General whether this proposed meeting, for example, of the official delegation of the City of Winnipeg with the Attorney-General is really of no use? Has he made up his mind once and for all? No matter what representations are made to him by city officials or other persons interested in the enforcement of the Criminal Code, have they any possibility of changing the Attorney-General's mind with respect to this decision?

HON. R. PENNER: Let me deal with the general issue first and then answer the specific question.

I recall vividly the former Chief of Police George Blow, a man of great stature and with earned respect, who was considered by his force to be a model police officer, and one whose respect for the law was second to none. At a time when there were activities that were very puzzling to a lot of the citizens of the city, were worried about them in some sense as parents alarmed by them, and that was the beginning of the sort of the hippie era - if I can use an outdated phrase - with large scatterings of youth on Memorial Park openly, in some instances, smoking marijuana, making a show of it, that George Blow's reaction was to go down by himself with another police officer and just walk through the crowd speaking to the young people not as a matter of policy, not in fact attempting to arrest or lay charges, earning the respect in a situation which might have been explosive had the full force of the criminal law been used. He was praised for that, and I think appropriately so. I think that I would like to make that point.

In terms of whether or not there is a lack of respect for the law, I think that when one considers the steps that have been taken under my ministry in terms of the prosecution of obscenity, which has increased several hundred percent in recent years, with respect to initiating a policy with respect to spousal abuse, a policy which was not there before I became an Attorney-General, in which there was in fact a policy which led to not only disrespect for the law but encouraged violence against women. With respect to dealing with violence in sport, with respect to drinking and driving, no Attorney-General - and I have no shame in saying this - has shown a greater willingness to enforce the law where the law should be enforced than this Attorney-General.

If the Member for St. Norbert, who was Attorney-General for four years, can tell me that during the course of his Ministry charges were not stayed in the courts every day, then he must be a unique Attorney-General, or at least didn't know what was taking place in the courts.

It is a matter, a commonly accepted matter in the administration of criminal justice that even where in some instances there is a prima facie case, it is not

in every instance that the charge will be proceeded and there's a whole number of reasons why. The particular reasons here are the reasons I gave and which, I think, justify the action.

With respect to the question of whether there's any possibility, I don't think there's much to be perfectly frank, but certainly if the representations are made I will listen to them courteously and consider them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, were the costs of proceeding with the prosecutions, against the demonstrators or the police, a factor in the Attorney-General's decision?

HON. R. PENNER: No.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Attorney-General about the total costs of the inquiry, and he took as notice some two weeks ago a question with respect to the costs of Legal Aid for counsel who worked on the inquiry. I wonder if he has that answer.

HON. R. PENNER: I don't have it as yet. I did contact the executive director of the Legal Aid - I actually did that personally - and he advised me that in fact he had just held discussions with counsel who were seeking his advice in terms of what might be properly charged and what might not a that he expected the bill to be tendered by the end of April. It's not past the end of April and we'll check, in fact, whether or not that bill has been tendered. I expect that we should know within two weeks.

All he was able to say to me was that he didn't think that it would be very large, but I don't know really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1)—pass; 4.(d)(2)—pass.
4.(e)(1) Law Enforcement Review Act: Salaries;
4.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: The supplementary information, Mr. Chairman, indicates that there are two persons employed by the Law Enforcement Review Board. That would be, I take it, Mr. Schneider who, according to an Order-in-Council, is paid \$64,600 as the Commissioner; plus a secretary, I would take it.

HON. R. PENNER: That is right.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister has appointed a 12-member board. What is the remuneration for the members of the board?

HON. R. PENNER: I will try to give it from memory but memory, especially with me, is an unreliable instrument, and we'll get that more precisely. I should point out that the members of the board are only paid when they sit. They're not an administrative board and they don't have a dual function. They are strictly a quasi-judicial board, and it will only be when it meets and then, of course, it will meet in panels of three.

The requirement of the act is that the person presiding in any panel should be a lawyer, so we have two lawyers as chairperson and vice-chairperson. Their per diem is, I think, \$250, but I would like to check that. The

other members who are not lawyers, the per diem is under 100, but the precise figures will be supplied, well not later today, but on Monday.

MR. G. MERCIER: Will the agency be filing an annual report?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I believe it's required to do so under the act.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, has the Attorney-General had an opportunity to discuss the reported statement of Mr. Schneider that most complaints of oppressive behaviour by police are likely legitimate? The newspaper reporter indicated he said: "I must say, if the allegations that we're dealing with now have substance, then the police officers should be taken to task. I think most of these cases are legitimate."

It seemed to imply some sort of prejudice against police officers and seemed to lack an independent review of allegations, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Attorney-General has had an opportunity to discuss that with Mr. Schneider and to correct the impression that was left.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I did so immediately upon reading the report in the press. In fact, the Commissioner had anticipated me and had written a letter pointing out that in fact the statements attributed to him were not correct - and I'll get a copy of the letter - because I have subsequently sent it to the Winnipeg Police Association, the mayor and the chief people who were concerned as they properly should be concerned about the statement as reported.

But the Commissioner made it clear that all he intended to say was that these were the allegations, but the statistics which he provided at the same time and which did appear in that same press report indicated that, as he had dealt with them, a very substantial number were in his view unfounded - and he dealt with them as unfounded - and indeed the current statistics for which I provided supplementary information to the member indicates that many of those which he has dealt with up till April 24th, 50 representations as he calls them rather than cases but I'd say 50 cases, of these only 28 were considered by him to be complaints under the act, it's about half of the number. Five of these have been resolved informally; 23 are still under review, investigation or conciliation, and we'll have an update on those by the end of May.

It seems to me, as I indicated in my opening remarks, that in fact the Commissioner is fulfilling his primary mandate of mediation. What appears significant at this point is that so far he has received co-operation from the police and has not encountered resistance as it was thought there might be. I can understand the police being concerned. It's a new mechanism and it's something that they're not used to and they want to be sure that it's fair. I can understand the concern about the article as reported, and I'm glad that the Commissioner corrected the impression which was left by that article, and I'm glad that it can be put on record here today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(1)—pass; 4.(e)(2)—pass.

Resolution 19: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$28,534,000 for Attorney-General, Law Enforcement, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 5.(a)(1) Court Services, Court Administration: Salaries; 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, just at the outset, it appears in the supplementary information, I think a word of explanation is required in terms of staff years.

We show an overall decrease of 15, but that was just a number that we required to have representing payment that was made to County Court judges when they sat for us as Surrogate Court judges. They received something like \$2.5 thousand a year or something of that kind and each payment was represented by a staff year with the amalgamation; and the Court of Queen's Bench, by changes in legislation being required to deal as part of its overall mandate with Surrogate Court matters, there is no longer any money paid out as extra on Surrogate Court matters, so the staff years are dropped.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, firstly let me indicate my pleasure at attending the opening of new Law Courts Building a few weeks ago. It's a very impressive facility.

My first question would be with respect to the next stage of the process. Is the Land Titles Building going to be renovated at the same time as the old Law Courts Building?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is it the Court of Appeal judges who will be in the Land Titles Office building after it has been renovated?

HON. R. PENNER: No. There'll be perhaps 22 Judges' Chambers, but they will in the main be Queen's Bench judges.

MR. G. MERCIER: It's anticipated that it will all be completed within two years?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Court of Queen's Bench administrative offices are being moved out of the Woodsworth Building, or have moved into the new Law Courts Building, who is taking that space up in the Woodsworth Building? Does the Minister know?

HON. R. PENNER: That space will be occupied by sheriffs and court administration.

MR. G. MERCIER: How will the Land Titles Office building be connected to the old Law Courts Building?

HON. R. PENNER: By an overpass.

MR. G. MERCIER: My next question, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether the Attorney-General has given any consideration to destroying that abomination of a connection between the old Law Courts Building and

the Woodsworth Building when these renovations are completed and . . .

A MEMBER: Who was responsible for that again?

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . and the fact that the Land Titles Office building is going to have a connection with the old Law Courts Building, could he assure me that a similar abomination will not be constructed between those two buildings?

HON. R. PENNER: I'm with you. I'm going to put in a plug that it be done in limestone Gothic to match the two buildings. I think seriously it is a good point, that the overpass should, in terms of its architectural detail, blend with the two structures.

MR. G. MERCIER: The renovations are going out for tender, or are out for tender, I thought the Attorney-General indicated. Could he indicate what is being asked for in the specifications for that connection?

HON. R. PENNER: I'm happy to say we still have time. The tendering is in two stages because the Land Titles Office will only take one year, and the Courthouse, two. The tenders are out now for the Courthouse and the tenders with respect to the Land Titles Office will not be out till November.

MR. G. MERCIER: I take it we have some assurance from the Attorney-General that any overhead connection would be in keeping with the present architecture. Could he indicate whether there are any plans to take down that connection between the Law Courts Building and the Woodsworth Building; and either do it underground or . . . ?

HON. R. PENNER: No, there are no current plans to do that. Doing it underground would run into difficulty, perhaps an impossibility, because the renovations to the old Courthouse includes very very substantial renovations to the basement where there would be any possibility of a connection.

I believe the Law Society lockers, robing room and indeed a pleasant lounge area, is going to be located on that east side of the building so that the lawyers can begin as they will likely end up, in total darkness.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, this may be straying a bit afield from the Attorney-General's responsibilities, but I'm sure he has some concern about the aesthetics of the Law Courts Building.

There has been discussion about the possible construction of a Remand Centre and take it north of the Woodsworth Building which would, in some way, have to connect with what eventually will be the new Provincial Judges' facilities in the new Law Courts Building. I wonder if there could be some consideration given when that Remand Centre is being planned - and eventually it will have to go ahead by whoever is in government - the traffic then might allow for an underground connection between the Remand Centre and perhaps at that time there could be some consideration at least given to doing away with that overhead connection between the old Law Courts Building and the Woodsworth Building.

HON. R. PENNER: I think in a way we've anticipated the member in the building of a new Courthouse, we already built a tunnel connection out to the east side so that when the Remand Centre is built, there will in fact be an underground tunnel through to the Remand Centre. We made sure that when the foundation was built and the piles put in that the provision was made for a tunnel connection. So that's there.

With respect to the Remand Centre, which is not strictly speaking my jurisdiction but I work closely with the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, and I'm happy to say that included in the Capital allocations being proposed for this year is, indeed the go-ahead for the Remand Centre. In terms of now, hopefully if the detailed drawings are ready in time, then the beginning of construction.

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

5.(b)(1) Federal Courts: Salaries, 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, are there any plans to expand the number of judges in the Court of Appeal?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, that is under active consideration. I perhaps should say no more than this, that a proposal was made by the Chief Justice and it seems to be more than adequate reason for increasing the complement. The Federal Minister of Justice has advised that if indeed there is the position then the Federal Government would be prepared to change The Federal Judges Act in order to make that appointment, so it's under active consideration. There may then be a bill or it might be included in the Statute Law Amendment to increase the number of puisne judges in the Court of Appeal from five to six. There's hope for you yet.

A MEMBER: How much time do I have?

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of a bill that was introduced in the House of Commons, An Act to amend Various Acts as a Consequence of the Reconstitution of Courts in Ontario and Manitoba. Was that bill passed and did that have anything to do with the amalgamation of courts in Manitoba?

HON. R. PENNER: I'm not sure which bill the member is looking at. There were two. What is the date of the bill?

MR. G. MERCIER: November 7, 1984.

HON. R. PENNER: November 7, 1984. Yes, this is the bill that follows of course the change in government. There was one matter that was left over that was on the Order Paper before the House dissolved and the election called, and that would have added the position of senior associate chief justice to our complement and the feds are ready to move this through at any time. We're looking forward to that happening because the court, as it is presently constituted, needs a judge who is primarily an administrative person as senior associate chief judge.

MR. G. MERCIER: You opened up another position?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, you know, I don't know what I'm doing. I'm giving all of these job opportunities for you, but you know I always was mellow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Since we're on the Federal Courts, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to confirm a concern that I had already transmitted very briefly to the Attorney-General which essentially involves procedure in the Federal Court of Canada and the so-called federally sponsored Courts of Queen's Bench in Manitoba. There is a problem involving litigation where more than one party may appear as defendants. It is necessary, for instance, if one is to proceed against a penitentiary situated in Manitoba to sue in the Federal Court and sue Her Majesty in that regard.

If one also wishes to sue persons who may not agents or may not be agreed to be agents of the Crown in the same respect with respect to the same matter, one currently has to bring the litigation in the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, so one has two unassociated paths to follow involving the same factual circumstances. I've done a little research since I spoke to the Honourable Attorney-General and I'm advised that Mr. MacGuigan, before his political demise and his ascendancy, I might add, to the bench, was working on such a project, and I'm told by my sources in the Federal Government that Mr. MacGuigan did in fact give his personal assent at a formal conference sometime ago to reforming the legislation. The reason I'm speaking is just to indicate that it's my opinion that this matter should be brought to the attention of Mr. Crosbie, who I presume is a successor of Mr. MacGuigan, although I'm not sure that I've got the portfolios correctly.

I think it should be brought to his attention because it is creating some mischief, I'm advised, in many cases in the province right now and across Canada. Indeed, I think it deserves some attention and some future rectification. It certainly is important I think in some respects as a no-fault divorce and reclaiming the streets.

HON. R. PENNER: I've noted the member's concerns and will forward them to the Minister of Justice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the Revenue Estimates under Attorney-General, there is a reduction of \$300,000 in revenue from law fees. I think the Attorney-General's Department in past years have imposed some considerable increase in fees and I wonder what the reason for the reduction in revenue from law fees in this fiscal year, or was the previous estimate too high?

HON. R. PENNER: Under law fees, yes, essentially what that is it's in one pocket and out the other, but it's to the advantage of our department. There was a system up until April 1st, pursuant to which Legal Aid was charged the court fees, and that appeared as a charge to the Legal Aid budget. We were successful as a department in convincing my colleagues that this was inappropriate and that a system should be developed

and the system is in place pursuant to which Legal Aid matters, as they are filed, are filed without fee, and that's about \$300,000, approximately.

MR. B. CORRIN: Yes, I wanted to take this opportunity since we're on this subject to also thank the Attorney-General for his prompt attention to a matter which I raised, and which was of personal concern to myself and other practitioners and indeed their clients, respecting duplicity, or duplication may be a better term.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, thank you.

MR. B. CORRIN: Administrative duplication may indeed be sometimes duplicity, Mr. Chairman. Respecting the filing of set downs on trials in the Court of Queen's Bench jurisdiction then, this was not a small matter insofar as that it is a step. Steps have been taken which will rationalize filing and therefore save litigants a considerable amount of money across the province with respect to the cost of litigating. Formerly, there was a charge for setting down a record in civil proceedings and also a set-down fee with respect to the notice of trial. That has now been rationalized by the Honourable Attorney-General and the record is no longer the subject of a fee imposition. So, on behalf of myself and many other people who represent litigants in the courts, both good and bad and right and wrong, thank you.

HON. R. PENNER: What can I say, except thank you.

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

5.(c)(1) Court Services, Provincial Court: Salaries; 5.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to read some short correspondence into the record and then ask the Attorney-General a question.

On September 13th of last year he wrote to Mr. John R. Nixon of 256 Waverley Street, and said, "Please be advised that at a Cabinet meeting held on September 12, 1984, your appointment as a bail magistrate has been revoked, effective September 30, 1984. On behalf of the Government of Manitoba, I wish to thank you for the service rendered since your appointment to this difficult position."

On October 12th, Mr. Nixon wrote back to the Attorney-General and said, "Dear Sir: It was with dismay that I received your letter revoking my appointment as a bail magistrate. It had been my understanding that one of the strengths of the NDP philosophy is fair labour practices. To dismiss someone from a position that they have been fulfilling faithfully for over three years and not give a reason for this decision is beyond my comprehension. I await the explanation of the Cabinet's decision. Yours truly."

The Attorney-General then wrote back on October 25th to Mr. Nixon and said, "Dear Mr. Nixon: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 12, 1984. As you are no doubt aware appointments by Order-in-Council are not subject to the provisions of The Labour Relations Act. These appointments are often changed and such changes are made for a variety of reasons. It is not the practice, when an appointment

by Order-in-Council is terminated, to provide reasons. Yours truly."

Mr. Chairman, I recollect during my tenure as Attorney-General that I am virtually positive that it was only in instances where a person resigned that I ever revoked an Order-in-Council of a magistrate or a justice of the peace. I have noticed in the Orders-in-Council over the past few years that the Attorney-General has revoked a considerable number of magistrates and justices of the peace positions.

I would ask him on what basis is he specifically making this particular change in regard to Mr. Nixon and the numerous other changes that he has made over the past few years?

HON. R. PENNER: I am happy to answer both of those questions. With respect to the bail magistrates at the Remand Centre, it became clear on information received - and I would be happy to put on record from whom that information was received but from people associated with the system and with the Remand Centre - that we needed some strengthening, we needed an improvement in terms of the quality of the bail magistrates. After a very careful review of that, in conjunction with the Chief Provincial Judge - let me stress that - in conjunction with the Chief Provincial Judge - and taking into consideration his recommendations with respect to possible appointments. I don't know if it was bulletined but it was certainly made known that there would be, I think, two positions - it wasn't just Mr. Nixon - there was one other person who was changed at the time.

Several people were interviewed and two persons were hired, in effect, appointed by O/C as replacement one, a former senior police with the City of Winnipeg Police, a man of great strength and repute; and the other person who had been the superintendent at Headingley, again a person with great background and strength and the advice I have is that the system is working immeasurably better. Sometimes you have to do that, and it's not pleasant to do that. I don't want it on the record that Mr. Nixon and the other person were changed because they were totally inadequate or they did something bad. It wasn't that at all. It was felt that the strengths that they had were not the strengths which were needed.

In terms of the general question asked I can only think of one instance in which there has been a revocation for cause in a sense. There are some problems associated with that person. All the other revocations have been because of death or retirement or resignation; no other reason.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Attorney-General indicate what the present time period is for setting down criminal matters in Provincial Judges Court?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I am happy to say here there has been a very great improvement. Part of the reason is that systems which have been developed by the ADM, Court Services, as he now is, and the Chief Provincial Judge are apparently working very very well.

In adult court, all trials for one day or less are being scheduled within 90 days. All trials for one day or less

are being scheduled within 90 days. Custody trials are being scheduled within three weeks. All trials exceeding one day are being scheduled within three-and-a-half months. So the maximum now is down to three-and-a-half months and those are only for non-custody matters where the trial is expected to exceed one day.

In the youth court, all trials are being scheduled within one-and-a-half months.

In the Court of Queen's Bench, to move from criminal matters to family division matters where delay would also be a cause of concern, pre-trial conferences are being scheduled within three weeks - and there is great use now being made of the pre-trial conferences - and trials are being scheduled within one month. This is a remarkable improvement, and I think all of those connected with both courts are to be commended. We have received several expressions of satisfaction from members of the public who are involved in court services.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that because we had reached the stage a year or so ago, or a year-and-a-half ago, where the delay was getting up into the four and five months range, and if we can maintain a three month or a 90 day period, I think that's probably about the optimum that can be maintained. But I think as I found, and the Attorney-General has probably found, there has to be a continued review of that time period to ensure that it's maintained.

On another matter, Mr. Chairman, involving Provincial Courts, the Attorney-General in his opening remarks indicated that he would not likely be proceeding with any legislation to expand the jurisdiction of Small Claims Court.

I had proposed a private member's bill at the last Session of the Legislature, a simple bill that would have increased the jurisdiction from \$1,000 to \$3,000, something I think that was done in the past year-and-a-half in the Province of Saskatchewan. The rationale being that since the \$1,000 limit was established, there has obviously been a great deal of inflation over that number of years which would justify a significant increase in the jurisdiction. Also during that period of time, there has been - obviously caused by inflation - an increase in legal fees which in many instances simply do not justify a litigant to proceed through the normal court system.

I would submit that in the amalgamation of the courts and the elimination of the County Court, which was not in my view performing its historical role of providing an inexpensive process to adjudicate small claims, there has been neglect I think of the small claimant and the difficulty that he finds himself in. I think anybody with a claim in that order, under \$3,000, finds it very difficult to justify proceeding with it because of the cost of legal fees.

Now, we run into the concern that is expressed by some persons that the Small Claims clerk, some do not have the ability to deal with claims of this magnitude. In fact, some say they have difficulty with the existing jurisdiction. I don't totally agree with that, because it is only a small number of cases that are in fact appealed from the Small Claims Court. There are, I believe, and the Attorney-General might have some up-to-date figures, but as I recollect there were certainly in the

vicinity of 10,000, 12,000 claims that are dealt with annually in the Small Claims Court. I think it may be that the number has been reducing; it may not be that high. It may have been reducing which I think is because of the fact that the jurisdiction has not been increased. It doesn't take very much now to cause a dispute to arise over a figure under \$3,000.00.

But with respect to this concern over the ability of Small Claims clerks to adjudicate these matters, there certainly could be some consideration given to establishing a provincial judge's civil or small claims court to consider matters, say, that may be between \$1,000 and \$3,000, and allow a rotation of provincial judges for certain periods of time to serve in that court, which might not be a bad idea also, to have a change of scenery from time to time.

I really do think, Mr. Chairman, that this is an important matter and an important service to the public of Manitoba. I would ask the Attorney-General, if he doesn't have any plans to proceed in this fiscal year to increase the jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court, whether we could receive some assurance that, again if he has the privilege of presenting these Estimates at the next Session of the Legislature, whether we could look forward to at that time some steps to increase the jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court?

HON. R. PENNER: Here again, I'm in substantial agreement with the member on a whole number of points made by him, very well made. I would agree, for example, that magnitude does not mean complexity. In Small Claims, if the Small Claims clerk is capable of dealing with a contract matter involving \$1,000, you might as well fill in the blank and put in \$3,000, it's still going to involve the same issues of law. The fact that it's \$3,000 instead of \$1,000 doesn't make it more complex. These figures are arbitrary, and there are now lots of examples in other jurisdictions of the amount, in fact, having been raised either to \$2,000 or to \$3,000.00.

I want to say this, I'll give it as an undertaking that I am prepared to discuss this with my colleagues to see if there is a willingness in this Session to perhaps bring in something that would just deal with that one issue, namely, given the existing structure because I don't think we're able to change the structure. Whether or not we would be able to accept the suggestion made by the member and increase jurisdiction, that will be looked at and discuss it with the member perhaps next week.

I do feel that there is a need for a thorough look at the the entire way in which the Small Claims Court works. We do have the benefit of the Law Reform Commission report. It did make suggestions that would involve the judges of the Provincial Court, but there are other mechanisms which can be looked at as well.

There are arguments which can be made, and I only say can be made - I don't say that I necessarily support them - that perhaps if you are increasing the jurisdiction not only in a monetary sense but perhaps in other ways that one ought to consider the possibility of the employment of legally trained people in the Small Claims Division wherever it may be associated. That is something that can be looked at in due course, but in the meantime we can look at the monetary jurisdiction question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would encourage the Attorney-General to, at this Session, introduce an amendment to increase the jurisdiction. I would ask him to consider \$3,000.00. If he feels he can't go that high, I think we would, in the opposition, accept whatever we could get in this particular area, and I think I could assure him that there would be very little time spent on it in the Legislature. There would be nothing but support from our side of the House if he chose to introduce a simple bill to that effect or even include it in The Statute Law Amendment Act. I think it's something that should be done and the earlier it's done the better.

On another matter, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General issued a press release on April 19th of this year announcing a new pay plan and category for provincial judges. Just prior to that, there was a news report indicating that the government was going to relinquish administrative control over Provincial Court judges. I wonder if the Attorney-General could explain that statement.

HON. R. PENNER: Later the same day, I had a letter from the Provincial Court judge who was named in the press report apologizing for what was clearly in error. I was trying to think of the Latin term you use when a judge is in error. You have to use a Latin term when a judge is in error but you can use ordinary language when an ordinary mortal is in error. "Per incurium," I think, is the term. That was made per incurium.

No, what we have done, we've taken the first of what may be two or three steps. We have made, I think we all agreed, necessary adjustments in the pay schedule for judges and at the same time, put them into a separate category so that they were no longer linked to the senior executive, senior manager category in the Civil Service. That link had indeed been a problem that when adjustments in salary were being considered for the provincial judges where the connection ought to have been made with other persons fulfilling somewhat the same functions, both within this jurisdiction and in other jurisdictions, while those comparisons could be made the salary adjustments would necessarily be linked to salary adjustments which were being considered within the system for senior executives. It linked them too closely to Civil Service considerations. So that part of the umbilical cord to the Civil Service and to government has been cut.

That left us still with another problem, namely, how to adjust these salaries from time to time, as of course in the fullness of time they must be adjusted, in a way which would perhaps make the process somewhat more objective, that is relatively free from the constraints of the day, other than fiscal constraints. Of course, those must always be observed. So it could be said only with difficulty that there were political considerations that went into the adjustment of salaries here.

But we have, by no means, taken a decision to hive the judges off on their own as some extra-terrestrial unit, some unidentified flying object.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the article indicated that a committee had been struck to decide who will be appointed to an independent body to administer the judges' pay and working conditions. It said: "The

committee composed of several judges, Deputy Attorney-General, Mr. Altman, Chief Provincial Judge Giles and the Administrator of Court Services expected to meet within two weeks." Is the Attorney-General saying this is not an accurate statement of what is happening?

HON. R. PENNER: Indeed the Attorney-General is saying it is not an accurate statement at all. It is per incurium. It is a case where perhaps wishful thinking overtook clarity of vision. What is being proposed is informal meetings between senior officials in my department and the judges, not with a view to setting up some independent commission but with a view to looking at that second stage, namely, the elaboration if possible of some formula other than mere indexing.

One can always index, but I'm not so sure about indexing. You know, the history of indexing in this country has been checkered at best. But some form of regular adjustments to the pay scale which would not be dependent on, first of all, changes in the Civil Service pay scales or dependent on the goodwill of the Government of the Day.

MR. G. MERCIER: So there is no formula that has been agreed upon for increases in provincial judges' salaries. They have simply been set up to a period, I'll refer to the press release, up to April 1, 1985, and there's another increase effective October 1, 1985, but there is no formula for pay increases past that stage at this time.

HON. R. PENNER: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to raise concerns respecting the erosion of jurisdiction of the provincial level of court personnel. There have been several circumstances which have caused this situation, I guess most noticeably for the information of all members, the Unified Family Court coming into being and the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to the granting of certain types of orders in family-related litigation matters. The Court has held that only courts of superior jurisdiction have the inherent power to grant such special types of orders which are fundamental to many separation cases.

As I said, with the unification of the courts and paramount power reposed in the superior courts to deal with all aspects of matrimonial law, I think it can be fairly said that the provincial courts and the judges sitting in that level of court have found their workload to be substantially diminished.

I know there is an effort to work this level of court personnel into other matters, and I know that there is presently monitoring taking place with respect to activities at the juvenile level, the young offenders level. But I did wish to poll the Attorney-General with respect to another area of possible work. I don't expect him to respond to me immediately. I respect the fact that it's more or less off the top of my head and something that has occurred as commendable to me, but he may wish to take as notice and give consideration to over several weeks or months.

It deals with the authority of government to appoint inquiry officers under The Expropriation Act. The legislation currently provides that Cabinet can appoint such persons as it wishes to conduct inquiries with respect to expropriation matters in order to make recommendations and give advice as to the nature and appropriateness of an expropriation being conducted, not only by the province but also by other public bodies such as municipal governments.

I've always had some problem with that, and this goes right back to the days when I was on City Council, and even before that when I worked for the City Law Department, because I have always felt that it's possible, and I'm not suggesting that it's probable, but it is possible that an unscrupulous government might, in order to serve its own purposes, appoint a person who it had some affiliation or association with to make a favourable disposition in their favour.

I respect the fact that no recommendation binds the expropriating authority anyway. It always, under the law, is tendered as a recommendation and nothing more, but I still feel that it would be in the best interests of the public to have a completely independent, at least quasi-judicial type inquiry.

It seemed to me that in order to assure that that type of inquiry actually takes place, it would be sensible if there are Provincial Court personnel available, to designate them as a responsible authority to look after these matters. I think we can all agree that they cannot be perceived as being captive of the government, and they obviously have made some great complaint about that because they do not want to be perceived, obviously, as being in any way affiliated, associated or under the control of government, or beholden to government.

So I would like to as an individual member, without the benefit of having done any extensive consultation with other members, propose that this matter be looked into and that consideration be given to this type of approach to inquiries under The Expropriation Act in the future.

HON. R. PENNER: I thank the member for that suggestion, it's a valuable suggestion and one that certainly will be looked at. Actually, we would not need any change in legislation since, under The Provincial Court Act, the judges can, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council do that kind of extra-judicial work and so that kind of appointment is possible without, as I say, a change in legislation. It's something I will certainly put on the list of things that we will shortly be discussing with the provincial judges. We're just beginning to get a reading on the workload and it was known, of course, with the creation of the Family Division of the Court of Queen's Bench, the Unified Family Court, as the member calls it, that there would be a period of time when there would be, relatively speaking, a lower workload that, at least, some members of the family division of the provincial court would have.

But, at the same time, we were phasing in The Young Offenders Act and we had no way of knowing, with any degree of precision, what workload that would entail. We're beginning to get a reading on that. I don't want to go beyond that, but certainly to an extent which

would justify some discussion of the workload of the Provincial Court in the next year or two, and there are a number of suggestions that have been made. One was made here this morning referring to the Small Claims Court as a possible area of jurisdiction, small claims; you've made one which is valuable; there is the legislation in place which would allow the judges to serve as masters to the family division with the experience that some of them have, that's something can be looked at. So all of these matters will be considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to pass Provincial Courts before we break up?

MR. G. MERCIER: Why don't you pass everything down to Protection of Individual and Property Rights, if nobody else objects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1) Court Reporters: Salaries; 5.(d)(2) Other Expenditures.

MR. B. CORRIN: Yes, my concern in this respect is that there is a differential tariff which pertains to Court Reporters working for Legal Aid and those working on reporting matters to the private bar involving litigation where the litigants are not supported or indemnified through Legal Aid. This to me, although I'm sure is motivated by genuine concern for the rights of the financially underprivileged, is somewhat unfair to those others who are participating in litigation at their own expense and who, after all, may only be marginally more affluent than those who qualify as eligible candidates for Legal Aid.

I'm concerned because Court Reporters working in the public domain, of course, are to some extent, private entrepreneurs. They're allowed to work privately when doing transcripts and they are able to remunerate themselves, not only from work in the public sector, but also this sort of quasi-private sector work; they work at two levels. I don't want to belabour this, we only have about 40 seconds, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to encourage the Attorney-General to give consideration to reviewing the whole situation as it pertains to public court reporters in this anomalous situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1) to 5.(f)(2) were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 20: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,483,600 for Attorney-General Court Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

What's the pleasure of the committee?

HON. R. PENNER: Committee rise.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The committee will come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 7, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Hospital Program.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I believe yesterday evening the Minister undertook to provide some staffing information. I wonder if he might have that now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The total staff of all the departments at Deer Lodge is 508, Mr. Chairman. The Budget for the year ending March, 1985 is \$15,083,400 and this includes, from the Government of Canada, \$7,799,625.00.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the patient count is somewhere under 300 at Deer Lodge at the present time, and the staff is 508? That would seem to be slightly above a normal staffing ratio. What extra advantage, or what extra work, are the staff there doing which justifies having them continuing in place?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, yes, it's true that it's a little higher. My honourable friend remembers they were all federal employees at the time when we took over; one of the commitments that we made was that we would try and find positions for as many as possible, and then that we would reduce the staff by attrition and that has been established. For instance, the dietician section was pretty heavy in that department. Of course, that's been going . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, as a specific department, can the Minister indicating the staffing level for the pharmacy area in Deer Lodge?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Pharmacy, there is one director, three staff pharmacists, two technicians and one clerk typist for a total of seven.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister have readily at hand, for instance, the pharmacy area staff complements in something like St. Boniface or Misericordia, one of those hospitals, for a comparative analysis?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, we'd have to get that; we haven't got it here.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd appreciate it if the Minister might be able to scout up that number so that we have it for the next time we meet, presumably Monday afternoon, that would be a useful figure to have.

Mr. Chairman, in the '83-84 Health Services Commission Annual Report, can the Minister indicate, when we go through specialty hospital, rehab centre for children, and then we get into federal hospitals, we have Deer Lodge of course going from '82-83 rated bed capacity 151 down to 0, can the Minister indicate - and maybe I'm missing it in here somewhere, but I cannot find where Deer Lodge now appears in the . . . Oh, I just found it, here it is here. Now, Mr. Chairman, for extended treatment hospitals, the '82-83 rated bed capacity at Deer Lodge was 120 for extended treatment hospitals; for '83-84 it dropped to 94. Last night, I believe the Minister indicated that it was back up to somewhere close to the 300. Now, that has occurred at the same

time that, in terms of federal hospitals, and I presume that is active treatment beds, dropped from 151 to 0. That recognizes the change over in the hospital function over that time period but, what has happened since '83-84 for '84-85 to get us back up to that 290-some patient complement in terms of rated bed capacity?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, what we requested Deer Lodge to do is to set up a kind of pilot program of 16 intermittent beds - the people are in for a while and out for a while, you could handle 32. Faced with that, one of the reasons was to get people out of hospitals, that were blocking the hospitals, and they accepted the request. Actually what have is 287: personal care beds, 185; and extended treatment, 102.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that come rated bed capacity for '83-84, a portion of 102, which is more than the 94 that's indicated in extended treatment, you'll have 102 figure for '84-85 presumably when the Annual Report comes out, and then in personal care homes you'll have the balance of the 185 appear within the Winnipeg - it's already there in terms of the Deer Lodge and personal care home. Mr. Chairman, on the patient rotation system, I presume that's under the Extended Treatment Program, not the Personal Care Home Treatment Program where you're rotating 32 beds?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it's under the Personal Care Home Program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Chairman, that presents the interesting question - if that is being done at Deer Lodge and block beds in our active treatment hospitals are the same problem, why the program for Deer Lodge and not for other hospitals?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there are 22 beds in personal care homes across the province that are also in that pilot project.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 22?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 22, yes. This is a program, it's still in that early stage; it's still a pilot project. We're getting more information. It is quite selective. We have to select not only the patients but the families also, so we have to work with the families on that. The reason, as I say, this was a special program, and it's a pilot program. If we can iron out the kinks and if it works well, I would imagine that there will be an awful lot more of it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, is this an extension of the Respite Care Program that was brought in by the former Minister of Health? Is this what we're talking about?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's not the same program at all. Respite Care is maybe two weeks or a month a year. It's the people that normally would be staying at home or with relatives, and to give some kind of a holiday or respite to the family who might be leaving the province or going on a holiday or just taking it easy. The patient is taken in for, let's say, two weeks, a month.

Now, this is not exactly the same thing. It forms some kind of a respite, but they will go for a month or so and then come back. Then another patient would come in, and you would handle twice the number of patients. With one bed, you'd handle two patients.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it appears as if MHO has reached an agreement with MONA. It would appear as if there is a 2 percent salary increase provision for this fiscal year. Can the Minister indicate whether there were, in addition to the salary provisions of 2 percent - I understand it's for this fiscal year, not retroactive to January 1st of 1985 - any other financial matters specified in the contract such as shift differentials and weekend premiums?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have only read the article today. I would sooner check and give this information on Monday.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's fine, Mr. Chairman. On Monday, if the Minister might also have the best guess the Health Services Commission will have on the impact on the Hospital-Personal Care Home line, that would also be appreciated, the financial impact of the new settlement.

Mr. Chairman, one of the situations that has come to bear, and I guess it was raised again at the MHO Annual Meeting in Winnipeg, was the issue of sick pay. There was an article recently in the Free Press which indicates that, you know, hospitals have quite a wide range of sick pay as a percent of their salary budgets. Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any thoughts he'd like to share on whether the utilization of sick pay and particularly the variance between institutions has any implication as to the level of staffing, the working conditions, etc., etc.?

Sick pay is a pretty touchy issue in a hospital, because you certainly don't want to have staff in the hospital who are not healthy themselves. But in view of the fact that there is a fairly wide range between funded institutions in terms of the sick pay as a percentage of the salary budgets, does the Minister find that there are any identifiable reasons for those variances? Is MHSC showing any concern as to whether this is a growing problem that may have to be analyzed to see whether potential solutions or potential remedies can be made?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it's being looked at, at the present. It is not something new; it's something that has been negotiated for a number of years. Some hospitals have an administration which feels that there will be quite an impact, and others are saying no, that there is no problem with it at all. So the Commission is discussing with these hospitals to see what they can come up with.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the variance in hospitals in the rate of sick pay between hospitals might be a reflection in part on the pressures on staff within those varying institutions. In other words, in certain areas of Health Sciences Centre, no doubt staff is under considerable pressure and possibly some of the other major hospitals as well. The level of sick

pay at 2.4 percent of the salary budget at the Health Sciences Centre follows upon similar reports back I believe about a month and a half ago where, because of surgery theatre staff being off for sick pay that certain of the surgical theatres had to be closed down for a period of time.

Is that an indication that staffing levels are run at a minimum level with increased pressure on the staffing, or is that merely an isolated incident that the two are now being focused on in terms of reported problems at Health Sciences Centre in their surgical program, their operating theatres, and then of course the recent MHO meeting having this as a specific area that they discussed?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is very hard to answer, because my honourable friend is actually making a supposition and that's all at this time.

If we are talking, for instance, in areas such as the operating rooms, of course, there are so many people that are trained. There's a shortage of them at times, and if there are people missing because they are sick, then of course it's obvious that will put pressure on them. But it is only because of the shortage in certain areas of trained people, and not only through sickness but get them to stay. Many of them take the training and use it as a stepping stone for something else.

I think my friend was talking about the city mostly. You weren't talking about those . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, yesterday, and last evening, particularly, we discussed a series of statistical comparisons - Manitoba with other national averages established in other provinces in Canada - and then even got into some limited comparison with health organization plans in the United States.

Now given that the Minister has undertaken to analyze our costing structures in our hospitals, and given also that there appears to be some substantial variances within our hospitals compared to the national averages - teaching hospitals are significantly higher than the national averages, but the general hospital cost is still above the national average in Manitoba as well in terms of cost per day and utilization - and, Mr. Chairman, given the identification of those anomalies, if you will, or variances in statistics which impact fairly significantly on the hospital budgets in Manitoba, could the Minister indicate what next steps are being contemplated within the department?

He has indicated that certainly he is analyzing those results; he is analyzing those statistics; he is attempting to get further clarification on some of those comparisons. But just yesterday, in the Manitoba Telephone System consideration of the annual report, the Telephone System is currently engaging at least one professional consulting firm which is taking an overview of their staffing and their management procedures to identify areas where there may well be an opportunity for staff salary savings, staff position savings and economies that can be achieved within the Telephone System.

Now I would ask the Minister, given the global indications the Minister has on the Manitoba system, if he is in the process of considering bringing in any management analyst consultants or any professional

outside groups to take a look at the Manitoba hospital system to see whether those areas of potential saving can be identified to see whether the management and see whether the staffing patterns in our hospitals can be streamlined. Is that the next step in the Minister's agenda?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no, not at this time. Let me say again - because my honourable friend keeps saying that it's all hospitals - up to 300 beds, the cost per day in Canada is 284; and in Manitoba, 258; long-term hospital is 244.48 in Canada, and 245.59 in Manitoba. In the teaching it's \$378.16 in Canada; in Manitoba, 450.54. The length of stay, for instance, up to 300 beds in Canada is 1,541, and 1,400 in Manitoba; and long-term is 1,318 in Canada, and 1,388 in Manitoba; in teaching Canada is 1,887, and it's 1,357 in Manitoba.

What I said yesterday - and don't forget there are about 25,000 employees in the hospitals that we've put in St. Boniface on the line by line and we are in the process of doing the same with the Health Sciences Centre - we feel that at the moment anyway that we have the staff with the hospitals and the Commission, the people that can, once they get this information, give us the reason; if not, then we will consider hiring. But the main thing right now is to get the information as to, as I say, put the two teaching hospitals on line by line.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the teaching hospitals, as indicated, are above the national average. But reference has been made, for instance, that taking the 10 year period, or 11 year period - I guess it is - from 1971 to '82-83, there is an indication that the per capita cost in Manitoba for the non-teaching hospitals rose to 62.31 percent after adjusting for inflation while the Canadian experience saw an increase of only 35.74. So that even in our non-teaching hospitals, the per capita costs in Manitoba were about 74 percent greater than comparable non-teaching hospitals across Canada.

So it would appear from information that is available, that although the problem is more dramatic in the teaching hospitals where their increase in the 10 year period, or the 11 year period from '71 to '82-83, after inflation, was worth about 113 percent over the increase over the national average.

There appears to be similar problems and, of course, later identification and information indicates that there are a couple of things. Admittance is one of them and also, there is eight hours per patient day in '82-83 which is greater than the Canadian experience by almost 24 percent.

So, Mr. Chairman, the reason I pose the question to the Minister is although it may not be comparable, but I am given to understand that - I presume it was the Ontario Department of Health - undertook to manage a hospital close to Ottawa and I guess the option was that it was going to be closed down because its costs were quite high, etc., etc., and they undertook a management review study and apparently brought in some management expertise that ran the hospital on apparently less budget to deliver the same kinds of activities and services out of that hospital, and that

was a result of bringing in apparently some professional expertise in management analysis.

That's why I am posing the question to the Minister today that given the identification and the indication of specific problems, or specific indications that Manitoba's hospital system is per capita per day more costly than the national average, if the Minister was contemplating a similar sort of a process, a consulting firm or whomever, to come in and take a look to see where the specific areas of cost saving can be identified.

I pose that question, Mr. Chairman, because I think we had come to the conclusion last evening that the budgetary problems facing governments, hence facing hospitals, aren't going to lessen, they are going to increase. You can do one of two things; it's the same sort of a budgeting analysis that you do in hospitals that you do in any other area. You've got two options if you are running into budgetary problems: No. 1, you identify areas where you can do the same job more efficiently and save budget, or; No. 2, you increase the funding and increase the revenues to those hospitals.

Now it would seem as if the one option the Minister has an opportunity to explore now is, of course, in the cost side of it, and that stimulates the question this morning.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we have enough to go on to see if that's producing anything in Ontario. The Commission has been in touch with that firm to get some data and so far we haven't received it.

My honourable friend keeps jumping from per capita and then per diem, the per diem the cost per patient per day and I think you've talked about a 10-year period, where I was talking only about cost per patient day, and only for the '83-'84 year and there it would appear that it's the teaching hospitals. Then of course, there's the comparison of beds, it's very hard, because they designate beds differently in different provinces and this is what we're trying to get together at least the equivalent. But we feel that the first thing, no matter what, no matter if we call somebody in later on, the first thing we should do is go back on line-by-line for those two teaching hospitals and as I say, we put St. Boniface on line-by-line and we're in the process of doing the same thing with the Health Sciences Centre. I'm not saying the things won't change but right now, we have no intention of doing anything else at this time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I recognize what the Minister is saying in terms of using different comparisons and a 1982-83 statistic but I think there's information that the Minister has available that indicates that over a given period of time in which hospitals have been completely funded — (Interjection) — but I believe that the information adjusted that indicated that our costs were increasing faster and that is even factoring out our personal-care home program which, theoretically being better, should relieve the hospitals. And when you've got those kinds of comparisons on a national basis showing a trend in growth, if you will, in our hospitals, then certainly the management information that might be available from the Ontario experience could be extremely valuable.

Okay, Mr. Chairman, given that the commission is having a look at the Ontario situation in the hospital, and I don't even know what community it was in, but basically the Minister knows the one I'm referring to, it's cited quite frequently in any discussion on hospital care, is getting that information. That would be very interesting information and if it weren't of a confidential nature, I'd appreciate when the commission receives that information from OHIP or whomever it's going to come from, I'd appreciate having the Minister share that with me. I'm interested to see what sort of things they were able to accomplish.

So, Mr. Chairman, can we switch now to . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As soon as we get the information, I can't see any reason why that should be kept confidential. But there's an indication, I think it's quite clear, that the utilization, we know that it's different in Manitoba, and this is what I've been trying to say, either we have too many beds or there's more people being admitted more often, or maybe because of the number of doctors that we have, these are all factors that I was saying that when we were talking about changing motivation. But on the other hand, we're told nearly everyday that people are in the hall and that we haven't got enough beds. And I know that my honourable friend will talk about the people that should be in personal care homes. But I would imagine that in other provinces, some of these people are, especially those that haven't got as complete, as universal a personal care home that we have, so this is all the information that we're trying to get together and then work with the different people. I think it is better to look at the pattern and the method of what is being done, and work with the providers of services also, than just try to get some figures and say, we're much higher and impose something on people without any more explanation that we want to pay the same as other provinces. But when that information comes, I'll make sure that my honourable friend gets a copy of it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That will be appreciated, Mr. Chairman. Given that, I suppose you could say a number of options are being explored on the cost side, can the Minister indicate whether the department is undertaking any study, any development of information on the revenue side in terms of hospitals? The Minister, although he was musing I guess on the meal charge, are there considerations going on in the department now to take a look at methods of revenue enhancement for the hospitals, other than simply asking the Minister of Finance for a bigger health budget which will be in turn, passed on? Is the Minister looking at new sources of revenue in the hospital system?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We're complying with The Canada Health Act now, and certainly we're not looking at anything special for revenue. But I've said it before, and I'll say it again, that I would want to present all the facts to my colleagues and I think that our policy is quite clear, that we don't want to charge premiums; we don't want any extra-billing; we don't want any utilization fees. And I want to impress on my colleagues, we'll try to operate and get the most for our dollars,

but then I want to present the fact to my colleagues that if that is the case, if we can't get revenue within, then if we don't cut the standards, then I will have to get the money from the Treasury Board. So, yes, again I think that I've explained that.

The situation was that we've always been very clear that we don't want any deterrent fees, and on a radio talk show the question was asked, well what about for meals? I know that this was mentioned, in fact I think it was Mr. Green that used to say that they should charge for meals in the hospital and they should charge for meals in the jails. That these people should work for it, why give them free board and room. So the point is that I said, no, we won't go for that and the caller said, well, yes, I understand it's not a deterrent, but these people would have to eat, isn't that something different? And I said, I guess you could call it different by stretching things. And that's all I said.

So I'm not saying that those things will never, certainly by saying that, it doesn't mean that I'm announcing a policy that my colleagues or the government will change anything, but I'm not saying that those things will never be looked at. I think they might have to be looked at as an option anyway, if you're going to have all the options in front of you. Because if you say that you don't want to raise taxes; you can't have a deficit; you're not going to cut down on standards or on needs and you're not going to have other revenues than that; and that is why I've been pushing and successful at least, in some areas like in personal care homes, where we're not punishing the patient at all by leaving him or her with \$150 a month, especially when the idea is that these people are receiving an old-age pension and a supplement just exactly for that. The people are given that so they can have board and room and whatever they need and if the state or taxpayers are paying for that, I feel that they should pay part of it, it's not the same thing at all. These are people that will remain the rest of their lives. It becomes their homes. I'm talking about personal care homes.

It was never the intention at any time, or even thought of doing the same thing in the hospital, except for a chronic patient also which we couldn't do before. It's exactly the same principle as in the personal care home and the same thing in a mental institution. But that couldn't be done before. But after checking with the federal Minister of Health, fine, he agrees with us and tells us that that can be done. But we have no other way, if anybody has any ideas, I'll certainly listen. But as far as what is commonly known as deterrent or extra-billing, this government is very much against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we can probably spend a lot of time on this, but you know the Minister has and he has laid it out again this morning that the revenue options are limited in certain ways. I believe and I think even the Minister of Finance will agree that the financial option of his ability to raise more tax money and to borrow more money to finance an ever increasing hospital budget is not that viable an option.

The Minister has got a projection of some \$3.040 billion, I think it is, in 1995 doing exactly the same thing we're doing now, just simply plugging in a projected

inflationary cost. That's where some of the options on the hospital system and on the medical system really start to close in on you, because it would appear to me that if you are going to eliminate a number of options on the revenue side and the marketplace, if you will, will probably eliminate some of the budgetary increase from the government because there is a limit to the amount we can borrow as a Province of Manitoba to fund our system. If you have in mind maintenance of the system at a standard that is currently in place today, you're looking at a tripling of this budget in 10 years.

That to me would leave the Minister or the government, whoever it is, with some pretty limited options because we don't find new sources of revenue or cost savings and pulling out even the cost on average nationally, 8 percent on 600 million is a \$50 million saving if that's achievable. That still isn't going to solve the problem of the \$3 billion figure the Minister has identified.

Now when you start talking in terms of principle and we can get into all kinds of discussion and I'm sure members of the media will put different interpretations on different cost assignments, because I think there was one article written, "When is a user fee not a user fee?" Well, it's not a user fee when the New Democrats put it in, you know.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We don't care. We don't build personal care homes for the . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yeah, but I kind of agree with them when they say those kinds of things though.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I know, and it suits you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Of course.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And I don't blame you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Of course.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But you don't agree. You let them say it and don't argue, but you don't agree.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh no, I always agree with the press.

Mr. Chairman, it puts us now into the subtle distinction case for political presentation. A principle is established that the per diem charge should apply to chronic care patients, because basically you're providing them the same things that you providing a personal care home resident. Therefore, you're not changing philosophically and adding any user fee - this is the argument the Minister is using. He can defend that anyplace.

The similar argument, I presume, was made and agreed to on the property tax credit rebate which, because you couldn't get the things through Ottawa wasn't implemented this year but that's something that's coming next year.

In principal, the argument is the same, that you're providing entire care for those people. Therefore, if you leave \$150 at the end of the month, that's enough to take care of personal needs when all other costs are covered. That gets into the interesting debate as to whether it's a user fee when the Minister used or, I

don't know what the circumstances were, but anyway it was identified as saying that, yes, maybe we should look at or maybe we have to take a look at meals in hospitals.

But I think, given the philosophy that has led to the establishment of a per diem for personal care homes, since extended to mental health institutions and non-panelled chronic stay patients in hospitals, you're coming pretty close to being able to establish the same sort of philosophical underpinnings for something like a meal charge, because basically you're providing a need that they would have to put up at home and cost at home.

That's why I'm asking the Minister today what sort of revenue options the Minister has to be considering, because I'm reasonably certain that the Minister is not simply looking at the hospital budget problem from one side, only from the cost control side. You can't do a complete analysis unless you're looking at both. That is where, on the charge side or the revenue side, you're fraught with even more political problems because, as the Minister has already found out, his musings on meal charges received some considerable attention and debate, and even getting into the philosophical argument of where services end.

How long do you keep a terminal patient on life support and those sorts of philosophical arguments really get into a very, very emotional and highly charged and even highly politically charged debated out in the community. But they are real issues that are going to be faced.

That's why I wanted to discuss in brief today the revenue side of the analysis that obviously has to be going on, not only within the government, but certainly within MHSC and within the Minister's new planning directorate.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll get back to that. That's very interesting, but there is one point that my honourable friend is forgetting or not making. When I'm talking about \$3.044 billion, I'm talking about the total cost. Now if there is any extra billing or a utilization fee, that's not going to change anything.

The first challenge that we have is, spend less money. Now I'm talking about all money. If a government chooses to pay all the costs, but then if another government chooses to have premiums, it isn't the total cost. It's a mistake they make in the United States. I'm talking about what the cost is for delivering health no matter where it comes from, premiums, utilization fees or through general revenue. That's what I'm talking about. That is the first thing that we want to change because, no matter who pays for it, it's going up. It's going to be too much.

Having said that, I think that my friend is probably right. This is probably where there will be a difference between the two sides of the House. But now, speaking for myself, I want all the options to be in front of my colleagues and in front of Manitobans. Having said that, it doesn't mean that I want to change anything or that I'm suggesting to change anything, but I think we will have to look at that. We will have to make decisions.

Let's say that after trying our best to cut down the total cost of delivering the services that maybe we'll be successful up to a certain point, but it's still too

high. Then there'll have to be an option. It could be, fine, the present policy of the government of no premiums - in other words, I won't go through the whole thing again that everything will be paid through the Consolidated Fund and General Revenue.

Now other people have said when we talked about Medicare and hospitalization, we weren't talking about a kind of a catastrophe plan, something that the people wouldn't lose their shirts. The example we've giving, yes, we promised transportation, but not necessarily a Cadillac, maybe a bicycle. That will have to be looked at.

I heard my honourable friend last Friday, a week Friday. I don't think he was speaking too much like a socialist either, the way that he was pushing this . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: It sounded like he was in pursuit of excellence, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yeah, I don't know if he was putting an ad for Mayo Clinic; anyway it sounded right, but I mean that is the kind of talking and the kind of things that are going to add to the total cost.

So it might be, and I'm speaking in general for any government or the public in general, that we might be faced with all that and might say, yes, we still want it, but we want to pay for it, part of it, or we want to do something else or we want at least that everybody gets the same, but then any extra you would have to pay for it yourself. Certain things should be de-insured, for instance. That's what I feel that I should do.

Even saying that we could look, for instance, at the possibility of paying for the food. That doesn't say that I am changing a policy, but I think that all this information has to be placed in front of the general public. Then we might agree or we might disagree on some of that.

It might be, as I say, that the standards will say, okay, a standard but no more. It might say that, you know, but right now, and that is what is so difficult, how do I argue, for instance, with St. Boniface Hospital when the nuns come and tell me, like Mother Youville came in and they don't want to refuse anybody and the patient is king, then don't bother me with this, and we're going to do everything we can. How can I argue with that? But I mean, the public has to pay the bills. There has to be some rules somewhere and so on.

Now it's the same thing and then the doctors come in and they say the same thing. You've got two pieces of equipment, there's a third one. They might save something, and we're coming up and up, and that is where the cost is skyrocketing. It changed so much in these last few years, and that is why it's going to go up so much.

So I would agree with my honourable friend that all that should be placed in front of the public. We have to look at revenue. It doesn't mean that a party or anybody has to accept it, but everything has to be in front of them, and then they decide. They might be able. Even this party might have to bend a bit to do something to save the total plan. I don't know. But right now, the tendency of this government has been very clear and very consistent on that, that they won't go along with these things.

Now my honourable friend said that I'm stretching things. I don't think so at all. I think that the policy -

because we're the ones that brought in the insuring of the personal care homes. From Day One, they were paying a certain rate. I know what my friend is going to say in opposition. They were state-made, but discarding that, the principle of it, we've always charged in that.

Then the principle of a pension for people, because the pension system wasn't too good in this country at one time, so the Federal Government brought in an old age pension. All right, I'll go fast. The situation is to pay exactly for that, the same as a tax rebate. I have no problem with that, but I will not admit for one minute that we are going in the other way because we do that. It isn't that at all. Certain things we couldn't do before because of the Federal Government's regulation. Now there might be some change and there might be some change in the Conservative Party also.

The Conservative Party - it's just as true to say that they felt that there should be a utilization fee or a deterrent fee, and many of the doctors and the medical profession are talking about deterrent fees and so on. I'm sure they're going to look at it. Politically, right now it's not too popular, because the public don't really understand what the cost is. We saw that in the last federal election. I'm sure that the Federal Conservatives certainly put a lot of water in their wine, because they agreed on certain things that they never agreed to before, but I'm not faulting them for that.

I think that all the options have to be placed in front of all parties and the public. It might be that there will be some changes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this subject, I don't want the Minister to leave the impression on the record that, as he stated here just a minute ago, that the Conservatives are in favour of a deterrent fee, because at one time the New Democratic Party was in favour of nothing but nationalized industry and that's changed — (Interjection) — Right, but there wasn't the indication that it used to be in favour. There was the danger that the impression was that we were in favour of it now which is not the case, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — it's not worth bothering with back there. Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister what the — (Interjection) — can the Minister of Health contain some of the crowing in the back row, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, under the expansion plan of the Health Sciences Centre, the Children's Hospital has been under construction now for a couple of years presumably. Could the Minister indicate when the Children's Hospital was to be opened or will be opened, and what some of the reasons for the delay is?

I think at one point in time, it was to be onstream right now and an operating hospital. If the Minister had a resume or an indication of when the initial contracts and whatnot were let on the various aspects of constructing Children's, I'd like to have a brief discussion with him this morning on Children's Hospital.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have just received a consultant's report, and I think the intention is to separate the legal part and the practical thing. It is deficiency in the construction. They don't know if they'll be able to move in. They might be able to move in.

The things is, they'll hire an architect immediately to make these changes, and it will be a question of months before it's fully operative.

Now during that time, the legal battle goes on, but the intention is not just wait until the legal battle is all settled before we go ahead. We know we need the hospital, so there'll be an architect hired to make these changes, to correct whatever is wrong with this construction and to move in gradually and as fast as possible, but it will be a question of months before it's fully operative.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, refresh my memory. I believe that when the Member for Fort Garry was the Health Minister, the redevelopment plan on Health Sciences Centre saw the Children's Hospital advanced maybe a couple or three years. Is my memory correct in that, I think, the sod was turned on the original construction back in 1981. I think contracts were - when was construction undertaken then would be the fair question?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll check that, but I believe the architectural drawings were approved by the former Minister. The actual construction, I think, started - it seems to me that I was there at the ceremony that they had to officiate on the sod turning. I don't think it was sod turning, I think it was . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Golden shovel.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it was some kind of a - I know I had a wrench anyway that I didn't know what to do with anyway, but something like that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, rumours abound on Children's Hospital. I think that's fair to say, and they are, of course, aided and abetted by some of the legal ramifications. But, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether in developing the plan for the Children's Hospital, when the architectural plans when drawn, what sort of approval stages do they have to go through before they get the stamp of approval for go ahead? What are the checks and balances in that system? — (Interjection) — Right. Well, obviously, the Minister of Health doesn't design the building. You have that contracted out, presumably architects design aspects of it, presumably engineers design aspects of the building foundation, etc. etc., but obviously those plans have to go through an approval process and receive eventual stamp of approval by the department. What's the process by which that occurs?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm a little nervous discussing that because that's in front of the court now. It is not the design; there is nothing wrong with the design. That's not in question. The architect was brought into that only because supposedly for lack of supervision, it's the construction. So, I'm a little nervous to talk about that. Normally, they have, of course, the functional program and their design and the cost more or less, where the tender should go, the maximum, and then they go ahead with the architect. They chose the architect, I'm talking about in general. Then they have tenders for construction and that's it. Now, the battle

is over supposed faulty construction and maybe lack of supervision from the architect.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But basically though, irrespective of what went from plans to ended construction, irrespective of that, before any contract is let, presumably the plans that are in place or are contracted out to engineering firms, contracting firms, those plans receive perusal and approval within the Department of Health and have to - I know the Minister of Health would not be saying, well, this is a good plan, because if the Minister of Health has any more knowledge of architecture than the rest of us will, that's a bonus. But no Minister of Health does that; you've got your professional staff to make those kinds of decisions.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to know is whether there was any change in terms of the budget allocation towards Children's Hospital? Was there any reduction in the amount of funding that was originally proposed for the hospital? Is there any change in that level of funding?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there hasn't been any change at all. Normally the plans will have to be - not my department, I guess my honourable friend meant the Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is for quality. For instance, if they want to replace a certain brick and so on, those things have to be approved, and also the cost, but there hasn't been any reduction at all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister, I think, originally said that he was going to provide, possibly for Monday, when the tenders went out, etc. etc.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You didn't ask that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh okay, I thought I asked you on that, maybe I'm thinking of another program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Does my honourable friend want us to tell him the date that the architectural - I guess functional planning doesn't matter that much - the architectural planning where the architectural planning was approved and then the date that the tenders went out?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay. And the actual date of construction?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister also indicate, like obviously there was a budget struck for the construction, and the Minister indicated there was no change in the basic design in the building. There wasn't anything that was significantly changed or presumably changed at all in the building. Could the

Minister indicate whether, to date, the construction project has proceeded on schedule - not on schedule but on budget? Was the building put up to its present time theoretically ready for occupancy, was it on budget or did it exceed the budget?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll double check on this, but I think got the - now I know why it wasn't a shovel that I had - it was constructed in two phases. The first was the substructure, and that was started in 1980, and the superstructure was started in 1982; and yes, it's been give or take a few dollars, but that hasn't been a problem. It has been on schedule as far as cost also.

This is something that I'll read for the committee for the first time: "The Interim Report prepared by the consultants for the Health Sciences Centre describes several deficiencies in the building envelop of the new Children's Hospital. The final report which will be available later this week" - this was dated April 30th - "will recommend what remedial measures should be taken to resolve the deficiencies, and it will then be possible to determine when the building will be ready for occupancy. Details of the report will be available for the Health Sciences Centre once they have reviewed the report. The Health Sciences Centre has started legal action against the contractor and the design consultants. As this is now before the courts, we are not in a position to comment on the responsibility of the various parties involved."

MR. D. ORCHARD: Presumably substructure, to a layman, is the foundation, the footings, that sort of work, and the superstructure presumably is the actual - (Interjection) - okay. Basically, the foundation on which the hospital itself was going to go on was the substructure construction and the superstructure being the hospital itself.

Now, did the Minister indicate that the contract was let for the superstructure in 1982 or construction commenced in 1982?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll double check that, but it's the construction, and that I'm pretty certain, but we'll double check and get the time the architectural planning was allowed and then the actual construction, when the tenders went out and the actual date of construction started.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, as I say, rumour abounds on the Children's Hospital in terms of different things that have allegedly been done improperly, not functional and not working, etc. etc. Would it serve a useful purpose if the Minister and I were to go over to Children's Hospital and have a look. I wouldn't mind finding out if all of these rumours, and they're substantive, are correct for my own personal information and also for future information, because I think the Children's Hospital is an example of what possible kind of problems governments can find themselves in - it's rare but it happens - in terms of not getting value for dollar, court case aside, but by the very fact that there is litigation in process, it would appear as if this is going to be a substantially costly kind of a project.

It's changing subjects slightly, but the sawmill at Manfor underwent some problems in terms of its modernization, which is going to cost money to correct. I don't know if there is litigation up there as well. But, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be beneficial for both the Minister and myself to attempt on a first-hand basis to see first-hand, to tour that structure so that as elected politicians, we at least have some sort of handle on what some of the potential problems are for the purpose of finding out whether there is a check and balance or a control that was missing in our system of approval, so that we don't find ourselves next year, or the year after the year after, in a potentially similar situation.

The situation at Children's is obviously bad enough, although the building is physically complete, it has numerous problems which are preventing it from being used and Manitobans have \$12 million or \$13 million sitting in that structure right now, presumably with only the parking underneath as the functional part of it. And that was only, if I might say, an add-on to the building and more efficient use of the space. So I wonder if the Minister and I might at some mutually agreeable time after the Estimates are over, avail ourselves of a tour of the Children's Hospital to see first-hand some of these alleged problems.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be unwise for us to go there when there's a legal argument at this time. I would suggest two things. First of all, I would suggest that my honourable friend meet with the Chairman, Mr. John Bullman, who has been trying to explain to the staff what is going on and then when his final report also is produced, we can get more information. But I'll go further than that, on one commitment, if it's kept strictly out of the political arena, in a confidential way I'll share the report when we get it; we should get it fairly soon. With that understanding, I can share that. But I would hesitate to go either alone or with my honourable friend when this legal case is on; I think it would be unwise. If my honourable friend wants to accept this suggestion, we'll do that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think that would be beneficial. I don't believe there is a political issue here; I don't believe it exists. But there is an issue that is very important to us as elected MLAs and that is that, ultimately, we're the ones that are responsible for our budgets.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I meant, it's quite clear that they're going to proceed now, that they're going to separate the two, the legal battle and then hurry up and get this thing occupied as long as possible, working.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, no question. At this stage of the game, I don't detect that anything political has happened here. But because we're all politicians, it's wide open to the suggestion that, you know, something had to happen. And there's always that kind of innuendo and suspicion out there. But what I'm interested in finding out because I'll be so bold as to predict that we're going to probably inherit some of the problems after the election. — (Interjection) — No, no, no, I'm not talking 10 years to the Minister, I'm talking 10 months and I doubt if the legal system is going to be able to move that fast.

We are talking a sizeable commitment of taxpayer dollars and sizeable future costs and if there's some control system, and if there's some lesson we can learn as elected politicians as to how mistakes like this do occur that would be beneficial so that they don't occur again, I think that, Sir, is mutual, on both sides of the House. If the Minister wants to share at a later date, the next few weeks, the kind of information that we discussed today on a confidential basis, that would suit me fine and if it was arrangeable without causing . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll ask the Chairman to meet with the two of us when we have that and then maybe he can make a public statement.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, that would be fine. My colleague, the Member for Radisson, has a couple of questions on the same topic so I'll turn it over to him. — (Interjection) — I meant Niakwa, I keep insulting my colleague.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just something that came to mind and if the Honourable Minister thinks that it's going to cause some problems, particularly because of the court case - I really didn't know that much about it - but I understand that there are some parking facilities in the basement or in the underground part of the new Children's Hospital area there. That was part of my background before I came into the Legislature and I was just wondering whether this has caused any problems actually in the consultation and the planning. Has that anything to do with it at all?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Not as far as I know. It's not in that area. I'm reminded also that it is administered by the hospital. It's not funded by us. But the faulty construction apparently is not in these . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Are there any regulations as to the amount of parking spaces that are required to service the facility, and if so, does the Honourable Minister know how many parking spaces are available in this new structure?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have no regulation as per the parking spots required by the City of Winnipeg. But this is not just to service that hospital; it's the whole complex. They needed more parking, as you know, and they were taking advantage of this new construction to have the parking.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Has the Honourable Minister discussed the parking facility - what I'm really trying to get across now is that I know that the Health organization doesn't pay for the parking and has nothing to do with the revenue that comes in from the parking, it's a different type of business altogether. It seems that in the last little while that it's developed into quite a lucrative business and whatever profits there are, should go to the hospital. — (Interjection) — Not quite, Minister, I'm not trying to put you on a spot.

Actually, the profits to some degree go to the hospital, and they use it for whatever purposes they want. The

profits don't go to the operating of the hospital, I realize that. But there could be additional profits if the hospital operated the parking themselves. But as I say, I'm cutting myself out - the type of business that I was in before, I'd be cutting it out. Has the hospital ever considered the operation of the parking facility on their own rather than hiring it out to a private company?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That, Mr. Chairman, is up to the hospital. That is known as an ancillary benefit, and they can find many ways to get certain equipment and so on that is not funded by the commission. But I can assure you, it goes not for the operating costs of the hospital but for the hospital and to help the patient. That was always a tradition that they have the revenue of certain areas.

Now if they feel that they could make more money; in other words, operate it better than the private sector, that would be up to them to make the decision. I don't know if they have considered that at all; maybe they feel they haven't got the expertise to do that. As my honourable friend knows, it's not the easiest thing to do, and you need a certain amount of expertise to run it properly.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I am not going to prolong the discussion on this, but I would just say it's kind of an unique business and you do require unique-type people to operate that type of business because you've got people who are very overwrought, and they are going to visit sick people at the hospital. They've got to be in a position, and some training, to be able to discuss and talk to these people because they are usually at a point where they are ready to blow at a moment's notice. I think that it does require a unique type of person.

But I would think that the hospital should really have a look at providing more facilities, and I really think that the profits should go towards the operation of the hospital and to the point where, if there is any chance at all that these monies, rather than - I don't know what they spend that money on - but I think that the health services and the Minister should have some control of the spending of that money. That was the only point that I was trying to make.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You just lost all the votes of anybody connected to the hospital to that statement. They have been fighting for that for years and years. No, seriously, there are certain things that are not covered by the commission; it might be equipment and so on. My honourable friend might have a point that I will discuss with him privately. I don't want to lose all the votes that he's lost.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Just to advise the Honourable Minister, I have supported it in the past; I am just bringing it up as a discussion point. I don't think that either you or I have lost any votes on this because I am not sure whether any action will be taken. I think it's just a matter of . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I won't be losing any votes, you know, at the Children's Hospital. I think most of the people that support me work over at the St. Boniface Hospital, and I didn't mention St. Boniface Hospital.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the — (Interjection) — no, I'm surprised. Al is worried about Al too. If you've got a candidate like Eldon Ross running against you, you look over your shoulder all the time.

Mr. Chairman, the — (Interjection) — yes, it was by popular demand though, my picture on the map.

MR. H. ENNS: I want your picture on my hospital cards, Larry.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is a conference coming up at the Marlborough. It talks about management information systems in Canadian health care facilities. Now I don't recognize any of the people that are dealing directly with the management information system — (Interjection) — it's a conference - Frank DeCock is going to be the opening remarks speaker at it. — (Interjection) — It's an MHO Conference, but a Betty Lawry is speaking on the overview of guidelines for management information systems in Canadian health care facilities.

Mr. Chairman, this management information system, is this concerning the use of computers as enhancers to management and the flow of information within our hospitals and care facilities, or is this a new approach to management with the idea of cost savings?

I'll send the pamphlet over, and the Minister on Monday can . . . — (Interjection) — well, I'll send the pamphlet over. I am interested in the information on that management system.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion in the Johnson Report on the MHO and its relationship with government. Can the Minister indicate - or maybe I've got the wrong name and the wrong report - but, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether it's in the cards or in the government's plans to change any of the existing relationship that MHO has with MHSC and with the government?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is under review. The report was handed down or given to the MHO and I have asked them to report within I think a certain date. They asked for an extension, and then we will discuss their comments on it before any decision is made.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I missed his last answer.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I stated that I have given copies of the report to the MHO and asked for their comments; we have seen it - but before we made any decision, we said that we would discuss it together. They have asked for an extension; they felt that it would take them a little longer and that was agreed. We haven't their recommendation yet; we are not doing anything until we discuss it with them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can the Minister share with us the reason for the study and if there is any justification for

some of the concerns that MHO, as it is now structured, and functions, will not exist that the Minister and this administration are somehow seeking to change the relationship with MHO, is that a legitimate concern?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Chairman, I can give you the reason why this was done, but I wouldn't want to discuss what might happen because the commitment was made that we would look at it together.

The concern was that we were asked - all the departments and the Crown corporation and so on - to have an accountability. The MHO actually is financed 100 percent through the government, through the hospitals, and it has grown into a multi-million dollar organization. The accountability, we haven't been able to get their budget and so on. It's just automatic; when we had restraint, when we were told, even the departments and the commission and so on, had to stay within certain guidelines, the MHO, and they recognized that. They would just tax the member hospitals and that was it. We want to make sure that there is no duplication and so on. We want to discuss the whole thing with them. There's no sinister motive or anything, wanting to do away with them at all. It's just to look at the situation and discuss it with them. One thing I can say, we certainly want to be in a position to look at their budget and so on.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether there's anything sinister behind the scenes and — (Interjection) — No, that's what I say. I don't know whether there's anything sinister behind the scenes. — (Interjection) — I see what the Minister's getting at.

Mr. Chairman, the MHO, given the Minister has expressed some concerns in terms of accountability in their budget control, but there surely can't be any argument as to the kind of legitimate role that MHO serves, in terms of arm's length relationship with government, by and large, in terms of its provision of certain services to the member organizations, certainly has to be considered almost invaluable in terms of its role in negotiation as providing a central negotiation desk for all labour matters and unions matters, and seems to me that it also provides facilities with an ability to collectively deal with MHSC and, ultimately, with the government, because individual facilities on their own would not enjoy the same influence or clout, if you will, with either MHSC or with the government if they were bringing their cases up as an individually-funded facility.

That, from time to time, can cause problems. There's no question, in terms of if governments have embarked upon a given plan that doesn't meet with favour necessarily within the funded organizations - and I'm talking in a theoretical way - are wanting to impose certain administrative procedures or changes in board structures, a number, a myriad of sorts of things. Some of them we've even discussed in here.

If MHO didn't exist as it is currently structured, I'm sure if it was, for some reason or other, to no longer exist and no longer be part of the health care field in Manitoba, that an organization would, of necessity, and as a natural evolution, replace it, because there has to be some form of collective voice-making and opinion-making and policy-setting and also a place that's valuable to, I think, the Minister in terms of providing

him with a different sounding board for various policies which may be developed either within his own department or within MHSC, because MHO, by and large, if, I think I can use the analogy without too much difficulty, is primarily an organization which represents board members of the member institutions. Administrators and board members have a fairly high role in MHO operations.

That is a different group of people than the Minister himself is normally in touch with, because the Minister is dealing with his departmental staff, his bureaucrats within the department. The Minister is dealing with the MHSC as his funding arm and his insurance arm, and the MHO provides him with a different perspective on how policies will impact and how new programs will impact and provides him with a reasonable group to suggest changes or new directions that should be considered by the government.

So within the structure, within the delivery of health care in Manitoba, the MHO is a valuable organization, as structured now. It may have some problems the Minister wants to take a look at, in terms of its budget setting and its budgetary controls. One of the concerns that's been expressed is that they've become part of MHSC, in effect. The Minister shakes his head. I think that would indeed be a mistake because it would lose its objectivity then in being almost impartial. Nobody's impartial in the health care field, but it's certainly a third party window on health care, the department differing from MHSC.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into detail on that and I shouldn't, because as I said this is something that we'll look at together.

I would agree that certainly there's an awful lot of work that would have to be done. If it's not in this organization, it would be somebody else. There is a statement though that is questionable that my honourable friend said and that's one of the things that is being looked at.

My honourable friend said that it represents the boards and that's questionable. More and more it is thought by some of the institutions that it is representing more the administrator. The administrators have an awful lot more to say than maybe the boards on that. I'm not saying that's bad, but I'm saying that's one of the statement that . . .

No, we just want to look at the situation. Is it getting too big, for one thing? There's one thing that I want to look at, one of the things, for example, is they're talking about research. I doubt if we should duplicate the research or research going in different directions. I think the research, as a group, it might be something that maybe they should dispense with.

But anyway, these are the things that will be discussed with them and I can tell you there's no intention of having the MHSC take over from the MHO.

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

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply has adopted a certain Resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour - the Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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