

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, has he put the . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The motion before the House is that Madam 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.

**QUESTION put; MOTION carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources; and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair for the Department of Labour.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LABOUR

**MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin:** The committee will come to order. We are meeting this evening to consider the Estimates of the Department of Labour, Page 108. We will begin with Resolution 107, but before that, we will have an introductory statement by the Minister.

The Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I expected that there would be other copies of this opening statement. I will certainly give my copy to the critic after I've read it into the record.

Mr. Chairperson, fellow members, I am pleased to welcome you to the review of Manitoba Labour's Spending Estimates for the fiscal year 1986-87. I look forward to a meaningful discussion of our programs for the new fiscal year.

Manitoba Labour has identified six guiding principles as the basis of its role and mission within the context of this government and this society. They are:

1. To provide leadership and promotion and achievement of
  - (a) a fair and equitable workplace;
  - (b) cooperative relations between labour and management;
  - (c) shared decision making in the workplace in support of improving the quality of work life and efficiency of enterprises.
2. To protect the physical well-being and safety of persons and reduce property loss in respect to fire, structural, mechanical and other related hazards; to train and educate those persons entrusted with the responsibility of the enforcement of related legislation.
3. To promote, develop and administer apprenticeship and other cooperative skill training programs.

4. To promote and protect the retirement security of workers and to encourage expansion of the pension system.
5. To educate and inform the public, including special clients, with respect to the department's objectives, legislation and responsibilities.
6. To promote and practise shared decision making, affirmative action and effective planning with the department to work cooperatively with other departments and agencies and to present these as examples to others.

Some changes have occurred within the department since last year:

1. The Pay Equity Bureau has been established under the direction of Carol Geller. The bureau has a broad mandate which includes monitoring and reporting on the progress of pay equity as set out in The Pay Equity Act, and providing information and assistance to employers, employees and bargaining agents in both the public and private sectors.
2. In the Employment Standards Branch, a construction unit has been established to better enforce The Construction Industry Wages Act.
3. Our Mechanical and Engineering Branch has embarked on a new safety inspection program for propane and natural gas fueled vehicles. This program is being undertaken in cooperation with the division of Driver and Vehicle Licensing in the Department of Highways.
4. The departmental structure remains unchanged from last year with the Labour and Administration Divisions, the Research and Planning Branch, the Labour Board, the Pay Equity Branch and the Director of Communications reporting to the Deputy Minister. The Affirmative Action Coordinator for the government continues to report to me.
5. Affirmative action continues to be a high priority in our department and an Affirmative Action Committee has been established, received training and has been meeting regularly since February of 1985. The functions of this committee have been developed and implementation of the department's affirmative action plan, which includes policies for the recruitment of target group members and training for their career advancement.
6. We are also continuing our strategic planning process in the department which improves our decision making by focusing on long-term objectives to assist us in obtaining the maximum benefit in the allocation of our

resources. Computer technology and information systems are also being introduced throughout the department to improve our performance and cost effectiveness.

7. Manitoba's record of collective bargaining activity, work stoppages and unemployment continues to be favourable compared to previous years and to the national performance.

8.1 In the last four years, collective bargaining activity has been at an all time high, with some 2,800 agreements being negotiated. Of these, 98.3 percent were settled without work stoppages. That's a four-year average.

8.2 Since the beginning of 1982, only 47 work stoppages have occurred in Manitoba, compared with 144 in the previous four years.

8.3 Persons days lost due to work stoppages declined to 123,000 for the period 1982-85, compared to 585,000 days in the period 1978-81.

8.4 Manitoba's record on persons days lost to work stoppages per thousand, non-agricultural workers, was the second lowest among the provinces in the first nine months of 1985.

9.1 In the period 1981-85, Manitoba's working age population increased at twice the annual rate experienced in the period 1977-81.

9.2 In spite of the increased growth rate, Manitoba's job growth was able to sustain a rate of unemployment well below the national average. In July, Manitoba's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was the second lowest in the country, 7.7 percent, only half a percentage point greater than Ontario's. The Canadian unemployment rate in July was 9.9 percent. Manitoba's actual unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, was 7.1 percent, again the second lowest in the country. In June, for the first time in the province's history, the number of Manitobans employed topped the one-half million mark, and in July they numbered 508,000 people.

10. In 1986-87, Manitoba labour is requesting 231.11 staff years, which represents a net increase of 2.26 staff years over last year. Our expenditure request for 1986-87 is \$9,333,500.00. This represents a 4.9 percent spending increase over that budgeted in 1985-86. This increase is attributable to the addition of new programs which I previously mentioned and by minor salary and operating adjustments.

Mr. Chairperson, I've presented to this committee a brief overview of the major changes that have taken place over the past year and highlighted the major program initiatives that we're emphasizing in 1986-87.

I'm confident the members present will have many questions and so on.

Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I thank the Minister for making available a copy of his remarks. I also thank him for making available Supplementary Information for Legislative Review, although that was done earlier today. As helpful as they've been in the few hours intervening between then and now, it would have been more helpful to have them considerably sooner than that. I hope next year, whoever the critic is, and it may very well be me, I hope the Minister, regardless of distractions, will make that available to me a little sooner.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Agreed.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I thank the Minister for his agreement with that sentiment.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the somewhat favourable statistics the Minister has given us tonight, we have to remember all the time and in everything we do that the priority for all Manitobans is still jobs and a healthy economic climate in this province, a climate that creates a competitive edge wherever possible, for Manitoba. Our economy is delicate and needs to be treated as such.

We have to remember also, Mr. Chairman, that in Manitoba most people work for one small business or another and our labour policies should keep that in mind in every aspect.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that over the last few years, the government has done the opposite in the sense that it has placed some pretty important stumbling blocks in the way of a healthy and, how should I put it, convivial working relationship between employers and employees in this province and we have made that point whenever we've been able to. Certainly, in my Throne Speech debate, the Minister will recall some of my comments, and I know he took exception to some of them.

But I think, on a close examination and a fair examination, he will see if we look at the realities in this province, the economic realities and the workplace realities in this province, that a more moderated stance respecting employer and employee relations would not hurt and could very well help. Especially this is true, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the matter of equal pay for work of equal value in the private sector. I'm sure we'll get into that in more detail.

I don't want to talk for very long because the evening won't be as long as we might hope it would be. So I'll stop now and ask the Minister to bring in his staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. If the staff would like to come forward at this point. If the Minister would like to introduce his staff.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like to introduce to you, and I don't believe the critic has had the pleasure of having been introduced, not formally, to the Deputy Minister, Mary Eady. I will ask Mary to introduce the remainder of the staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Only you can go on record.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Jim Nykoluk; the Director of Administration,

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

Bob Gorchynski; Lawrence Smith, who is Finance Officer; and JoAnne Reinsch from the Personnel Branch. There are others who we'll be bringing up as necessary. I'll try to introduce them all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Deferring the Minister's Salary at this point, we'll begin with Administration and Finance . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Why don't you pass my salary?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It's not the usual practice.

Item 1.(b) Executive Support - the Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask about Communications. According to some reading I did last year respecting this department's Estimates, there was discussion to the effect that, at that time, there had been no Communications staff in the department. Maybe the Minister can bring me up to date on that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Staff are going to get me the exact date, but John Doyle - oh, we have it here - joined the department as Director of Communications on October 15. Prior to joining Manitoba Labour, he held positions in the communications field, including a news reporter and news editor of CKPR Radio and Television in Thunder Bay - here he is - 1972-77. He was a legislative reporter and labour reporter for CKY Radio and Television in Winnipeg from '78-85, received his formal training in Communication Arts at Confederation College and Labour Economics at Lakehead University. He's also held a number of executive positions for the National Association of Broadcasting Employees and Technicians, and made that a Local 816.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, what would the duties of Mr. Doyle be in the department? I ask that question bearing in mind that up until now I understand the department hasn't had a Communications Officer. If I'm incorrect, the Minister can correct me.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I would like to say, keeping the Minister out of trouble, but I'll get the formal answer.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** You couldn't pay anybody enough to do that, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I may not give this the fullest of description that perhaps would be warranted, but basically it's to coordinate all communications in the department, preparing material on behalf of the department as necessary in respect to all matters requiring communication either within the department or externally.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** What did the department do before October 15, 1985?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We had a Communications Director, Michael Balagus, and then he left us and we limped along interdepartmentally on the communications.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Was Mr. Balagus' costs and salary reflected in previous years' Estimates?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Was Mr. Doyle's salary reflected in Executive Support Salaries?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Perhaps the Minister can expand on that because it appears the Salaries have decreased from the previous fiscal year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, there was a reduction because the '85-86 included a part-year salary cost for the Labour Law Review Consultant and '86-87 does not have that provision.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I'm going to need a little help here, Mr. Chairman, as some of my questions probably don't relate to Executive Support. We have before us Bill 32 before the Legislature amending The Pension Benefits Act, and I'm wondering if that act has been before the Labour Management Review Committee for its study and recommendation.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** It hasn't. Is it not part of the mandate of the Labour Management Review Committee to review legislation introduced by this department?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Its mandate is a broad one but we haven't in the past specifically referred pensions legislation, that I know of, to the Labour Management Review Committee. Perhaps it's a good suggestion. We could certainly have their viewpoint.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** If the Minister thinks it's a good suggestion, I invite him to give it further consideration.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I think the Labour Management Review Committee can have a very healthy role to play in respect to all legislation. I have referred an extensive number of items to that body and they won't be without areas of concern. In respect to pension legislation, we have a Pension Commission that of course advises the Minister on pension legislation as well.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, the Pension Commission is also the body charged with the responsibility of monitoring and making sure that pension legislation is carried forward in the manner it was intended. I just wonder if the Labour Management Review Committee would be something more of an independent body reviewing and monitoring such things.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I wouldn't disagree that it may be a very useful body as I've indicated.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Similarly, has the Labour Management Review Committee given the Minister any of the benefit of its wisdom respecting The Pay Equity Act?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The question of pay equity I think has been the subject of discussion by the Labour Management Review Committee. I don't know whether there have been any recommendations from that group.

I'm given to understand that the Labour Management Review Committee has set up a subcommittee on pay equity but as yet have not given us any advice from that subcommittee.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Does the Minister know if that subcommittee is also looking into the so-called privatization of equal pay for work of equal value; and will it be offering its opinions and suggestions to the Minister and his department in that regard - pay equity in the private sector.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that they decide their own agenda and how they approach the subject so I'll await their views in respect to the application of pay equity in the private sector.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, should we pass this item and get onto another area? I'd like to go into a little more detail about pay equity and perhaps it should come under . . .

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, just so we can understand where we should ask some questions, are all of the grants made by this department contained in Item 2.(j) - all of the grants made by this department.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me. With the Minister's agreement, his staff are all here if you wish a free-ranging discussion to deal with any item that you see fit.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I have no problem of you jumping anywhere you want.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We could go and just pass the whole thing at once if you want.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Where would Affirmative Action be dealt with?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Under Executive Support.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Under that area then, at the last Session of the Legislature, we had quite a lengthy discussion on that topic. The Minister provided some statistical information to us that indicated the number of women employed in the Civil Service and their various classifications. I believe, if I recall correctly, it showed approximately 50 percent, perhaps even a little over 50 percent.

What I would be interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman, is to what degree have the classifications of women in the Civil Service improved. That is, have they got better jobs in the Civil Service than they had a year ago?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm inviting the Director of the Affirmative Action Branch to come forward, Brian Dagdick, to supply me with the information for the answer.

I'm advised that, in this past year there has been a significant increase in the hiring of women in senior officer positions; in the other areas, not as dramatic an increase, but a significant increase overall in the senior officer area.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister was kind enough to forward to me Tables on Male/Female Distribution by Salary Interval. Does he have such a table for this year? This last one was dated March 4, 1985.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, I don't have that. It isn't available. It takes a couple of months to produce this. We could probably give that information to the honourable member, but we don't have it here. I'd have to send it to him subsequently.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm a little disappointed because we've asked for this the last two years and got it. I would think the department could have anticipated that we'd be asking for the same information this year.

Would the Minister undertake then to - it must be done on a regular basis by the department. It was done in March of 1985. Could the Minister undertake to supply this information to us after the Estimates are completed, and perhaps undertake to have this information available before the Estimates start next year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that this information has to be obtained initially and compiled, and the information comes from the Civil Service Commission. This year or in this years budget, monies having appropriated it will allow the Civil Service Commission to prepare this data itself, so it should be available in future for the regular Estimates process.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On what basis is the Minister saying that women have achieved higher-paying jobs in the Civil Service during the last year, if he doesn't have this information?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There was a review of the senior officer area and that indicated a significant increase.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How many people?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't think there's any problem in revealing names. They're civil servants.

Sharon MacDonald is an Assistant Deputy Minister in Health; Isabel Dube, Assistant Deputy Minister in Northern Affairs; Brenda Kustra, Assistant Deputy Minister in Northern Affairs; Roberta Alice Grunfeld, Senior Officer 3, ADM equivalent to Civil Service Commission; Sheila Rogers, Senior Officer 3, Deputy Director, Legal Aid, the Attorney-General; Elizabeth Wagner, Senior Officer 3, Secretary, ERIC and Jobs Fund; and Sobharam Singh, ADM, Energy and Mines.

In addition, Senior Officer Branch Directors, Tannis Mindell, Executive Director, Employment Services . . .

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You could just give me the numbers.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Just the numbers? Senior Branch Directors, seven, and the numbers in the Assistant Deputy Minister were seven, and one more Deputy Minister in Employment Services, the target group women.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** The Minister, I believe, has undertaken to provide this information shortly.

I believe this is the area where we would ask about legislation. Is the Minister planning any other legislation?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Period?

The Minister of Labour.

I thought there was more to the question.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, I thought he was going to say this Session. There's nothing in the legislative hopper this Session. We have had discussions about contract performance legislation. That has not been confirmed or developed as yet.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is the Minister contemplating plant closure legislation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not this Session, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is anyone studying such legislation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not legislation.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is the department, by itself or in consultation with any other department, considering legislation with respect to technological change?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairperson. As the honourable member knows, a number of initiatives have occurred in the area of tech change, the Workplace Innovation Centre. I think that significant investment in initiative is taking place this year. Also the Tech Change Dialogue Program was carried out. I don't think there is any legislation contemplated.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** The Minister and this department are planning no major changes in legislation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I wouldn't say that we're not planning any major legislative change. We certainly have interests in a number of areas and as and when we decide that some legislation will be brought forward, of course we would announce that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What process will the Minister follow with respect to major legislation, in terms of consultation with outside groups?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That may vary, in accordance with the demands of the legislation.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** And the philosophy of the Minister.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** True.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, while we're on legislation, I'd like to tell the Minister that I have done as he asked and I've read his speech at the presentation for Second Reading of The Pay Equity Act, that being June 25, 1985. I'll read something the Minister said:

"It is suggested by some that the private sector should fall into this legislation, Mr. Speaker. We decided against including that sector. It is our opinion that we should lead by example, that we should show that pay equity could be achieved at a reasonable cost or without disruption. We feel confident that the private sector will proceed with pay equity willingly on their own. Our Pay Equity Bureau will be available to offer them advice and help in implementing it in their workplaces."

I'll stop there, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Minister if, on June 25, he was enunciating government policy?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I was indicating the attitude of the Minister and, I assume, of the government at that time, that we believe that we address pay equity in reasonable stages. We were looking at our own house, the Civil Service, Crown corporations, major funded institutions, and we indicated the extent of the initiative that we were prepared to proceed with at that time. That did not foreclose further initiatives after that date.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I'll ask the Minister, what intervened between June 25, 1985 and February, March of 1986 that should cause the Premier to go about the province telling employers and employees that pay equity would be imposed upon them by a newly elected New Democratic Government?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I want to correct the honourable member. I don't think the Premier indicated that pay equity would be - I don't think he said that pay equity would be imposed upon the private sector. He said that this government would proceed with initiation of pay equity initiatives in the private sector after consultation with the private sector. He didn't indicate the manner in which pay equity would be developed in the private sector.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** What consultations have taken place since the election, with the private sector?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** When the Premier was making that commitment, he was making commitment in respect to the program of this government as contemplated in the next four years.

As the honourable member knows, we have significant program involvement in the development of pay equity within the Civil Service, within the Crowns, within the institutions, and then of course we will be looking at the extensive consultation necessary in respect to development of pay equity in local government, in school boards and the private sector, of course, will be part of our agenda during the four-year period.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if the Minister is going to do this, that he should do it now,

because if he does it at a time that is closer to the next election, he'll be in some big trouble. You should get some of these unpopular things out of the way right away so that you don't have to face the population and the workplace and the workers and their employers in this province.

The Minister of Education seems to want to get involved here, Mr. Chairman. I'd be glad to yield the floor to him, if he wants to talk. There he goes. He makes the point, Mr. Chairman, that all the female workers in this province would support such a move. Maybe he's talking to those who aren't employed now, because those who are employed may have a little bit of difficulty holding their jobs - or a number of them would - if the Minister and the First Minister proceed with forcing this on their employers in this province.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I sincerely appreciate the advice of the honourable member. I'm sure that he means this well and would like to see us in office for many, many more years; and I'm sure that he's concerned to give us good advice in saying, do it now.

The part of his advice that I disagree with is that, in implementing vigorous dialogue and hopefully leading to consensus building and voluntary adoption of pay equity in the private sector, I don't think that is an unpopular measure. I think the majority of people in Canada, certainly in Manitoba, hold the view that women are no longer second-rate workers, that the work they do is as valuable, in all respects, as work done by men. Historically, as the honourable member knows, there has been systemic discrimination against women.

The value of the work that women have performed has been considered of less value than work performed by men, often, despite the fact the work was very similar. Over the course of time, we've finally narrowed the gap, we did have legislation adopted providing for equal pay for equal work, but that is only a part measure.

The honourable member, if he talks to many women, will come to appreciate that women are militant in their demand for justice and that a growing number of men, husbands, fathers, just ordinary Manitobans with a growing appreciation for fairness, believe that we should be well on our way with respect to pay equity.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** While the Minister is dealing with systemic discrimination and fairness, I would invite him to turn his attention to the thousands of women who don't leave their homes to do their work. They do an awful lot of work and their hours are not 9 to 5, Mr. Chairman, and when we're talking about systemic discrimination, I have a family and a wife at home, as I'm sure others do, and my wife happens to be looking after five children and she has to live on whatever it is that I can bring in, and that is the case in many, many other households across this province. The Minister's pay equity program doesn't do anything about that problem which has been here, I would say, longer than the problems the Minister is talking about. So that pay equity does nothing for people like that. Sure the Minister can respond by saying, well, we can only respond to the needs as they are brought to our attention and as the pressure mounts. But, you know, there is an awful lot of pressure in all these areas, Mr. Chairman, including pension reform for women who

have stayed in their homes all their lives doing a very valuable service of raising children and looking after homes. You know, the pressure is going to build for those kinds of reforms, too.

If the Minister wants to respond, I'll give him an opportunity.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour. I don't think you'll be able to stop him.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I appreciate the honourable member when he indicates concern for the value of work, it's often the woman is required to do in the home. However, it's becoming more common to hear of men doing the work at home and the woman having the career. I believe that social democratic governments in this province have set an example in Canada by advancing the interests of women. We developed fairer legislation in respect to marital property and the right to a fair division of that property, equal division of that property, in a previous term of government. We have done much to address the inequities that have historically existed in respect to women, not only women in the workplace, that's the sector we're addressing now, but women at home, as well.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I asked the Minister some time ago, Mr. Chairman, who is going to pay for pay equity in the public sector agencies and Crown corporations? The Minister wasn't very very clear in his answer and maybe he could give us a clear answer tonight.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In respect to government spending, there is only one body that pays and that is the taxpayer. The salaries of workers are negotiated over the course of time and what we're looking at here is, over the course of time, redressing an inequity that has existed for far too long. It will be phased in. It's estimated that the cost will be 1 percent of the payroll per year; that in a four-year period we should accomplish that in any specific payroll. That is not an inordinant amount of money. It's certainly well justified to right an historic wrong and to provide reasonable salaries to women.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Has the Minister decided the mechanics of how it will be paid for? For instance, if we take the Health Sciences Centre or the Brandon General Hospital, for example, there will be certain cost increases when this is brought in, will the government be granting extra monies to pay for pay equity or will these institutions have to make accommodations in their budgeting so that they can pay for pay equity?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would suggest that it is probably not within the purview of this Minister or this department. I would suggest that that's probably under the Department of Finance that that question would be more appropriate. If the Minister wishes to comment, I can't stop him.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I felt the Minister might be willing to comment, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I appreciate your concern about the nicety of my being required or wishing to answer

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

---

his question, but it is a legitimate question to ask the Minister responsible for the introduction of pay equity and I accept it.

Certainly, I'm sure that the health organizations will advance the concern they have in respect to their funding requirements which will obviously include the pay equity adjustments. That is something that of course government will be faced with and will have to take into consideration when we look at their fiscal needs.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, let's say that in the next two years pay equity is working in the public sector, but not yet introduced in the private sector, will the higher rates of pay in the public sector not create pressure in the private sector to increase wages for women and thereby obviating the necessity to impose pay equity?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's our expectation that the example that we set will be emulated in the private sector, because the value of the jobs identified in the public sector occupied by women, when those jobs are re-evaluated, it will have repercussions in the private sector, there's no question about that, and we trust that will facilitate the introduction of pay equity in the private sector itself.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Why was it necessary to introduce legislation? I wasn't here a year ago, Mr. Chairman, when it was brought in, but why could pay equity not have been carried out by way of administrative changes and regulations?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That is a good question and those questions were asked by some of your colleagues in the past sittings of the Legislature and my answer then may be far more complete than I would give it now at this meeting. But, basically, the concern was that we establish, in a formal way, the ground rules and the principles for the introduction of pay equity, to establish the technique of the introduction providing for a phased introduction of pay equity. It was argued, of course, all of that could be done by regulation because it's the direct Civil Service, the Crown, but we were concerned to establish pay equity in a formal way in which we involved as much public process as possible so that it would prepare the base for pay equity implementation, or introduction and implementation in every sector of society, including the private sector.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Since certain news items came out about pay equity in Minnesota, has the Minister been in touch with authorities there, particularly representatives Knickerbocker and Dempsey about the so-called unfortold headaches those two gentlemen spoke about caused by the Minnesota Pay Equity Bill, and that bill's been in effect for the last three years? I understand the Minnesota model is the one being used in Manitoba and I understand the Hay formula is being used in Manitoba, which is the same formula used in Minnesota. Has the Minister or members of his department been in touch with authorities down there?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'd like to introduce Carol Geller who is the Director of the Pay Equity Bureau and yes,

the answer is that staff have talked to officials in Minnesota, including the state officials and the union officials that negotiated and have introduced pay equity, and they have indicated that the remarks of the two persons, the honourable member has referred to, do not reflect the facts of pay equity in Minnesota.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I guess you can't believe everything you read, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I've noticed that, yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I guess we'll have to ask some more questions about that ourselves because the arguments they made were very disconcerting to me, as a member of a political party in this country that supports pay equity in the public sector, to find that before we even get it off the ground, they're having all these troubles in Minnesota. I don't quite understand the Minister's answer just being a flat denial that these problems exist. I don't think it's quite as simple as that.

I guess I'll move on and ask the Minister what the timetable is for the imposition, or whatever the Minister prefers to call it, of pay equity on cities, towns, and municipalities in this province - and I suppose school boards too - what consultations have taken place since the bill was passed a year ago last July?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There haven't been any formal consultations with school boards or local government as yet. There have been some inquiries and the director of the Pay Equity Branch responded to those.

The time frame for that has not been determined. It will be, of course, during the next couple of years; we'll be proceeding with that.

I might say also, we will send the member further information in respect to the Minnesota experience. It might be helpful.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Can the Minister tell us what response, generally speaking, that his department has been getting from municipalities, towns, city, and school boards, about the proposal and about how it will be funded?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm apprised the municipalities have asked questions but they haven't indicated any specific areas of concern as yet. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees is having a seminar on pay equity in January and the director will be speaking at that seminar.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if one of the concerns will be where a person is in the order of seniority in a workplace. I've seen the Memorandum of Agreement between the government and the MGEA and the female-dominated classes are listed here. Not being an accounting clerk, or a former accounting clerk, I can't really speak about that, but I have been a Court Reporter 2 at one time, and Court Reporter 2 is listed here as being one of the female-dominated classes. It used to be that all court reporters were male so I can say a lot of progress has been made certainly in that one field. I wonder why I see Court Reporter 2 here as a female-dominated class. I take it that's because

70 percent or more of the people in those groups are female.

Would this agreement that will result in adjustments later on, will that result in adjustments for court reporters, Reporter 2 and Library Technician 2 or is that subject to further negotiation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not necessarily so. They have been identified as classes that are dominated by women. The jobs then will have to be evaluated pursuant to the job evaluation classification system that has been agreed upon. Then it will be a matter of, after that determination takes place, negotiating the introduction.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** What are the specific criteria in this point system embraced by the Hay Formula?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The whole system, of course, in evaluating the job is based on the skill, effort, degree of responsibility, and the working conditions in which the job is carried out.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Does the amount of training come into this or is that part of the skill component?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that within the system, there are sub-factors under those general categories I referred to; the skill, responsibility, the effort, and the working conditions. Under the sub-factor of skills would be training, previous experience, and so on.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Can the Minister tell me how many points are given for skill, or what the total is for skill and how much each component is worth?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that when you adopt a consultant like Hay, you adopt their expertise which involves factoring and evaluations. They don't make it public so anyone can then pick it up and use it. The parties are briefed on the evaluation and the evaluation takes place with the understanding and commitment that the parties - the results are then confirmed by negotiation. I understand also that the Hay system is a subject of copyright and therefore, even though I quite frankly would like to share with you what the system is, I can't do that.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I think this is probably one of the main difficulties with what we're trying to do with pay equity, Mr. Chairman. The Minister doesn't understand it any better than I do, I'm finding out. You know, the average Manitoban understands it even less if that's possible. There's a real problem because people are frightened, certainly in the public sector, just as to what pay equity means.

I think some further effort is going to have to be undertaken to make sure everyone involved in the process, and certainly the taxpayer, has a much better understanding of what it is they're paying for.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has told us, I can't remember when it was, it wasn't very long ago, but he said that employers and the Crown agencies will begin negotiating in October of this year. Is that correct?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Correct.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** They'll be negotiating for the same type of agreement as the one reached with the MGEA. But what is it they're negotiating at this stage? Is it the same type of agreement, and that is strictly to identify the classes and to decide on which job evaluation system, so that in these other sectors we might be talking about a different system of evaluation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's correct, the first thing the parties have to do is agree upon the consultants and what kind of program they want to engage. Now in the case of the Civil Service and the MGEA, they agreed upon the Hay's System. They heard submissions from various groups of consultants and chose the Hay's System. They negotiated and agreed on that.

The second stage was agreeing on the classifications that were gender dominated.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Could the Minister tell us what the services of those consultants have cost to this point in time, the ones used in the negotiating process?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I would like to be able to give some quantification for the honourable member, but my information is that the Civil Service Commission would be the appropriate department to ask this of, because the Civil Service Commission and the MGEA met with and bargained with Hay and struck their agreement with them and I'm not privy to those details.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** It seems to me I asked some similar questions of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission when his Estimates were up, and I think some of the answers I got from him were to ask the Minister of Labour, so I really have a problem. Perhaps it's something the Minister can take under advisement and check with the Minister of Finance, and perhaps supply me with that type of information.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Sure, will do.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The other point is, how much has been spent by the government on consultants respecting pay equity generally, in its application, however it's going to be applied in this province?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We're budgeting for \$40,000 this year in these Estimates for consultants.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** What was budgeted for and what was spent in 1985-86?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It was a half year and we spent \$4,500.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** This Hay System, I understand is copyrighted, and perhaps this is another question for the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, but what does it cost to make use of that formula?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't have that. I will undertake to try and get that information included with the . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Thank you. The \$4,500 in consulting costs last year really wouldn't have bought very much,



but I wonder if there's been any studies done about the effect in the private sector of the position, if you will, of pay equity? What would be the result? Has any survey been done as to how many people's jobs are in jeopardy; those people that we really want to help, but who we will end up putting out of work if we impose it on the private sector?

Surely the Minister is interested in that kind of statistic, and in finding out that kind of information, before he proceeds.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised the only nation that looked at their pay equity was introduced 10 years ago in Australia. The results there did not produce a reduction in employment.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, with respect, I wonder if that's a very easy thing to quantify. People lose jobs and people find jobs, and the reasons aren't always documented. How can the Minister say that with such assurance?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, the honourable member asked me a question then that he admits is very difficult to quantify.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Still the Minister tried to quantify it.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, there is commentary about the Australian experience and that commentary is to the effect that it did not lead to a reduction of women in the work force, which is a concern the honourable member . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** It is very certainly and definitely a concern. The payroll tax, Mr. Chairman, doesn't discriminate in the sense that it hits marginal and unprofitable businesses, just as any other business, and this would be the case too with pay equity in the private sector.

Does the Minister not agree that if pay equity is to be done fairly and uniformly across the province, then it should apply to every workplace; then if it does, we run the risk of increasing costs to employers, thus forcing them to make decisions, like letting some people go.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Manitoba does not have a payroll tax. It has a levy for health and secondary education. That levy is designed and does contribute a significant amount of money to facilitate health and education costs in the province, recouping particularly from the Federal Government salaried employees, the work force that the Federal government has in this province - and the Federal Government is, I suppose, the second largest employer in the province - many millions of dollars.

However, the health and education levy is not universally applied to all the workplaces. As the honourable member knows, most small businesses in Manitoba are not subject to the levy.

The application of pay equity in the private sector likely will have similar exempted features, because it will be virtually impossible to provide for a mandatory pay equity in very, very small workplaces. I don't think

that would be the intention of any government to legislate pay equity in small family operations, where you call them a Mom and Pop grocery store sort of thing.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Will there be any subsidies, or does the Minister foresee any subsidies for private sector employers . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me. Could we have a little order, please?

The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Will there be any subsidization for private sector enterprises complying with the Minister's and the government's wish to go ahead with pay equity?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I wouldn't contemplate that, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** This list of female and male-dominated classes, of course, lists those classes with respect to both sexes, and the male-dominated class is quite a lot bigger. What about males? Is there any relief for them in the Pay Equity Program of government in the public sector?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No. Quite frankly, it's the male sector in society that historically has received all of the benefits and the rewards. We are playing catch-up in our fairness to women. But one of the significant features of our legislation is the fact that there can be no reduction in male salaries as a result of pay equity.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand the legislation, there can be appeals to the Manitoba Labour Board on pay equity decisions. Is that correct?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In respect to the introduction of pay equity in the Civil Service, there is no appeal to the Labour Board. There is an arbitration process that is provided for. In respect to the introduction of pay equity in the Crowns and the major funded institutions, there is an appeal to the Labour Board if the parties fail to reach agreement on any specific area of requirement.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On what basis will the Labour Board make a decision?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** They will hear argument from both sides in respect to the positions of both sides in respect to the issue under appeal, and then make a decision one way or the other. In some instances, I suppose, it may be that a compromise position may be in order.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What guidelines or principles will the Manitoba Labour Board use?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** They will be making their decisions on the basis of the arguments that are placed before them, the precedents in other areas in other

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

jurisdictions. They will have to choose from the submissions that are made and, of course, will look at the guidelines for decision-making that they have in respect to other issues that come before the board.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, will the Labour Board have any specific guidelines or principles to follow either in the legislation or in terms of some sort of direction perhaps from the Minister's Office? Are they simply in a vacuum?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Labour Board will receive the benefit of a report by the Director of the Pay Equity Bureau but, other than that, there are no specific formulas that will be just handed to the Labour Board for its decision-making.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Who approves the guidelines from the Director of the Pay Equity Bureau?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There won't be guidelines given to the Labour Board from the Pay Equity Bureau. It will be a report as to the negotiations.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Would this be a subjective view of the director?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, a factual report.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I'm just finding it difficult to conceive how decisions will be made in those instances of appeal where there are no legislative guidelines or principles to be followed. I question whether, with all due respect and I'm not in any way being critical of the Director of the Pay Equity Bureau, whoever is in that position, if the board is to be governed by her report. She has no basis, other than certainly setting out the facts. But what principle is to be used? How are the parties, the outside agencies, the Crown corporations supposed to attempt to resolve these matters? How are they resolved by the Labour Board when there are no legislative principles?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I disagree that there are no principles. The Pay Equity Act . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** That's what I asked.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Pardon me?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I asked that at the very beginning.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Pay Equity Act does indicate principles of pay equity and, of course, the board can look at that.

As someone who was an administrator of some tribunals in the past, I know that in many instances there are no set guidelines in respect to the adjudication that's necessary. It's an application, in many instances, of common sense.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The Research and Planning Division of the Minister's department deals with - what? -

industrial labour information and statistics, and uses those facts and figures to formulate policy and monitors that kind of situation. I'm wondering if the Research and Planning Branch has done any specific study about the effect of this province's labour legislation in industry, specifically respecting jobs and job creation.

Now we know the Minister told us at the beginning about the record of Manitoba respecting work stoppages due to labour strife and so on. It reminds me of my old friend, Jack Horner, from my Ottawa days. One day, he was making some comments about the unemployment situation in Nova Scotia. Someone asked him why it was like that in Nova Scotia. Well, Mr. Horner responded in his usual kind of language. He said that it was because people in Halifax have an inappreciation of their jobs. Well, Mr. Stanfield was there that night and wasn't going to put up with that, and he said that he inappreciated that comment.

Well, the fact is quite the reverse if that's the fact in Halifax, which I very much doubt. It's quite the reverse in Manitoba. We have a long history in this province of working hard and doing our best to hold down our jobs. I'm just wondering if the Minister has any statistics from anywhere or relative statistics with other provinces that can say just what effect the climate is in Manitoba on jobs and job creation in our province vis-a-vis other provinces.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I did indicate in my opening remarks the growth of the employment force in Manitoba, which has been very heartening, the equivalent of the City of Brandon, if you will, I know, in increased population and a very significant increase in the number of jobs. So that is, as my notes indicated, for the first time in our history, over half-a-million employed.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Well you see that doesn't just jive, Mr. Chairman, with some of the discussion we had yesterday with the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security when we discussed the numbers of people on welfare in this province. You can't really have it both ways. You can't say that because of our labour legislation in the province, our employment rate is getting better when at the same time, we're experiencing unprecedented numbers of people going on the welfare roles. I really don't understand how the Minister can say that and lay it at the doorstep of his department's labour legislation.

That's the point I'm getting at. I don't think the Minister can provide me with the kind of information I'm looking for, but I think it's fair to say an operation in a marginal situation faced with enough difficulties in these times as it is, is also faced with labour legislation that's been brought in by this government which has been denounced soundly in many, many cases. Of course, the positive comments come from the government that puts in the legislation in the first place.

The Research and Planning Division, I understand does analysis based on Conference Board information and statistics. Can the Minister share some projections with us as to where his department sees the employment situation going in the next little while?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm provided with the actual and seasonally-adjusted unemployment rate and employed

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

by the province and Canada for the month of June, 1986. The actual employed in June '86 in Manitoba, 502,000; in June of 1985, it was 486,000 which was a positive increase of 3.3 percent in that month - that's a snapshot of the actual employed in June of 1986 - 486,000 in June '85; 502,000 in June '86, a 3.3 percent increase.

The average in Canada during that same period, comparing those two months, was a positive change of 3.2 percent; so we were .1 percent better than the national average.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister to go forward in time, not backward in time. I asked what projections his department has made. The Research and Planning Division prepares information on labour relations, conditions and trends, and research and analysis to the department. I'm wondering what analysis could be made available to members of the Legislature that's been done by the department.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Our department doesn't provide that kind of information, but I would refer the honourable member to the glowing analysis and prospectus, if you will, for Manitoba by the Royal Bank and other . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I've heard it before.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** You've heard it before? Well in the "Financial Times," another socialist rag. I've been informed that's libellous. I'll say it's another responsible . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The Minister says he doesn't provide that kind of information to Members of the Legislature. Why not?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I appreciate the honourable member wanting us to do more but these things cost money. The Conference Board of Canada and a number of other areas do look at the future and make guesstimates. The Conference Board Labour Relations outlook indicated that in respect to economic growth as measured by real gross product, has been above the long-term average in '84 and '85 for both Manitoba and Canada. The projections for '86 and '87 indicate a continuing strong growth. Recovery from the '81-82 recession has been strong but the recession remains a vivid memory for business, labour and government and is still an important factor in governing decisions and activity.

It goes on: The projections have employment growth for '86 and '87 at over twice the long-term average. That's the Conference Board's look at the future.

I don't think we can do much better at this time than indicate to you what the experts at the Conference Board indicate.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The Minister says that to provide members of the Legislature with research and analysis papers would be expensive. Perhaps he wouldn't mind just letting us have the originals then, and we will just photocopy them and get the originals back to the Minister.

If that isn't satisfactory, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this type of information will be available to members

of the Legislature and members of the public when our Freedom of Information legislation is proclaimed. If it is, then why not go along with our request now?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, I will make sure that the honourable member gets a subscription to our list. It's the Manitoba Labour Relations Information Bulletin. It's provided to anyone who asks for it and we do have a mailing list. We'll make sure that he's put on it. I think the critic should receive a copy of this. I don't know why we wouldn't have supplied that. We certainly will make that available. It does provide statistics and a better overview than I give him.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I'd appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, and the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. I think they should be made available to every MLA, quite frankly.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** That does seem to take us some way down the road, Mr. Chairman, but now that the Minister has told us there's information he doesn't provide, is that the information he was talking about?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairperson. The honourable member was talking about a look into the future, the future prospects. I don't know that documentation which is retrospective in large part deals with future expectations.

I'm advised that it does contain conference board and other institutional forecasts, like banks, like that Royal Bank I referred to.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Does the department have any employment forecasts of its own for the future?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Okay. There's not very much to provide then, is there?

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, this area of Research and Planning has spent, or will be spending, \$476,700 in the forthcoming year. What research and analysis is planned in this fiscal year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The responsibilities of the branch, and I read those, and what the branch has focused on.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I've read that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** You have this? Okay. I'm sorry, I'm given to understand that you have supplementary material but you don't have these notes.

The main responsibilities of the branch are developing information on labour relations conditions and trends in Manitoba, conducting studies and analyzing information and policy related concerns, providing the department with research and technical assistance, providing development support for departmental

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

planning, developing and implementing management information systems.

During the past year, the branch focused on a number of priority areas. Major accomplishments were (1) continuing with the development and implementation of a formalized planning process within the department; (2) expansion and improvement in the collection and reporting of labour relations information, e.g., the analysis of collective agreements and the labour relations information bulletin; (3) analysis of needs and assistance within the development of management information systems within the department; (4) assessment of procedures and reorganization of some branch operations of the department; identification of opportunities for more cost effective operations; (5) preparation of background information and briefing notes on a wide range of policy issues and concerns; (6) provision of research and administrative support to the Labour Management Review Committee.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is any of that information given to persons or organizations outside of government, other than the Labour Management Review Committee you referred to?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There is an analysis of collective agreements that is developed by this branch that is furnished to industry and labour unions. There is also a bulletin that goes out quarterly, providing statistical information to those same groups.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could that information be made available to the critic and to myself?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, copies of those, yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just a simple question now. Is any of the other information, will it be available to members of the public through The Freedom of Information Act? I would think the department, by now, has had an opportunity to consider the implications of that Act and how it will apply, not only to the whole department, but to this area.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The information that is developed for policy consideration by government, the government asks for specific initiatives, that kind of material wouldn't be the kind of material that we would tender as public information; but a broad range of this material certainly would be and the department is in the process now of compiling information that will be available through The Freedom of Information Act.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Will the department be preparing sort of a summary of information that could be available under The Freedom of Information Act or will someone have to schedule?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We have just established a computerized bank of information this year on collective agreements and we are scheduling the documentation that will be available under The Freedom of Information Act.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, getting on to the topic of the province's labour legislation and, more

specifically, some years back there was an important submission produced, the Smith Report, and this report had something to do with the basis for the legislation that came down later.

I wonder if the Minister could make available to me a copy of that report.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, I could provide the honourable member with a copy of the White Paper which was the public document that resulted.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Was there something other than a public document?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There was research done for government that contained subjective analysis and specific suggestions, ideas that were not part of the public document.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Perhaps the Minister can make the public document available to me and then, upon reading that, I may have further questions at another time.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Back last winter, we had a difficult situation in Brandon which the Minister is very familiar with and it had to do with the T. Eaton Co. and difficulties there with the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers Union and the employees, as well as the company, to the point that the council of the City of Brandon got very concerned because of a threat - it was more than a threat - the distinct possibility that Eaton's store in Brandon, which is the main anchor store in our downtown area, would become something less than a full-line department store, which it had been for many, many years before, and would become a bargain-basement-type store.

Forty-three employees were looking at the loss of their jobs. Seventeen others were looking at the possibility that their full-time jobs would become part-time jobs and many of the employees there laid the blame for all their troubles on the first-contract legislation of the province; and aside from all the debate that went on at the time about first-contract legislation and the fact that there's no appeal procedure allowing either side the opportunity to take a dispute further than the Manitoba Labour Board. The Minister responded to the motion passed by the Council of the City of Brandon by way of a letter to Mayor Burgess, and I will read the Minister one paragraph and ask him if he is serious about this. "Where an employer alleges financial difficulty, it is consistent with universal legal practice that the employer is bound to bring some evidence of this before the adjudicators determine such an allegation can be acted upon." Mr. Chairman, at the time Eaton's were claiming that if they were forced to go along with the contract imposed by the Labour Board, that they would no longer be competitive, and they were, I assure the Minister, very ready to make good on the threat of cutting back their operations. I attended the store and saw that a whole floor had been cleared right out.

Now I wonder if the Minister agrees that in a situation like that, when an employer claims that his competitive

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

edge would be damaged, that he should open his books to labour leaders and to the Manitoba Labour Board.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I want to give the honourable member some data on first-contract legislation so that in cases like the Eaton's application of the Act can be looked at in context.

In respect to first-contract or first-agreement legislation, I would like to give some background to give the honourable member an appreciation for the results of this legislation and not just look at one particular case. From 1982 to the end of '84, the board received 13 applications for first-collective agreements.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I know all that, Mr. Chairman. I've been told that before, what the Minister is about to tell me. I've read it and I've heard it told to me a few times. I guess the Minister doesn't really want to answer that specific question.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, if the honourable member tells me that he has reflected on the very substantial degree of success of first-contract legislation in Manitoba, fine, I understand. He appreciates that legislation has been very effective in resolving the acrimony of first-contract negotiation. In some instances, in the past history of this province, we had very serious problems. Those problems have been eliminated.

There have been, in its place, a problem, for example, that the honourable member refers to in Brandon, and the honourable member indicates concern that I should write to an employer and indicate that if they are arguing economic hardship, they should be prepared to place that argument in its fullest before the tribunal that will be making the decision. I don't think that's unreasonable. If an employer says, in essence, that it is not in a position to provide wages that are being sought and bargained for, then it has to be able to place evidence of that, I think, initially, before the workers themselves, and then before the respective tribunal. I don't think that is unreasonable.

As a matter of fact, I believe that we are one day going to have a society where there is much more openness in respect to the benefits that flow to employers and the benefits that employ to employees, and more sharing of that vital information because, from my perspective, employment is not one sided; it's a partnership. There is an employer and an employee and they must work cooperatively together.

In the Eaton's case, I think that the results of the legislation forced the company to negotiate very effectively, or very openly, with the union. Ultimately, there was a giving on both parts and agreement was finally reached, notwithstanding the posturing that may have occurred on either side.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Well, the Minister may remember that the final conclusion came when the workers at Eaton's threatened to sue their union and it was only then that the union backed down and, of course, this was just within days of an election call, too; so that you have to bear all those things in mind.

I don't think we're going to get anywhere with this particular argument, Mr. Chairman. But I will ask one

specific question on that point, and that is, the Minister was about to tell me how many first contracts have been imposed since the legislation. I'd like to ask, of that number of first contracts imposed, in how many of those cases was one side the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers Union?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised there were 7 out of 21.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Fully, one-third of all first contracts in Manitoba since this legislation came into being have had, on one side, that Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers Union, is that what the Minister is telling me? Seven out of 21?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The statistics indicate 7 out of 21. I'm not surprised that should be the case. I think in the service area is one of the areas that has been the least subject to union organization.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I wonder if the Minister can make available to me a copy of a list of all unions operating in Manitoba. I understand such a list is available, a labour register.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That the honourable member will find contained in the labour directory which we will furnish to you.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Thank you.

My colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, asked the Minister earlier about Affirmative Action, and while the Minister is getting information for me - and I assure him, as far as I can see, none of this would be very expensive for the Minister to provide to me - I would like to know on the Affirmative Action Program, of the four groups involved, I would like to know the targets: No. 1, for each group. I would like to know the percentage of each group operating in the public service in 1981, as well as in 1986. This will give members of the Legislature an opportunity to judge for themselves. The Minister said earlier that things were going very well. Well, I'd like to see those kinds of numbers.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Now, I certainly will provide that information to the honourable member. I don't want him to misunderstand what I said.

I said that in one category, when I was referring to women - and the honourable member was asking about women - that we had made significant progress, I think, in the number of women that have successfully obtained senior positions in government. But I'm not rah-rahing that we've done extremely well.

Affirmative Action is not an overnight process by any means. It's a process that involves close cooperation, collaboration of workers in every area of activity. We have established committees, as the honourable member knows, I think that I've reported on that. The committees are in each department and the committees are charged with the responsibility of identifying systemic barriers in the workplace, identifying opportunities for Affirmative Action and cooperating together in the process of ensuring the recruitment and success of Affirmative Action in each department.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister in this department responsible for implementation of Affirmative Action throughout all government departments?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, this Minister is charged with the responsibility of coordinating Affirmative Action.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, there was a report earlier today that the Department of Highways are categorizing their employees by sex, physical handicap, ethnic origin. Is that categorization taking place in all departments at the direction of this Minister with respect to its Affirmative Action Program?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Each department, through its Affirmative Action Committees, are involved in a process of determining the numbers of target groups presently within each department by self-declaration so that then we can have accurate statistical information on which to base our initiatives.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** So this is being done in all departments?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In all departments, yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What if someone refuses to sign; or are they identified by their supervisors?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's a voluntary program and if they don't declare, that's it.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** The report I heard indicated that supervisors were requested to turn in this information by the end of August.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There's no question, but we are asking that the program, in order to assist in program development, we get this information. Department-by-department, we're asking that self-declaration process be proceeded with and give us the results of that review by a specific time frame. If the member says it was the end of August, I wouldn't quarrel with him.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how the Minister implements Affirmative Action then? The Member for Brandon West talked about pay equity earlier on a point system. In the Affirmative Action Program, does a person get an extra point or two if you are female versus male, if you are handicapped versus not being handicapped, or if you are of a certain ethnic origin; so that when whoever is doing the hiring - just how does it work? You have two people with supposedly equal ability, equal skills, equal education, if one applicant is in one of these categories in the government's Affirmative Action Program, do they get the job over the other person who may have equal ability or perhaps might even have a little more ability or training?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that the committees in each department set target goals year by year . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What do you mean by target goals? Is that quotas?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** They look at the probable opportunities within that department for internal advancement or recruitment, and then when there is a job position that is the subject of bulletining or board adjudication, all other things - I shouldn't say all other things - providing that a target group member has the qualifications, there may be special consideration given to a target group member. But they have to have the qualifications for that position.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What are the target goals for this Minister then in this fiscal year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The target groups are looked at from the point of view of what that group is in a percentage of society, then a target is established on that basis. Visible minorities, the target that is estimated is 6 percent; Native people, 10 percent; Disabled, 7.5 percent; Women, 42 percent.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** But women now occupy more than 50 percent of the jobs in the Civil Service. Is there going to be a reduction by 8 percent of women in the Civil Service?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm sorry. Obviously I misread this item on this category, but women are 42 percent now of the . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Of what? The total Civil Service?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's the information I'm given. The goal is to provide a more equitable distribution among all categories of employment.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just so that I can understand this . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that this number fluctuates between 42 percent and 50 percent, depending upon the time that the snapshot is taken, that it varies because there is a higher incidence of males in term positions in certain times of the year, the summertime in highways construction and similar things.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just so that I understand then. I was a little surprised by that one statistic the Minister used, that handicapped people constitute 7.5 percent of the total number, does that say of Manitobans?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that statistically there are many more than 7.5 percent of our population that are disabled. But the 7.5 percent are those who are disabled but nevertheless have capacity to work.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Maybe I missed it. The goal then of the department is to have 7.5 percent of the Civil Service involving handicapped people, 42 percent women?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What is the objective? Fifty percent women?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The goal for women is virtual equality with men but a greater mix. At the present time, women are in the lower paid clerical and secretarial positions.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Then the Minister referred to visible minorities. The goal there is to have 6 percent of the Civil Service. What do they constitute now?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** 2 percent.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister define visible minority?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Non-white except Native people are categorized under a separate category.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What is the goal for Native people?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** 10 percent.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What do they presently . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** 2 percent.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How does the Minister define Native? Treaty Indian or does that include Metis and if that's Metis, what is a Metis?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Treaty Indian, non-status Indian, Metis and Inuit.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How does the Minister define Metis?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Self-declaration.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is that type of program being approved by the Human Rights Commission?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I think the Minister talks about this generally but how does the Minister plan on implementing this without imposing some form of quota system?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The whole concept is to ensure that there is complete cooperation within the staff in respect to identifying and realizing the opportunities for affirmative action. It's not a top down process. It's a program that is to involve workers in each area of work activity, in each staff grouping through their Affirmative Action Committee efforts, identifying affirmative action opportunities and in persevering in ensuring that affirmative action does take place with respect to recruitment and advancement of target groups.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We should notify the members that the time is after 10:00 p.m. for voting purposes. I assume we wish to continue, is that correct? Does the committee wish to continue — Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I prefer to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Is it safe to say we're generally in the area of Division Administration, 2.(a), for the purposes of the staff, that they need to know where we're at and where we're going.

Considering the time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the latitude that's being given at this hearing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you want to go line-by-line at this point?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Or do you want to just pass it?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I don't think we're going to be a whole lot longer actually so that we might just get to the end and then pass the whole thing if that's suitable to everyone here.

One moment, Mr. Chairman.

Under Mechanical and Engineering, I understand the office of the Fire Commissioner now has responsibility for The Building and Mobile Homes Act. A matter has come to my attention that when a mobile home is sold it's up to the vendor to see that certain standards of safety, electrical safety and so on are met and that this comes under the Fires Commissioner's office. Certain orders are issued after an inspection by the department and certain things are to be done by dates that are given.

What happens if these orders are not complied with in the time period specified?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** If the manufacturer does not meet the standards we will not permit the sale to go through.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** In the case, Mr. Chairman, of a used mobile home, I guess the sale from a vendor to a purchaser, the vendor not being the manufacturer, as I understand it, is the vendor's responsibility similar to the situation in Ontario with vehicles where it's the vendor's responsibility to secure a safety certificate for the vehicle? Is that the same type of thing here in Manitoba for mobile homes?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that if the mobile home is CSA approved then on resale it does not have to be approved, but if it has not been CSA approved, it will require certification by the department.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, in the case I'm talking about, I guess there was no CSA approval, because a permit was issued to make changes in this case and the changes were not made by the deadline stated in the permit. The purchaser is concerned and I have tried to be in touch with the Fire Commissioner's Office and I'll no doubt be trying again soon but, as I understand it, can title still pass to this? It's not like a real property transaction, but can the purchaser take up domicile in a mobile home that has not yet been certified?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that if a purchaser buys a home that is not CSA approved

and there are deficiencies, he would have to see that those are rectified and then we would certify it, the purchaser or the vendor; but if there's a situation where a used mobile home has been occupied and there has been no certification, that's a matter for adjudication because the act requires that it be certified and it'll be up to the courts to determine who undertook what activity and assumed what obligation, I should say.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I think the problem is fairly simple here; it's a matter of compliance. We have the rules and we have deadline dates and I think the idea is that we should adhere and comply to the law. I just wonder if it's commonplace in a department to allow these things to be put off and the compliance not to be made.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't want to inhibit the member in any way. However, I think the honourable member is referring to a specific incidence and it may well be that's a matter for litigation between the parties because of an obligation that one of the parties assumed. So I would rather, if he has a specific case on which he wants background information from the department, that we do it in that way.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Yes, I prefer to do it that way, Mr. Chairman.

I just wonder, I haven't read The Building and Mobile Homes Act so I don't know what sanctions there are for non-compliance, but are there actions that can be taken to ensure compliance with the act?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Enforcement provisions.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** While we're dealing with Fire Prevention Estimates, Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me. Can we have a little order, please?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** . . . could the Minister assure this committee through the Fire Commissioner that the situation at the Manitoba Developmental Centre in Portage is adequately protected from fire at the present time?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The answer is, yes it is.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** There's no risk to the inhabitants of the centre in the opinion of the Fire Commissioner?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I can't say that there's no risk.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** No abnormal risk.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No abnormal risk, yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Those are all the questions I had on that. Perhaps under the Mechanical and Engineering, which is I believe the area where the inspections of amusement rides takes place.

I note in the 1984-85 report that there were 289 inspections and 258 orders issued for remedial action. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the number of inspections that took place during the last year March 31, 1985 to April 1, 1986, and perhaps they have the record from April 1 of 1986 to the present time, particularly I guess, in view of the accident in Edmonton, this is a concern; and I'm not raising it because I have any suspicions or have received any complaints about amusement operators in the province, but it is a concern of some people and I wonder if there's been any emphasis on the inspections.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** As soon as the staff have the statistics, I will relate more fully, but I share the honourable member's concerns, and I don't know whether the honourable member or another, the Member for Brandon West, asked me in the House about this area of departmental responsibility. I've been most concerned about that, particularly the very terrible accident at the Edmonton Mall.

During the course of the recent Red River Exhibition, following so closely after the West Edmonton Mall, I had very serious apprehension about the need for constant checking or adequate checking of the amusement rides particularly, and we had, during the course of the Red River Exhibition, some strong natural forces; we had strong winds. Further inspections were made and I'm happy to report that there were no serious incidents, but as I indicated to the Honourable Member for Brandon West, there's a large number of minor rectifications that are required which, to me, confirms the thoroughness of the inspection demands that are made upon the operators.

The honourable member asked for some further statistics. The honourable member has before him, on Page 12, the 1984-85 statistics, I believe, and perhaps he could pen in the 1985-86 that are not published yet, but he could pen them in. They'll be in the next report. That's on Page 12 of the annual report. The total number of inspections were 363 - this is 1985-86. The orders issued for remedial action, 254; the electrical hazards, 95; mechanical hazards, 159; number of rides condemned were, again, zero.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I take it the Minister doesn't have the statistics from April 1 of this year. I would gather, in view of the concern, that there may have been an increase.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that April 1 on is the heavy incidence of fairs and exhibitions and the inspection is very heavy. Those statistics will be changed in the next period because one ride was condemned this year, at the Red River Exhibition there were four inspections there.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, we, in Brandon, are happy that the Manitoba Fire College is located there, and I'd like to ask the number of courses offered since the opening of the Fire College, and the number of candidates. I lost track of the exact date that it did get going. If you have that, that'll be helpful too.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The number of courses offered and the number of candidates for the courses, yes. On



Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

Page 22 of the Annual Report, the Fire College courses were 147, and in attendance 2,059.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I'm sorry, I didn't make my question clear enough. I'm talking about the Brandon College since it opened. At the writing of this report, the Brandon Fire College was just nearing completion so you wouldn't find that here.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Since the college has opened there have been three fire-fighting courses; 15 members in each course, for a total of 45; and dangerous goods handling courses every second week with 15 participants in each course.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** What is the duration of the fire courses?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** One of those three courses is for 40 weeks and the other two are for three weeks.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** How many staff are employed at the Brandon Fire College?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Five and two clerical for a total of seven.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, this time for real on Fire Prevention.

Moving to Employment Standards, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how construction wages are set and what role the Construction Wages Board plays in setting of those construction wages.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Construction Wages Board holds public meetings, hears representation in respect to the schedule and makes recommendations on the basis of the submissions that have been made to it. The last recommendation was processed but recently. Pardon me? The rural and heavy construction had their hearings, made their recommendations and those recommendations were adopted. Winnipeg has yet to complete.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Is there a difference between non-union and union wages?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, the wage schedule is based on the submissions of both the contractors and the organized workers. Generally it is reflective of the average negotiated wage in the industry.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Okay. Earlier the Minister and I had a discussion about first-contract legislation, so there is no need to go into that again.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On Employment Standards, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated he had some information available earlier. Could he indicate what the employment rate is of young Manitobans as a percentage of adult Manitobans? He should be able to make that calculation pretty quickly.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that it is in the bulletin, under Labour Market Statistics.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister indicate how many unemployed youth there were and how many unemployed adults there were?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is the question the number of unemployed youth and the unemployed adults . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I know that the Minister of Employment Services waxed eloquent in the House not too long ago on that subject, and indicated that there had been some progress in that area, but I don't have those statistics.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is the Minister directing the Minimum Wage Board to consider an increase in the minimum wage?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Why?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The last increase has been some many months ago and honourable members know that the cost of living doesn't stand still. There has always been a concern that the minimum wage should in some way be reflective, or at least changes in the minimum wage should be somewhat reflective of the changes in the cost of living.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Does Manitoba still have the second-highest minimum wage rate?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I hesitate because I know that two jurisdictions have indicated an increase is being made. I don't have the date when the increase is being implemented. I believe Ontario is in October. But my understanding is our rate is the third-highest at the present time. Northwest Territories is \$5.00; Saskatchewan is 4.50; ours is 4.30. So we're third-highest at the moment.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, just very quickly; I don't want to get into it too much, but a number of years ago there was a report by the Minimum Wage Board in which there was a minority position. The government adopted, I think it was the majority position. One of the concerns that was expressed was that there should be a study of who receives the minimum wage, with a view perhaps to implementing it in a different way.

Is the Minister inclined to undertake that type of study?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's certainly an area that we will be looking at. I know we've had representations from some industries that deem themselves particularly affected by the changes in the minimum wage, tourism and the hotel industry, among others. They've asked for greater lead time. Certainly, that whole area will be the subject of further consideration and it may include that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You're not committing yourself?

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not at this time.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Would the Minister do this through his department - would he undertake to provide the Member for Brandon West and myself with the rate that I referred to earlier, the unemployment rate of young people in Manitoba as a percentage of unemployed adults, and compare that to each of the other provinces in Canada?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** For what period?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** When can you do it?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** These statistical results, or compilations, are subject to change.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** To make it fair, let's say you did it on the average figures for the year 1985. Would that be fair?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** An average in 1985?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yes.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Certainly we'll see whether we can come up with that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You know you can come up with that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** These would be figures that we would get from Stats Canada, I presume, and then do an averaging on it. I don't know whether they have that precise information or whether — (Interjection) — They have it? We can supply it, yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I appreciate that very much.  
Just one other question on this area. How much was paid out from the Payment of Wages Fund during the last fiscal year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** For the fiscal year '85 to '86, there was a total of \$408,827.56, of which 133,973 was recovered.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Where does the recovery show in the Estimates? It doesn't.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, I guess that goes into Consolidated Revenue.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** That is still funded entirely by the government, as originally developed?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is the Minister considering any changes in the method of financing the Payment of Wages Fund?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Surprisingly enough, we did have some of the business community that thought maybe there should be an assessment on employers. Given

the enthusiasm for the levy, we didn't think that was appropriate at this time.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the maximum amount an employee can get is \$1,200.00?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Which was the maximum amount we brought in when we introduced this in 1980, I believe. Would the Minister not consider that some six years having passed, that amount should be increased to cover the cost-of-living increase that has taken place over those six years?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The suggestion is worth looking at; however, I'm advised that sum still covers 90 percent of the claims that are submitted.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** A lot of statistics have been provided to us respecting the Manitoba Labour Board, and that had to do with applications that came before it for one thing and another, so I'm not going to ask any questions about that. I'd just ask one question about the Other Expenditures line, at \$137,500.00.

Hereweare. There's an increase of \$30,000, reflecting increased rates of fees paid to board members and vice-chairpersons as well as increased frequency and complexity of board meetings under The Labour Relations Act. Can the Minister tell us why the increased complexity? Question No. 2, what kind of increase of rates of fees has there been? Is the complexity resulting from changes over the last few years to The Manitoba Labour Relations Act?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The answer would be yes to that.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Right, and the rates of fees?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The member was asking what they were and what they've gone up to.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I take it there is a certain per diem rate that a member of the board gets, and I'm asking how much that's been increased.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that the board personnel, the board members, received \$50 per meeting or \$100 per day. Vice-chairs received \$150 per day or \$75 per meeting. That was before the change.

Under the new regime, board members receive \$80 for the first half-day and \$50 for any second half-day or second meeting. If the board goes a full day, it would be a total of \$130.00. The vice-chairs receive \$300 for the full day. If it's a half-day meeting, it's \$150.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Do the participants in the hearings from labour and management, I assume for the most part, and of course there are other hearings having to do with the payment of wages, do those go to the Labour Board or do those go to another board?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm sorry, I have to make a correction on those statistics. The vice-chairs, it's \$200

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

for the full day for the first meeting, and \$100 for the second part of the meeting. It's \$200 for the morning. If it goes into the afternoon, it's \$100 for the afternoon. So it's a total of \$300.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The question was, The Payment of Wages Act, does that come before the Labour Board disputes?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** And employment standards.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The answer is yes, but generally there's a single member of the board who sits.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** People filing applications, are there fees for the filing of applications?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Applications for certification?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** For certification or for any other adjudication being asked for by the board.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** None?

With respect to Conciliation and Mediation Services, plenty of facts are available to us in the annual report so that I won't be asking any questions about that. My colleague has one.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister describe how arbitrators are appointed then?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The arbitrators are appointed by the board chair from a list of arbitrators that are recommended by the Labour-Management Review Committee.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister supply us with that list of arbitrators?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, one of the stated goals of the Apprenticeship and Training Division has been to include additional occupations, as I understand it. Have any additional occupations been included in the services provided by the Apprenticeship and Training Branch?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** How many additional?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Yes. Have any, and how many, and what are they?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Three: cooks, bakers and parts persons.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** When did those come in?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** During 1985.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Does the department envisage bringing in any more occupations?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, we hope to bring in some categories in the electronics area.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** How does it work? Does an employer approach the department to ask for this type of assistance, or how does it work that new occupations become included?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's a mix. There could be some individual employers who make a request, but trade advisory groups are the main source.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Has there been any dialogue amongst the department and community colleges, students and employers to set up a program that would include more occupational groups that could take advantage of the Apprenticeship and Training services offered by the department, thereby assisting people in finding employment for one thing, and getting apprentices started?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand there's an ongoing dialogue between the community colleges and the department. I'm given to understand the Department of Education has a representative on the Apprenticeship Board.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** It seems to me that I think maybe we've got five or six occupations under this program. I just think it's a program that maybe should be expanded, and this would be a way to do it. It would be to have more dialogue than we have now and maybe in a structured kind of way. The experts, of course, know better than me about that, but I wonder if something more structured is something the department should be looking at.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It is an area that we are going to be looking at.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister indicate why the Women in Trades Training Program is being eliminated?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That activity has been transferred to Employment Services and it's contemplated that it will be expanded in that department.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** It has been budgeted for this year in Employment Services?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, it's included in there . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, Other Expenditures in the Pension Commission, as well as Salaries, are decreased from last year's appropriation. I wonder if the Minister could explain the reasons? Maybe it's in the Supplementary Information which I haven't had a whole lot of time to look at.

— —

---

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The explanation is that the reduction reflects reduced requirements for promotional and informational pamphlets relating to pensions in the province. As well, the 1986-87 reduction reflects a reduction of \$10,000 which had been budgeted for the proposed voluntary employer pension plan.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I note that in the explanatory remarks, there's a further reduction, reduced requirements for promotional and informational pamphlets relating to pensions in the province. Can the Minister indicate whether it will be a sign of another election coming when that communications area would be increased again?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Good idea.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** The Minister indicates it's a good idea.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'll accept any constructive suggestions the Honourable Member for St. Norbert may make from time to time.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, for the record, it wasn't a constructive suggestion, it was a cynical comment.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Then I will just have to indicate that I note the honourable member's concern.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) - the Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** On Page 12 of the Annual Report for 1985 of the Pension Commission, we see a graph and 1982 we have a number of new plans that year. I wonder why there would be such a significant number of plans in that one year. Would anyone be able to give me an answer for that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What section?

**MR. J. McCRAE:** We're under the Pension Commission, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** What was the question, I'm sorry . . .

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Just in 1982 - I pointed out to the Minister one day that there was quite an increase that year in a number of plans filed with the Commission, and I just wonder if anyone knows the reason for that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There was a change by Revenue Canada in profit-sharing plans, tax reduction plans, so there was an increase in the number of participants in pension plans.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Bill 32 is before the Legislature and I have a number of questions about Bill 32, but I think I can ask those at committee stage, can I not?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** So I don't have to ask them now, you'll be happy to hear that, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to move on to Grants. Last year the Minister listed some grants that were given by the department to various agencies amounting to a total of \$268,500, when the appropriation was \$206,500.00. Was there a miscalculation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The explanation is the Unemployment Help Centre, which had been budgeted in this department up until this change, has been transferred to Employment Services. It was \$62,000.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The Minister refers to that as the Unemployment Help Centre. Is that the same as the Community Unemployment Counselling Centre? Is that the same thing?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** The Minister referred to it as that last year, but are they one and the same thing?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** And now this year, I don't know what all these things add up to, it says \$206,500, Mr. Chairman, but I understand there's another \$40,000 going to an Unemployment Help Centre in Brandon and that's under Economic Security, so neither of those come from this department then.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Correct.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** All right, so is there a grant this year to the Labour Education Centre of \$200,000.00?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, \$200,000.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** How many years has the government been giving \$200,000 to the Labour Education Centre?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** For the last two years and 1986-87 - I'm sorry, the current Estimates are \$200,000; for two years prior to that it's been \$200,000; the year before with \$150,000, and the first budget was \$100,000.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** So that covers about four years or five years?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, this will be the third year, or five years all totalled, yes.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Totalling \$750,000.00?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, \$850,000.00.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** \$850,000, okay. I don't think I have any more questions on grants. Moving down to Expenditures Related to Capital has to do with radio equipment for fire vehicles?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, correct.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) to 2.(k)(2) were each read and passed.

Resolution 108: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,848,200 for Labour, Labour for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass; Item 3.—pass.

Resolution 109: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$41,000 for Labour Expenditures Related To Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary—pass.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I realize it's after ten o'clock and there's not a thing we can do. Mr. Chairman, before staff run away, all of them, I'd like to offer my thanks to them for their assistance tonight. I realize the way it was handled was a little bit off-the-topic sometimes and we had to bounce around and I appreciate the staff putting up with this and their flexibility very much.

Mr. Chairman, also the Minister's had a long day so I'm not going to keep him very long. I'd like to thank him for staying with us 'til ten to eleven and hope we have a good discussion about Bill 32 very shortly.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution 107: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,444,300 for Labour, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Committee rise.

## SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** This section of the Committee of Supply shall be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. We shall begin with a statement by the Honourable Minister responsible for the department.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm pleased to participate in the presentation of the Estimates for the Department of Natural Resources for this 1986-87 year. In observing the proceedings of yesterday and today, I got the notion from time to time that perhaps some were interested in denying me the opportunity to make that presentation.

I would like to make a brief opening statement and, to begin in that statement, I would like to express my appreciation to the departmental staff. I have been a Minister for a short while only, but in that period of time I've been able to observe that I have the opportunity to work with people who are professional in their outlook and certainly dedicated. Many of them have had to do more with less under budgetary constraints that we are facing. Many of them have shouldered increased workloads in an attempt to provide quality service to the general public, while maintaining resource management programs.

I would like to make reference to a few of the people who have left the employ of the department due to retirement. In particular, I would like to note that the last year marked the completion of the long and distinguished career of Bill Newton as Director of the

Engineering and Construction Branch. As well, I would like to pay tribute to two former regional managers who have just retired, namely, Bill McLean of the western region and Joe Nespor of the Interlake and Eastern regions.

In looking at the mandate of Natural Resources, I would like to make the following observations. Manitoba Natural Resources has a mandate to protect, conserve, manage and develop the province's forests, fisheries, wildlife, Crown lands and water and parks. In carrying out this mandate, the department acts as a steward of these resources on behalf of its owners, the people of Manitoba.

In this trusteeship role, the department endeavours to arrive at sound and fair resource use decisions designed to serve the long-term interests of all Manitobans. However, in doing so, it is faced with diverse and often conflicting requests from various users, including both those who wish to consume resources and those who wish to preserve resources in their natural state.

Whenever feasible, the department attempts to make resource allocations decisions in consultation with residents who would be affected and, further, it strives to make these allocations, while attempting to strike a fair and reasonable balance between the various and competing resource claimants.

Manitoba Natural Resources is a major contributor to the economic development and well-being of many Manitobans. The department supports and promotes resource utilization, provides outdoor recreational opportunities and provides for the needs of subsistence users. Recognizing that diverse government programs affect resources, Manitoba Natural Resources works closely with other departments, such as, Agriculture and Tourism. Moreover, the department provides a critical service to protect people and property from floods and forest fires.

In addition to all of these responsibilities, it is charged with conserving the natural resource heritage of Manitobans for future generations.

The department tries to achieve a reasonable balance in preserving our natural resources and, at the same time, facilitating their economic development.

Having made those references to the role of the department, I would like to highlight some of the accomplishments of the past fiscal year.

The Conservation District Authority was established and staffed to make substantial improvements in support services to existing and aspiring conservation districts. In addition to ongoing activities, specific conservation projects were addressed under the Agri-Food Agreement and local response, I'm pleased to say, in these projects was enthusiastic.

This province, through Natural Resources, contributed substantially to the preparation of the Government of Canada's paper at the International Conference on Conservation and Development. The World Conservation Strategy occupied the main agenda at this conference.

Beaudry, Spruce Woods, and Pinawa Dam were designated as heritage parks. In addition, several restored heritage properties were open to the general public, namely, at St. Norbert, the Heritage Park; Captain Kennedy House on River Road; and the Lockport East Heritage development site.

---

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

The designation of Atikaki Wilderness Park was a provincial milestone. It represents a major Manitoba initiative in setting aside approximately one million acres, primarily for a wilderness preservation.

In addition, the Bloodvein River, located within this designated park, was nominated and accepted into the Canadian Heritage River System.

Substantial improvements were made on flood protection works in the Red River Valley communities under the Canada-Manitoba Agreement respecting flood damage reduction, and the flood forecasting component of this agreement was extended, with the addition of new resources to enhance community protection.

Also, work under the Interim Subsidiary Agreement with the Federal Government on Water Development and Drought Proofing was advanced to a final report status. The related strategies and documents will be published shortly and will be a basis for ongoing water policy development in Manitoba.

The Habitat Heritage Act was proclaimed in 1985 to promote the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat. This significant conservation initiative facilitated the establishment of the Manitoba Heritage Corporation. A board has been appointed to undertake such tasks as acquiring land and entering into various agreements to protect unique or valuable fish and wildlife habitat. I hope that government funding for the corporation will stimulate other assistance from organizations and individuals.

The Remote Sensing Centre continued to develop sophisticated technical expertise and to find new application for its technology within the emerging field of remote sensing. The centre has helped to facilitate the development of software for such application as fire spread forecasting, habitat mapping, wild rice crop assessment, and crop monitoring for agriculture. The centre will continue to provide technical leadership and expertise. The centre serves such clients as Statistics Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, the Canadian Wheat Board and Agriculture Canada.

Having made those references to the previous year's achievements, I would like to take a few moments to highlight some of the initiatives planned for the current fiscal year.

Manitoba Natural Resources will be completing a management plan for Hecla Island and Grindstone Provincial Parks. In addition, the department will commence management planning for Atikaki Wilderness Park. It is our hope to dedicate more land for parks as identified under the Parks System Plan to nominate the Seal River for inclusion within the Canadian Heritage River System.

Revised cottage lot regulations have been approved to allow cottage owners to expand their facilities at most locations. For this expansion to take place, it will be necessary for cottage owners to meet environmental protection requirements. This will often require that they install a holding tank or approved alternative.

Of particular note, 1986 will mark the beginning of new era for local community participation and voluntary group involvement in the programming of our provincial parks. In this regard we have seen the formation of the Friends of Spruce Woods, the first cooperating association in the province. My department congratulates the association's members and looks

forward to their participation in the programming at Spruce Woods Heritage Park.

Over the past two years, Manitoba Natural Resources has been developing a strategy for removing excess rainfall from croplands. This strategy will guide the department in its ongoing projects for enhancing the infrastructure for agricultural production through much of Manitoba. Moreover, comprehensive policy planning will be initiated this year toward the development of a water management strategy for Manitoba. The strategy will address the development and allocation of surface and groundwater, flood damage reduction, excess rainfall removal, water pricing and water quality. The department will work closely with all interested groups in this endeavour.

Under the Canada-Manitoba Agri-Food Agreement, the department will be expending \$1.5 million on various water control projects. In addition, Manitoba Natural Resources has budgeted \$400,000 for the continued construction of water control works in the Cooks Creek Conservation District.

The department will complete the conversion of the provincial base mapping system from an analog system to a digital mapping system at a cost of \$318,000.00. This conversion will enable the department to complete all provincial base maps within an anticipated 16 years, as opposed to a projected 600 years through the current analog system. So this, I think, is a very significant improvement in the delivery of maps to the users.

Manitoba Natural Resources will continue its major initiative for forced renewal under the Canada-Manitoba Forest Renewal Agreement and sectoral project, part of which is funded through the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Funding for this initiative will increase in 1986-87 to an approximate total of \$6.7 million, an increase of approximately half-a-million dollars over the previous year. It should be noted that in 1985 and 1986 the second year targets of the Canada-Manitoba Forest Renewal Agreement were met and seedling nursery greenhouses were constructed at Clearwater and Hadashville. Moreover many hectares of forests were improved through silvicultural techniques such as . . .

The 1986-87 Estimates of Manitoba Natural Resources reflect the government's overall concern for budgetary constraint. Accordingly, my department aim is to provide an acceptable level and quality - not only level of a service but an acceptable quality of service - with reduced departmental staff and fiscal resources.

In its concern for budgetary restraint, Manitoba Natural Resources took the initiative of identifying, proposing and implementing cost-saving measures. My department will continue to examine areas where greater economy, efficiency and effectiveness can be introduced.

The department's Capital Program for this year reflects an overall reduction from approximately \$14 million in 1985-86, to approximately \$10 million in 1986-87. To a very great extent, this decrease in capital expenditure reflects the termination of two major cost-shared agreements with Canada. These agreements involve the Canada-Manitoba Value Added Crops Promotion Agreement for approximately \$4 million; and the Canada-Manitoba Water Development Agreement for 380,000.00.

In spite of these reductions in shared-cost funding, the department, nevertheless, still included in its budget

several capital initiatives which I referred to in my earlier remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my introductory remarks, I would like to restate that Manitoba Natural Resources wishes to emphasize its stewardship role in managing our province's resources. The department does so while being cognizant that these resources belong to the people of Manitoba. Whenever feasible, the department will make resource management decisions after consulting with Manitobans who will be affected by these decisions.

Manitoba Natural Resources will attempt to manage resources in the long-term interests of all Manitobans. In doing so, every attempt will be made to strike a reasonable and fair balance between development and preservation, as well as between the various competing claimants on these same resources.

I hope that my introductory remarks will be of assistance to the members present and I'm pleased to be able to provide answers to questions that might arise. I hope that through the detailed discussion, we can answer most questions that will arise.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. The Chair now invites the critic of the Opposition to make his reply, if he so wishes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to congratulate the Minister officially on presenting his first set of Estimates.

I listened to his opening remarks. This is the Minister's first opportunity to present Estimates and I've had occasion to possibly deal with Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources a few more times, maybe, than he is presenting his Estimates.

In my almost nine years of affiliation in the Legislature, most of my affiliation has been with the Department of Natural Resources, some of it in government and some of it in Opposition. I've enjoyed most of it. I feel a real kinship towards that department, in spite of some of the things that one has to do from time to time.

It is not always easy, Mr. Chairman, to be a critic and to always try and look for the things that should be improved on. Unfortunately, one doesn't, with this government, even get into a pattern where you can properly get into a relationship with a Minister, because this happens to be, Mr. Chairman, the fourth Minister in little over a year within that department. It makes it very very confusing. The last three sets of Estimates that I've had an opportunity to deal with, it's always been a different Minister.

In fact, last year just prior to the Estimates, I sort of had a feeling towards the direction that the then Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for St. James, was going and, shortly before we got into the Session of course, there were some changes. The Member for Lac du Bonnet then happened to be the Minister, who had a completely different approach towards the department than the previous Minister had.

We went through the Estimates last year, and in going through some of the Hansards of what happened in our discussions, in many cases, I found it difficult to be too critical. First of all, the Minister had taken the responsibility just a few months before we went into

the Estimates. But the Member for Lac du Bonnet and myself could agree to some degree on many of the approaches that he was presenting. You know, he indicated at that time and he says, it's going to take about a year until I get myself set and respond to the various concerns of groups, etc., etc., and how he would deal with it. I had to accept that, and it was a little bit more difficult to be critical of some of the things, because it was a new Minister.

Well, since that time, Mr. Chairman, he quit, and this was a seasoned Minister of the government. He had been there a long time. He got into it. He started moving in a certain direction and, lo and behold, all of a sudden for personal reasons or whatever reasons the Minister decided that he did not want the responsibility. I have my suspicions what led to that to some degree.

But then we ended up with another Minister, the XX Minister, the Minister who had at one time been responsible for Natural Resources, the Member for Brandon East. That kept on for a few months. We ended up with an election, Mr. Chairman.

After the election, unfortunately we had hoped that we would be government at the time. It did not happen, so we have to accept that. So at that time, we got a new Minister of Natural Resources, the fourth one in a little over a year. It has created some difficulty, I think, for many people, for the people of Manitoba, No. 1, for the people within the department.

I'd like to liken this scenario to some degree where you have an office manager and he is running a staff of people. I don't know how many are in the Department of Natural Resources, maybe 1,500 or more, whatever the case may be. You have an office manager, and you change him four times in the year. What happens is that the staff at the upper level within that department all of a sudden realize that the new manager doesn't know what's going on. They sort of run the show the way they'd like to run it. I think that's the same thing that has happened within the Department of Natural Resources.

In my opening remarks - I was the second speaker to speak on the Budget Debate - I spent most of the time at that time trying to raise some of the issues with the new Minister of Natural Resources. I did that with sincerity to make him aware of some of the problems that were within the department. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to flag some of the issues and, not having met the Minister at that time, I was hoping that we'd have a Minister who had strength, who had conviction, was going to move. Finally, we'd have a Minister hopefully who would be able to move in that department and sort of synchronize things, knowing full well that there were problems within the department. I had raised them even prior to this Minister being there. I had hoped that this Minister would take charge and start moving in the direction that most Manitobans would like to see him move.

What has happened since that time, Mr. Chairman, is not necessarily to my liking. I'm not very happy with some of the things that have happened, because the Minister had decided - and I can't totally fault him. Being a new Minister, one has to sort of make provisions for the fact that he maybe doesn't know — (Interjection) — that's right. My colleague from Lakeside says I used that approach with the Member for Lac du Bonnet, and actually we didn't accomplish anything.

---

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

---

What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is that I had hoped that this Minister would take a very positive position with the department. It was needed after having a revolving door of Ministers within a little over a year, and the problems that were there. Possibly, the Minister did not realize when he took that responsibility the problems that were there, but I tried to raise those issues with him. What has happened since that time, Mr. Chairman, has been a disappointment.

As I indicated, my criticism during the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, will not necessarily be directed specifically towards the Minister, although some responsibility he has to accept, and we will go through that as we go through the Estimates. My criticism is more towards his senior administration within the department. I want to illustrate and, maybe to do that, Mr. Chairman, I should go back and give a little bit of history.

First of all, I've already illustrated the fact that we've had four Ministers in a little over a year, and you can accept the fact that there's not continuity in terms of administration because, between the four Ministers, each one had a different approach. For example, the Member for St. James when he was the Minister, he was an environmentalist. His whole approach was towards leaving everything the way it was and not developing the aspect of the harvest of the resources that much.

When he left the department, the Member for Lac du Bonnet took over, and he had a different approach to it. So within the department, I can see terrible confusion because you're moving all the time.

We finally ended up with the Member for Brandon East sort of being thrown in at the tail end, and he didn't really give a darn as far as I was concerned, and didn't know where it was from. I think he basically signed what he had to sign, and that was the end of it. We are looking and have been expecting from this Minister some very positive direction.

I'm bringing these things forward, Mr. Chairman, because we have concerns in this area. I have indicated before I've raised the issues, the various problems many times with this Minister to the point where I've spoken to the problems in the Throne Speech. I raised it in the Budget Speech — (Interjection) — yes. And then I also raised it again at various times, and then I went on a grievance on that highlighting some of the issues.

What has happened is - we saw an example this afternoon of the problems that develop if a Minister is not forthright and if his support staff does not give him the rightful information. Then everybody tries to cover each others' concerns. That is exactly what has happened in the Department of Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman, because from the time a year ago last July when the first concerns were raised within the Department of Natural Resources about the dealings, with concerns within the administrative staff, somebody goofed up. Somebody has goofed up, and nobody's really paid attention to it. I felt like a lonely sheep from time to time, because I kept raising the issue and raising the issue.

This Minister, pardon the expression, was being a bit cute and smart at times in some of his answers, because he refused to respond. He was listening to his staff, and saying everything is all right. Everything's okay. We have done the investigation. The first set of Estimates, which basically deals with his executive staff

and support staff, that is where we want to have some very specific answers.

Now, I've tried to put myself in his shoes to some degree. You come in there, not knowing what it's all about. Who are you going to listen to? Are you going to listen to the Opposition when they raise these concerns? But the Minister should have taken some of these things and made himself aware of it, instead of going and taking carte blanche the advice of his support staff. That's exactly what this Minister did. That is the most disappointing thing that I have found out with this Minister so far in the short tenure that he's been there. I realize he's got many problems that he's got to deal with in there, many of the making of his own department and previous Ministers.

I am hoping, and I'll have to be critical of this Minister, because even in the short time he's been there, he has not shown the kind of initiative we expect from him. If he's going to take charge of that department and it all illustrates and it goes around the area - I'm going to deal with many of the previous problems. For example, some of the directive coming out of his staff in terms of how you deal with Native people with their hunting rights, that they should get special privileges from the director and I tabled that letter. The aspect of dealing with the wild rice situation, the lack of dealing with the elk ranching aspect of it.

There's an endless array of things that should be dealt with and I've raised these at the press conference that I had. The thing I find most concerning is the fact that this Minister goes back to the same people who have created the problems for him within his own department and says everything is fine.

We saw an example, as I indicated before, this afternoon where the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone Services was led to believe by his staff and his advisors that everything was hunky-dory for the longest time, and the Member for Pembina has raised the issue for three years. I've raised this issue with the Minister not three years - no not three years - I've raised it now six or seven months, but the same pattern is developing where the Minister will not accept that anything is wrong, except bad advice, and as a result, Mr. Chairman, we had the people within his own department - just imagine the scenario where your staff people in the administration level are so unhappy that they feel compelled - first of all, they raise it with the senior staff within his department. They finally went to the Ombudsman which is a very dramatic move because people basically were putting their jobs on the line by doing something like that, so they must have been very concerned; but they did that. We raised that again in January; of course, this Minister wasn't in charge at the time.

But what we'd like to establish somewhere along the line is what kind of action was taken within the department about some of these problems. When I raised it, the Minister got up and he indicated to me in the House and to all people in the House - indicated things had been looked into and corrective measures had been taken.

I'll tell you something, Mr. Chairman, what happened is the Ombudsman had been investigating now for over six months. The Ombudsman finally made a report but, Mr. Chairman, I myself tabled in this House reports that had insinuated alleged improprieties, and I have



a letter where the Minister of Finance indicated that things have been checked into by the department and everything was fine.

A week later I get a letter indicating, based on that request and based on the information I tabled in this House, that the Provincial Auditor was going to do an investigation. That is after this Minister indicated everything is fine, hunky-dory, don't pursue it any further. After this stuff that I tabled in the House, the Minister, from the time he took office was aware of it.

Now if he wasn't aware of it, certain of his staff people were and they were covering up the thing and that is the seriousness of the allegations this afternoon, and again, I wanted to raise that with this Minister, because it is where you get your advice from and there are major problems. This is the same staff — (Interjection) — that has been advising the Minister illegally on the illegal Liquor Surrender Program. They instigated it and had to pull it back - unconstitutional. This is the same staff which advised the Minister and said for Native hunting that anything which is illegal, I think I tabled the legal interpretation of the people indicating — (Interjection) — Oh, Mr. Chairman, the Minister already says to me be careful. I'll tell you something, he is the one that's in problem with these things and has been making bad decisions based on bad advice.

For example, I want to illustrate some more problems, the increase of the wildlife certificates that went into effect last fall, and in January I wrote the Minister, who was then the Member for Brandon East, asking when the Order-in-Council had been passed. There was a time lapse and I finally got a letter back indicating they passed it the week before in February.

It is these kinds of things that have blown the credibility of the department. Who do we blame? Do I blame the Minister? In February, he wasn't even there, so we have to look at why have these things happened. There's a whole litany of these kinds of things that have happened within the department.

Like I indicated before, it's not a nice thing to try and be critical all the time, but within this department there are major problems and unless this Minister is going to take the initiative and make some major changes because the credibility of that department has been eroded because of the many things that have happened, and we will be going through this on a page-by-page basis, and we'll establish the fact that there's not credibility within the department anymore.

There are major problems, and this Minister after the Ombudsman's Report - and I have it here - which indicates - and I want to read part of that into the record - there's no problem with that: "The Ombudsman's investigation into complaints received from staff of the Regional Services Branch of the Department of Natural Resources, has found that the staff did indeed have valid grounds to raise concerns with the Ombudsman's Office about the professional conduct of the director of their branch and about the action taken by management to address their concerns." That is what it's all about.

If somebody had the initiative and the guts to make a decision at that stage of the game, we wouldn't have all these problems. But now I'm not concerned necessarily with the individual who is being investigated by the department in terms of what he has done; it goes further than that. It goes to his superior, the

Assistant Deputy Minister and to the Deputy Minister and to the Minister - like who was covering what? That is very obvious and the Ombudsman's Report to come up with a report like that, and we still don't have the Auditor's Report which would have been very nice to have had it for the Estimates, but based on what the Minister said that they had done an internal correction in there and an internal investigation and everything was hunky-dory, puts this Minister's credibility at stake. That is what we're talking about right now and that is a major concern.

We're not talking about the credibility of a directory; a directory you can change, and obviously from the time it was raised again this fall, he was moved and the Minister can indicate for whatever reason he was moved, it doesn't bother me. But the fact is senior people allow these things to develop and that is where the credibility factor comes in. I was hoping this Minister will have some answers as to the procedure as to what happened and who was responsible.

As I indicated, all we have to look at - it has taken a long time for the Minister of MTS to finally realize that his own people were misleading him and creating problems for him, and this Minister, I hope it doesn't take that long because there are problems right now and the credibility of that department is at stake right now because we'll go through all the problems they have created for him. I raised a raft of them in January when this Minister didn't even know what it was all about. I'm hoping this Minister acquainted himself in some of the problems, but I can see what's happening. He is going back to the same people who created the problem for him and says everything is fine.

It is not fine, and I want to ask this Minister what action he's going to take when the Auditor's Report comes in; and if he says well the Auditor's Report isn't in, then I fault this Minister for not looking at the records because they're available to him and his staff, his senior staff, and that they have not checked out, and I want to know the procedure in terms of approval of expenses, of car use, all the things that have been alleged by his own staff. Now why would their own staff do that? We're looking at a cover-up, Mr. Chairman, virtually as bad - on a smaller scale - as we have with MTS. I hope this Minister is going to take the initiative and listen to not just his staff who have created the problems, but use a broader scope on this.

He has a very important department; to me, it is a very important department. What Manitoban does not affiliate with forestry, with wildlife, with lakes and rivers? We all affiliate with that, even people who live in apartments in the city, when they get out into the country affiliate deeply; this is my heritage, my country, my province; these are my things, my trees, my wildlife, my water. — (Interjection) — I'll tell you something, no, what's going to happen - it almost happened this afternoon - where there's going to be a change. I was telling the Minister just prior to getting into the Estimates and prior to the adjournment that it came that close to maybe having me defend his Estimates or somebody else from this side.

**A MEMBER:** Dream on, Albert.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Landslide says, "Dream on."

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I raise these concerns as I have before and I hope we do not get this stonewalling effort by this Minister, that he's going to be sincere. He has some major problems to deal with created by departmental staff; he has to deal with elk ranching. In fact, there was some consideration within our caucus that we would not be passing these departmental Estimates until the Minister took a position on the elk-ranching issue, because it's been in the mill.

A lot of people have been misled in regard to the elk-ranching question. The reason for that is again departmental - why? I've suggested to the Minister why not make everything public in terms of what happened with the experimental elk ranch in Swan River. That's his own area. I know he is agonizing over it; he doesn't know which way to turn with the problem.

I'll tell you something, that is the pleasure and privilege of being a Minister and you better have the guts to make some decisions on that and other things and you will have to. You can't get away from it because people have commitments from his department indicating they've spent \$30,000 and \$40,000 putting up fences for elk ranching and everything has been stopped now.

This is how the legacy of problems within his department has built up. — (Interjection) — I don't envy this Minister in some of the decisions he has to make, but he'll have to make some tough ones, and basically they'll have to be with some of his administrative staff who are advising him, who have created these problems because we want to deal with some of the problems that have been outlined; for example, why would one group in society have the privilege of having any charges directed to the director? Why would that happen? Why would certain groups in society have privileges on wild rice? Where does this advice come from? You know the ad hoc reaction from some of the people who have been advising him as I indicated before the wildlife certificate jumped up price. It's not covered by Order-in-Council; it was done six months later. What is happening in the department?

As I indicated, I expect the fact that there's been four Ministers in a little over a year, that everybody does their own thing. I have concerns I'm going to be raising with this Minister in terms of allocation of trapping lines, where we have tapes of what people have said within the department and then we tracked it later on. We want to deal with that as well when we get to the proper line in there.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on for a long time on these issues and we want to deal with these things, but I'm highlighting some of the concerns with this Minister. I'm hoping this Minister is sincere in wanting to do best for the Department of Natural Resources.

I indicated in my Budget Speech that Mr. Minister be careful because you're a rookie Minister and this government has always treated the Department of Natural Resources as - how should I say it - a kicking stool, like they didn't care about it because why would you have four Ministers in one department in a little over a year? They have treated it with neglect; they have treated it shoddily; and as a result of that, that is why you have the problems you have right now. Nobody's cared about it and I'm hoping this Minister is going to be decisive with some of the things he has.

I've granted the fact that I've raised many questions during question period at the time, and the Minister

has taken many of them as notice. We expect some of the answers here, but also I would expect that before we get through with these Estimates, the Minister is going to tell me what his people found out in the internal audit the way they did it and why they didn't come up with positive results, why they did not deal with the concerns of the people in his own department.

I want to know what his position is going to be with elk ranching; not only me, but the people who have spent all kinds of money - and there's pros and cons on both sides - and the Minister says he'll be making the decision some time this summer or maybe this fall. I would suggest, if he wants to gain some credibility, that he come forward with a position on it right now, because I have seen letters where his departmental staff have indicated that permits would be issued, and based on that is why people have written or invested money.

Now these are things you, Mr. Minister, knowing full well you probably didn't know what kind of a buzz saw you got into, because the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the seasoned warrior and a Minister in this House, threw up his hands and says I don't need it anymore; he quit and you have the responsibility now. What are you going to do with it?

I have suggestions to make to you, Mr. Minister, that you better change some of your staff who are giving you advice. The Minister doesn't like to hear that and I don't like to request that, but obviously that's where the problems stem from, and the sooner this Minister is going to accept that rationale because it's not going to get easier for you, because if it has to be we'll drag you kicking and screaming through the same exercise that the Minister responsible for MTS is going through. You've been part way through that right now.

The fact that the Ombudsman's report indicated there's problems within your department - the Auditor's report is not in yet - but you don't need that, Mr. Minister. All you have to do is go back and look at the records yourself and ask your people what happened, because you claim that an internal investigation was done and corrective measures have been taken. That is one thing that we want to clear it out now.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of Estimates we have to cover here and we'd like to take our time, but I just want to indicate to the Minister that I will be cooperative. I certainly want to be, if possible, but this Minister better be forthright and better tell us the game plan that he has.

He indicated here that they have a water management program that they're looking at. I endorse that. I'd like to see what it is, because by and large, here's a department that I think is very vital to the province - a reduction of \$3 million in total - and when I look at where the reductions are - they're certainly not in salaries because you know the natural increments increase the salaries - so all the services have been cut back.

There's so much potential in this department if handled properly in terms of development. Mr. Chairman, I think we have the potential in Manitoba that every Manitoban who would want to have a lot on a lake, with the amount of lakes that we have, they should be able to do that. — (Interjection) — No, the Member for Inkster of course would have a fit, he'd have a heart attack. He's that type of individual. But we have enough lakes.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

I'm sure this Minister must have had the opportunity to fly over the province and see the Northern country, the endless beautiful lakes we have, the tremendous potential. Do you know where all the development actually and the pressure is on? - it's within a close proximity of Winnipeg, within reasonable driving distance, but when you consider it's the smallest portion of the province that is heavily populated where the pressure is on, when you travel up North and just fly over all this lovely country that we have, we are not doing anybody any damage but try and develop some of those ones that are closer to the major centres. — (Interjection) —

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I have sort of outlined some of the concerns I feel we have to deal with. I'm hoping as we get into it on a line-by-line basis, the Minister can indicate what he foresees. I had hoped actually that in his opening remarks, he'd sort of give us a telescope view of what he saw within the department. Maybe it's too premature to expect that from this Minister, because he's dealing with all these problems that were passed upon him, not of his own making necessarily.

I would hope we can both gain from these Estimates here today and that by next year - and I sincerely hope for the Minister, aside from change of government, that if we still have the same government I hope that by that time this Minister will have sort of been able to plant his feet and be able to become a little bit more positive in terms of what he sees for that department. I hope by that time he has managed to make some changes and clean up some of the major problems he has within that department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** At this point in time, we shall defer budget Item No. 1.(a) relating to the Minister's Salary, and invite the members of the departmental staff to kindly take their respective places.- the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'm just wondering if we could maybe have a bit of an understanding of how the Minister would want to deal with the issue, whether we could maybe take a section at a time and sort of flow through the whole thing and then maybe pass a whole bunch at a time rather than be specifically line-by-line. Would that be acceptable, Mr. Chairman? I'm asking the Minister.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I think we could go basically, if we want to deal with the branch-by-branch, so that we didn't wander through too many departments. But if we take it on a branch-by-branch basis, I think we could.

Mr. Chairman, I'm looking for your advice. I wanted to respond briefly to a couple of items the Opposition critic had raised in his comments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Usually the first item, Executive Support, is a wide-ranging topic which criticism and reply can go back and forth until we go to the nitty-gritty of the departmental details. I propose we take it block-by-block in the Estimates depending on the branch or the unit, otherwise, we wander all over.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, maybe for clarification then, I'm talking of, for example, the

Administration and Finance as one section. Would the Chairman be under the same impression, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think the Minister is of the opinion that we'll take it whoever is the staff that he will need to advise him about the answer. Being a rookie Minister, he has to rely a great deal on the presence of people here. So if we have to take anything by a set or a block, it has to refer to one particular unit. That's what he said.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That's what I was suggesting. For example, the Administration and Finance, if we deal with that while he has that staff here and when we come to the next item which is Regional Services, we deal with that as a block. Is that acceptable?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Too big a block.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** So there is no . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's like eating a whole loaf of bread.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying we would want to deal with the whole thing at random, you know. I'm talking of section-by-section.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Section-by-section - the Honourable Minister.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, that would be my understanding as well that within, for example, Administration and Finance, ranging right through to the section dealing with Regional Services, we would deal with items within that range because, as we'd go into Regional Services, we may want to have some other staff. So as long as we could contain ourselves to that particular branch, I would find that acceptable.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Okay, we start with Executive Support. 1.(b)(1) Executive Support: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures, together.- the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to pursue under this section, just looking through the various aspects that it covers, I wondered if the Minister could indicate what action was taken in terms of the complaints that were registered within the department in terms of the Regional Services Branch. At the time that the complaint was made, initially a little over a year ago, exactly what action was taken within that department?

I'm talking of a year ago last July when the first complaints were made in-house within the department and then, ultimately, they were raised with the Ombudsman. I just would want the Minister to explain because we have a more informal type of debate here, exactly the steps of what happened and the internal - because when I look at the next page, it says "internal audit." So obviously, there's a provision for that to have taken place too. The Minister indicated that this investigation had taken place and corrective measures

---

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

---

had been taken. I wonder if the Minister could explain that.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that is one of the first items that the critic would raise, because in fact in his opening statement he made reference to the Ombudsman's investigation and the Auditor's Report.

I wanted to clarify some of the comments which he placed on the record, having attributed those to me. Certainly, during the course of debate and questions raised in this Chamber, I did comment on the Auditor's Report or the fact that an Auditor's Report was asked for, and that there were some internal administrative reviews. I had indicated that on the basis of those internal administrative reviews, nothing had been revealed which would indicate that there was something untoward happening. Certainly then, when the critic tabled some documents in the House, the decision was made with the Minister of Finance that to clear this matter, it should be referred to the Auditor's Department to clear the air.

But I want to make it very, very clear that I will not prejudge the Auditor's Report. I think it would be irresponsible of me at any time to suggest that because we had looked at an issue and because with the resources that we had, we did not discover something untoward, we should then say nobody else shall look at this matter. I frankly, feel very comfortable with this matter being referred to the Auditor, and I say that not implying that the Auditor may not raise some concerns. But I very much want to have the record clear when a serious allegation is made.

The member opposite has that responsibility as a critic to bring forward those items. But I think at the same time I, as the Minister, have a responsibility within the department to see that those allegations, if they are founded, are dealt with in the appropriate fashion. On the other hand, if they can't be substantiated, the record of those to whom the criticism was pointed should be cleared. The same is true with respect to the Ombudsman's statement. The critic indicates that in my reaction, I had indicated that there was nothing wrong.

The Ombudsman was asked to investigate this matter, I believe in December of '85, perhaps January of '86, so that the request went for this matter to be reviewed by the Ombudsman. Again, I was not the Minister; I was not in government at that time. But when I arrived and took on my responsibilities as Minister, surely it would have been inappropriate for me to make observations on those very issues that the Ombudsman was investigating. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to pre-judge what the Ombudsman was looking into.

I, again, with respect to the report that I tabled, and I think the fact that I was prepared to table that report in the House, not at anyone's request, indicates again a desire for me and the departmental staff to have these issues before the House and have everyone have access to that information. The report did indicate, as the member opposite said, that the people who raised the complaints had some legitimate concerns. We never denied that. Certainly in my role as the Minister, and in discussing this matter with departmental staff, there

was never any denial that there was a problem that had to be resolved.

The comment that the critic made earlier, I think, is slightly unfair to me in that his comment implies that I was suggesting there was never any need to be concerned. I don't think the record anywhere will show that I said at any point that there were no issues that were of a concern.

In going back then to the specific question that the member has raised as to the history of this issue, it was a formal complaint, as I recall; it was brought forward within the department in about July of 1985. There was a review undertaken. People agreed that there were some problems centred around a given director that had to be resolved. It was recognized that there were some personal matters that individual was trying to resolve.

It should be pointed out for the record, and it was pointed out in the Ombudsman's report, that some of the allegations that were brought forward and some that had been referenced by the critic with respect to sexual harassment and financial embezzlement were not in any way substantiated by the Ombudsman's report. That is very clearly stated in the Ombudsman's report, that there was no basis for the allegations of sexual harassment or financial mismanagement.

But the Ombudsman did suggest in the report, in that the matter had been raised, to clear the air; it was a wise decision on the part of the department to in fact have the financial audit undertaken.

In dealing with that particular issue, there was discussion by departmental staff, the management in the department, with the director involved. In addition to dealing with the director in terms of the personal issues that he was dealing with, they were, at the same time, looking at the organizational structure of the department because at that time, as the structure existed, there were some 17 people reporting directly to that director. So there was consideration of putting in a different organizational structure which would leave the regional offices reporting directly to the director, but then the head office branch reporting through an office manager to him. So the number of people reporting would be reduced.

The individual involved was asked to spend some time away from the office in terms of earned holidays. He was also asked to undertake some assignments in the field, which were totally apart from the office. There were several meetings held within the department to try to resolve the problem by way of counselling and by way of a different structure.

The person returned to his position, I think it was in November. There was still evidence - there were some problems not resolved to the satisfaction of some of the people who had raised the issue originally but it was about that point, I believe, in November, where the matter was referred to the Civil Service Commission. It should be noted, for the record, that the Civil Service Commission did not pursue that matter. They did not feel there was a basis for pursuing it.

I think it is interesting to note, as well, that there would have been, I think, the opportunity for the people involved to have it raised through the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, and to the best of my knowledge it was not pursued by that group either.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

That having transpired, somewhere in the latter part of December of 1985, my recollection is that the group had the issue referred to the Ombudsman and, frankly, I am happy that there is in place a process that people who felt their concerns were not properly addressed would have some other avenue to express that, so that they were not closed in.

I say certainly my first hope would have been that it could have been resolved internally, but in that these individuals still saw that they had a grievance, I am glad that there was in place a process involving the Ombudsman to whom they could refer the issue. It was referred to the Ombudsman and I think it was sometime in January, if my memory serves me correctly, that the Ombudsman undertook to investigate this issue.

It was investigated; it was in some time coming. The report was tabled only a week ago in the House. The results of that investigation show that if there was a concern, the concern was less with the specific issues that were initially raised, and the issues which the Opposition critic himself focussed on initially. But the Ombudsman's report did focus on the process, indicating that perhaps rather than spending as much time on fine tuning the organization - I think I'm recalling the term from the Ombudsman's report - the Ombudsman's suggestion was perhaps there should have been a greater focus on the individual involved in the problem and that the problem should have been addressed in a shorter time frame.

I am not one to dispute or challenge the Ombudsman's observation, but I will only say here what I said earlier in the House, that in dealing with personnel problems, you are dealing not with items which can be readily quantified, but there is a large element of judgment involved. In this case, we were dealing with an individual who had a long record of good service to the department, who had served as a regional manager and who had, after really being encouraged to undertake the position of director, accepted that role and perhaps through a combination of personal matters and pressures on the job, some difficulties arose.

I feel very strongly that whether at the level of director or at the level of entry of employment with the department, when one individual encounters some difficulty, we have an obligation to work with that individual to try to resolve that problem. I think if we looked around, if we were able to look through the history of this department or other departments or, in fact, private sector employers, by far the greatest number of cases that arise, when some resources are devoted to resolving a problem, these in turn result in success stories. In fact, our greatest investment is in the people who deliver the programs. We have an obligation to work with those individuals and I think this is what was demonstrated in this case, that we had a person who had worked for some time and who was experiencing some difficulty. We were wanting to try to work that out.

It should be pointed out that individual is now not in that role. I think it is understood that he is not in that role where he was experiencing some difficulty but is serving in the position as a regional manager, a position in which he had a very successful career with the Department of Natural Resources.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** First of all, I want to right away caution the Minister. He is starting to talk in sort of

generalities and that concerns me a little bit. He says he feels comfortable with the Auditor's investigation. His opening statement, or a statement he made, was that he had tabled the Ombudsman's report voluntarily. I asked him whether he had the report and whether he would table it. Once the Ombudsman released his news release, that's when the Minister felt compelled to release it, because at that stage it was obvious it was going to become public knowledge. So let him not say that he voluntarily did that, until he was forced to do it.

These are the kind of things I want this Minister to change the approach a little bit, because this is the same Minister that on July 3 indicated he was "... somewhat disappointed that there is an element of what I see, irresponsibility in the criticism directed by the Member for Emerson." He also indicated: "I close by stating that the Member for Emerson appears to have adopted a style of over-statement . . ." "Previous to that, he indicated, "I'm pleased to advise the Member for Emerson, and indeed the House, that we do have information from the Ombudsman, that having had the report from the Auditor, there is no substance to the charges of any irregularity or fraud."

This Minister had better start being consistent in what he wants to say because he all around the mullberry bush trying to cover everybody's butt and he had better be responsible in terms of exactly what happened.

I want him to respond as to what his senior staff, how they responded and dealt with the issue right from the time that it was raised, whether they pooh-poohed it, whether they went and harassed some of the - I'm talking not of the director himself because that issue has been dealt with and will be dealt with more specifically with the Auditor's report, which unfortunately we won't have.

I want to know how his senior staff, how they dealt with it, because this Minister was not even on the scene. The senior people in the department were the ones who were dealing with it and trying to shovel it aside, because there was really no responsible Minister there from the time that the Member for Lac du Bonnet left. This was when it was initiated. The Member for Brandon East took over; more confusion. Then this Minister took over and is now trying to cover everybody's butt in this case. I just can't accept that at this stage of the game.

I want to know exactly the procedure that took place. This Minister told me that they had reviewed the internal problems and they had corrected them to the satisfaction of himself and the department. That, obviously, was not the case because the Ombudsman's report says no, and all he would have had to do is ask the senior staff to look at the files. I finally had to have them tabled in the House.

For a member of the Opposition, as a critic, to get ahold of that material, the Minister must ask how and why? Because something was very serious and it wasn't being dealt with.

We have the same situation developing with this Minister, as the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone Services, who was getting fed all kinds of stuff and finally it blows up in his face.

I want this Minister to now tell us exactly the steps. He has his staff here. He can indicate what they had done from the time the allegations were made, the

complaints were made. Because for staff within his department to have to go to the Ombudsman is a very serious step; a very serious step. Just like we had the individual who filed an affidavit today, a legal affidavit, indicating the irregularities within MTS and MTX.

I want this Minister to now take and outline exactly what happened so that we can understand. If staff had done that initially, and the Minister had done that initially, there would not be all these allegations. It's most unfortunate but the only one whose credibility is at stake is the Minister and some of his senior staff. Let's clear it up. If there is no problem, tell us what you've done, how you dealt with it. Why are there still some questions that you should have raised with your own staff? The moment it was raised, the moment this Minister got into office, he knew about it, he should have asked his staff what has happened.

He hasn't done that and he's tried to fudge it. That's why he's accused me of over-statement and not knowing my facts. Now he's here and we're dealing with it. That is the thing I want to establish with this Minister right off, to try and develop a relationship, so that we understand what has happened, so we can get that the department people feel comfortable, that they can get their credibility back. The Minister, I indicated in my opening remarks, some of the things that might have to happen.

I'm hoping that the Minister can indicate exactly what happened. He wasn't there but his senior staff were there. Let them indicate the procedure that happened in terms of investigating the allegations.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, just with respect to the Ombudsman's report, I want to make this statement. I had indicated to the member opposite that I did in fact have the Ombudsman's report. I indicated in this Chamber that I was expecting that the Auditor's report, as well, would be available and that I felt it would be appropriate to table both documents at the same time. Rather than dealing with the Ombudsman's report on one occasion, and the Auditor's on another occasion, I indicated in this House that I would table them at the same time.

Subsequent to my making that statement, we became aware that the Auditor's office was issuing a press release on this issue. Having been made aware of the fact they were making a press release, we felt there was no point in waiting for the Auditor's report. That was when the report was tabled here in the Chamber.

I want to point out again that what the Ombudsman's report said is that basically there were no recommendations to be made. One, because the person that the attention was being focused on, the director, was no longer in that position and was employed elsewhere; secondly, that the audit was being conducted. So the issues that were of a concern were at rest and the Ombudsman had no recommendations to make.

It seemed to me, having read that report, aside from the observations about process, the Auditor was quite satisfied.

Getting back to the question of what happened, I'm not sure how much more specific the Member for Emerson would want me to be because I think I've relayed to him the sequence of events. I think the

Auditor's report, which was tabled here indicated in some detail the meetings which took place, the attempts which were made to resolve the issue.

If the member could perhaps indicate to me to what degree of specificity he wanted me to proceed, perhaps I could help, but I think I've outlined in general terms what the process was.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I can see we're moving in a circle here and I'll try to be more specific. What I'd like to do is ask what is the procedure within the department in terms of approving expenses, mileage with a government car, etc.? What is the procedure? Who approves what?

For example, from the stuff that I tabled in the House, there were some questions as to whether some of the reports filed, mileage reports, expense accounts, etc., whether those reports - who approves the director's reports? We'll start with specific questions.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I think the critic would know that there are different approval authorities depending on the level of employment, but he is wanting those specifically for the director in this case.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Of the director, the mileage and expense accounts are approved by the immediate supervisor who, for the director, would be the Assistant Deputy.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you.

Is the Minister then satisfied, based on the information that is filed in the House here, that the expense accounts were properly approved in the case of the director, based on the information that he filed in the House?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** On the basis of the information that I have been able to obtain from staff, I am told that there was the appropriate authorization for those things. But I have to point out at the same time that matter is one of the items that is at this time being looked at by the Auditor. It was one of the items that was tabled in this House, and surely it will be one of the items that is reviewed. We don't have that report from the Auditor yet, but on the basis of the information that I have from staff I am told that the proper procedure was used in terms of authorization.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Can the Minister indicate whether he has looked at the reports that I tabled in the House? Has he personally looked at the reports that I tabled in the House?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Yes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Next question then, is the Minister then satisfied that proper procedure has taken place in the way the expense accounts were filed?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I have to point out again that I would answer with a degree of caution in that this is an item that is being reviewed by the Auditor.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** But I want your opinion; never mind the Auditor.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I think I want to make this observation. A particular expense claim passes through several hands, and a person wanting to get a copy of that claim may in fact have chosen to get a copy of it before it had received final approval from the responsible authority. So I think I would be anxious to have the observation of the Auditor in this case, because I think what the member is suggesting that the document that he had may not have had the proper authorization. But I will look forward to the observations of the Auditor as to whether the document, in its final form or in its final authorization, did have that signature.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** So what the Minister is saying is that he is totally satisfied, looking at the documentation that I tabled, that everything is hunky-dory. Actually what's happening with the Auditor's report basically is sort of just to confirm that. Is that what the Minister is telling us?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier that this is an item that is being reviewed by the Auditor. I have made my statement . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I want your opinion.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** . . . with respect to those claims. The critic says he wants my opinion. I, Mr. Chairman, am not an auditor. I think, on the basis of the observations that I have made and the information that I have, I felt reasonably comfortable. But I'm indicating as well that I am waiting for the Auditor. I am not an auditor. I will await his observations.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I can accept the fact that the Minister is not an auditor, and neither am I. But based on the allegations of staff through which this documentation was received anonymously, the stuff that was tabled there initially, before the tabling of that material when I raised the allegations again, and the Minister pooh-poohed it. The Minister of Finance indicated that there had been an internal investigation done within the department to some degree and that everybody was satisfied. After I tabled that information, that's when the Minister of Finance indicated that he would ask for a Provincial Auditor's report on that.

This Minister's indicated all the time that there's no problem and even now he's indicating that everything is fine. Basically, the allegations that were raised by staff that I brought forward here are all just allegations and there's no substance to that. I asked him. He says he's looked at the records and he feels no problem with them. If that is the case, that's all I ask him to say. If you feel that it's done properly and, in your view, because you have your senior staff there who do all the approvals. All you have to do is indicate to the House and to myself, yes, everything is proper. But you refuse to do that and make all kinds of statements, as you did a long time ago already, in Hansards starting in July, that there are not problems, that I'm overstating it.

All I want this Minister to do right now is, based on the fact that you have looked at this stuff which you admitted you have, you see no problem with it. Tell me there is no problem. Then you know, my next question

would be: Why are we having the Auditor's report? Obviously, the Minister of Finance and some of his people looking at it feel there's some justification in that. This Minister again is saying, no, I'm not an auditor, but everything is okay. That's what I wanted to say. Is everything okay?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the comments that the critic has made with respect to these claims, the Ombudsman himself said that it was wise to have referred this matter to the Auditor, not because he observed any kinds of substance to the allegations. But he said, in that the matter had been raised, there was only one way to clear the air, to remove any doubt. That was to have the Auditor make the statement.

Now, I'm wondering if the Member for Emerson would, if I indicated that I was totally satisfied with that, suggest that we call off the Auditor's review of this matter. I think he would not, so certainly my comment on this would not resolve the matter at this stage. I want to repeat again, as I said, that I'm not an auditor. The purpose of the Auditor's review of this matter is to in fact remove any doubt on the issue.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** This is where we're at, and this is what I was trying to caution the Minister that we should not necessarily get into, that he would be straightforward and come up and indicate exactly what happened. Because July 3 - and I want to repeat this again - this Minister said to me: "I am pleased to advise the Member for Emerson and indeed the House that we do have information from the Ombudsman and that, having had the report from the Auditor, there is no substance to the charges of any irregularity or fraud." Is the Minister still standing by that statement?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The Auditor's report is still not in. We do not have the Auditor's report.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Why did you say then it was?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** But on the basis of the Ombudsman's investigation at that point, the Ombudsman had indicated that there were no indications to them that there should be a concern about those financial matters. But certainly I did not mean to leave the impression at that stage that the Auditor's report was in, because we know full well that it is not. So there were some observations made with respect to the financial allegations, the allegations of financial embezzlement, but certainly the Auditor's report was not in and I did not intend to convey that we did have the Auditor's report. I think it was fairly clearly stated on my part that I was awaiting the Auditor's report.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, let's forget for the moment, if you please, the Auditor's report and let's forget the Ombudsman's report and investigation. Let's talk of how did the department deal with it, the senior staff, from the time that the allegations were made, how did his department staff deal with it. That is basically what I'm trying to get at. Because through kicking and screaming, we've finally got the thing to the point in this House where the Ombudsman, you

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

know, after a press conference highlighting this thing, finally did an investigation and I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I looked embarrassed after the press conference that I had in January and nothing developed. You know, it's almost like with MTS, you know, three years, and I hope this doesn't take that long till we establish and clear the air for once and for all.

I want to know from this Minister what his staff, how they dealt with the particular allegations from the time that they were made a year ago last July. Never mind the Ombudsman's report or Auditor's report, I want to know how his staff dealt with it and whether they feel comfortable with it.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Could the Member for Emerson specify whether the allegations generally, or more specifically the allegations with respect to financial misappropriations?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Really both, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to know because the director is the one who was involved to some degree; allegations were made against the director. I would like to know how the ADM and the Deputy Minister dealt with the situation and the Minister at that time; the Minister has changed since that time. I want to know specifically what they did, because certainly no staff in the field should have to take and live with a situation like this not knowing where they're at without having some indication. You know, that has to come through that they get some justification and satisfaction through the Ombudsman in the report. I want to know how the department dealt with it.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this issue, the departmental management had discussions at the branch level involving the various people who were involved with this, not just the director, but people at various levels. In Regional Services, there was discussion within 10 days of the original complaint and some of the original pressure that was building up seemed to have been relieved; and the director, within that period of time, or at the end of that period, within 10 days, was removed from his position, or taken out of the office, so that there was not direct contact with the staff. So those measures were put into place in relatively short order, 10 days.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** And what happened after that, once the irregularities or allegations were made regarding irregularities in the expense accounts? I'm talking from, let's move this timetable up to January when the people applied to the Ombudsman to do an investigation. Can the Minister indicate what action his staff, his senior staff, took from that stage on?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I just want to point out that the original complaints that were raised within the department did not make any allegations of financial misappropriations or financial embezzlement or misuse of expense claims, nor did those original letters make any reference to sexual harassment. I believe it was the letter that went to the Ombudsman in December which made those allegations.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister satisfied that the procedure in terms of approving

expenses is satisfactory? You know, that everything is fine, or have there been changes made since these allegations came forward in terms of approving expenses, or are there any safeguards, policy changes that have taken place?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate that in terms of the procedure for paying expense claims, no expense claims are paid without the proper authorization. We feel that process is working well and that process has not been altered as a result of some of the allegations that were made.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Actually, Mr. Chairman, I almost feel as if we're wasting a lot of time in a sense, because it seems that the Minister is satisfied that everything is fine. The senior staff seem to feel that they have dealt with it; there was no problem. The whole procedure seems to be fine and one almost wonders why the Ombudsman should have done an investigation, and why the Minister of Finance would spend money and time to have his department do an audit. I suppose that the Minister is going to tell me now that - you know, the question I'd like to ask, and unfortunately we can't deal with the Auditor's report, because we don't have that, which sort of puts me at a handicap to some degree. I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, what plan of action, what is the Minister going to say, in his mind, when the report comes in from the Auditor and everything is fine, then I, No. 1, will be very pleased with that. I will be very pleased with that, and if that report is not going to come out clean, then this Minister has a lot of accountability to be done, because he's put a lot of things on the record in terms of saying everything is fine. The senior staff tell him everything is fine and I hope for this Minister's sake that everything is going to be fine; because, if not, he's now got himself committed to the point where he's going to have a problem if it's not fine.

The same thing happened with the Ombudsman's report. He kept saying everything is fine, everything is fine, then it comes out. The Ombudsman's report - I don't have to read it to him. That is part of the problem that they have right now within the department.

There are so many problems within the department and it wouldn't be fair, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister to see whether he is happy with the staff and the advice they have been giving him, but I just want to illustrate some of the things that have happened.

I've got a copy here, an invoice, the Department of Natural Resources, Land Branch, demand for payment. This is on a property lot - lakeshore cottage lot and the payment is due and payable May 30, 1986, a billing. On the bottom it says, 1 percent per month as of May 1, 1986. It is these little things that seem so ridiculous. The billing is there, the payment is due and payable May 30th, but you start charging interest 1 percent as of the 1st of May. Can the Minister explain whether he has the confidence in his staff about these things happening? I have more examples of problems - like I raised before, the increase in the wildlife certificates, you know, these kinds of things. Is the Minister satisfied that things are functioning well within the department?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, just before getting to the specific question of this account, I want to go



back to the matter that the critic raised dealing with the Auditor's Report. He seems to be prepared to prejudge the outcome. I'm not prepared to judge the outcome of the Auditor's Report . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** You have, you've said everything's fine.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I've indicated, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of the observations that we have made, we are not aware of any problem but we are not prepared to prejudge what the auditor will say. I hope, as the critic indicated, that all will be well.

On the other hand, certainly if there is any indication that there are problems and that there were matters which were forwarded to me which were not forwarded in good faith, then corrective measures will be taken. But I will not, as I said earlier, deal with this matter in a fashion now which forces me to accept the view that the Member for Emerson has that something is in fact wrong.

Now on the matter of the billing, we acknowledge that there was a problem with invoicing that had been drawn to our attention. We've communicated with the people involved and we do now make a provision for 90 days. When the invoices go out, there is a 90-day period for paying the invoices; which I think is really probably a longer period of time than would be allowed for most accounts in industry, if you like.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is wondering why I am being a little hesitant about accepting that everything is fine within his department, I can just go through a litany of gaps that have happened within his department. It is for that reason that I have to sort of hold the Minister suspect when he says everything is fine because it is not fine.

It wasn't fine when we had a Gays Rights telephone installed. The Deputy Minister at that time agreed it would be fine to have a private telephone installed.

We have the kind of billing that we've had to the cottage owners. We have just an endless list of things that have been happening. This is what I'm raising with the Minister. The Minister keeps telling me everything's fine, that I'm being over-critical, everything's hunky-dory.

Now this is a new minister that got \$4 million knocked off his total budget, who says we have major plans in place but we don't know what the plans are. He's got trouble within his own department in terms of making decisions, getting some of these things cleaned up, and they made reference to the elk ranching. These are his key advisors that have to advise him. What is he going to do? Can the Minister indicate what he's going to do with the elk ranching? And if the Minister tells me he's going to be studying it for a couple of moments, the Minister has all the facts before him and his staff that he can make that decision right now.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** . . . again before going to the specific question of what will happen with elk ranching - and I'm not sure how that ties in with administration and finance - I thought we had an agreement that we would be dealing with it in those blocks. That seems to be in another section.

But I want to indicate something to the critic. He was indicating in his earlier comments that he was expecting some leadership from this new Minister. He wanted this new Minister to have a positive approach to the department. I think that is what I am trying to demonstrate but it is the critic himself who is casting quite the opposite image. It is very difficult, I am sure.

The department is not immune to what happens in this Chamber. People are aware of the criticisms and well there should be criticism. I am not suggesting for a moment that there shouldn't be criticism. But I think while that criticism is being levelled, the member should be aware that he is having an impact on the department which may make it more difficult for me to carry forward what I would like to see, that positive view to encourage people to carry on in their work, encourage them to do a better job rather than focus continually on what some see as problems.

Now granted, that again may be the nature of being a critic. I hope that he may have the experience some day of being in this position and having to face the critic but he may have awhile for that. But I say to him that the impact that he is having can have a dampening effect on the spirits of the people in the department. So I would ask him to be conscious of that and to be conscious of my role. I hope that he will see in the things that I do that I am trying to project a positive image and one in which we appreciate the efforts of people in all levels of the department and in fact the support from the general public.

Now dealing with the question of elk ranching, I think it should be pointed out for the record that the question of elk ranching is not a new issue. In fact the White Paper which opened discussion on the question of elk ranching, if my memory serves me correctly, was tabled in 1979. That is the period of time in which the members opposite were in government. So the issue was really raised at that time. If the criticism being directed to me by the Member for Emerson is that I have not made a decision yet, I accept that criticism. On the other hand, if what he is suggesting is that this government has raised the question of elk ranching and has not yet resolved it, he should be conscious of the fact that the discussion on elk ranching began with the White Paper in 1979.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'd like to indicate to the Minister that I certainly would feel more comfortable applauding any positive things that are happening in the department and I wish that maybe in his opening statement he could have indicated some of the more positive things that are happening aside from the designation of a few parks. But his program was very limited; there weren't too many encouraging things came out of it.

I hope that the Minister is not indicating that by raising some of the problems within the department, that I am now am hampering the operations of the department because I feel that's a responsibility that we have, to raise these concerns. I mean, the one thing that has happened is that, people when they have a problem and they can't get satisfaction with the Minister or his department, they have that option of going to the members of the Opposition who then raise it or deal with it as best they can. And we will have some of those coming forward as indicated in my opening

remarks, about the allocation of trap lines, etc. Because that is how the system works here and I hope the Minister is not trying to tell me that I'm hampering his operation within his department by raising some of the questions which obviously are there because how would somebody that gets a bill or a statement on a cottage lot for example, indicating it's due and payable on May 30th but we're charging interest from May 1st - like these kinds of things or things like a wildlife certificate or the fact that a certain group in society gets preferential treatment with the Minister if they get tapped for hunting irregularities. These are the kinds of things that have to be raised with this Minister.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue the area of Research and Planning, that aspect of it. I wonder if the Minister could indicate . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are we ready to pass (b)?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** No, no. I want to cover the whole thing and then we'll pass the whole works, okay?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Let me call (c)(1) Research and Planning: Salaries; (c)(2) Other Expenditures.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just raising that in terms of Research and Planning because we have senior staff here, I wonder if the Minister could indicate some of the - he alluded to Water Management, whether there's a program in place, whether there's some specific programs in terms of park development that he has. Is there some new direction that the Minister can bring forward, that we can look forward to and applaud in terms of development within the department?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, in looking at this particular appropriation, Research and Planning, that provides support to the Executive for evaluation of programs in the various branches. So in getting to the specific question on whether we have this other project under way, certainly when we get into the section of dealing with Water Resources, there will be projects that we will be discussing there. We will be raising programs in the Parks section. I don't know that we want to get into those specific areas now. I would rather deal with the specific projects when we deal with those branches.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, I'll accept that, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is indicating that we could be covering the whole waterfront and we don't necessarily want to do that at this stage of the game; we'll do it block by block.

I just want to raise another area here of concern. I don't know whether the Minister has ever heard of the Canadian Nature Federation: A Conservation Report Card on the Provinces. It's in our Legislative Library here; it was submitted there in June. I don't know whether the Minister has ever had a chance to look at it because it is a summary by Greg Shea, Conservation Director, Canadian Nature Federation. It was actually released on March 14th.

If the Minister thinks that I've been coming down a little hard on his department, I just want to read a little

article in here that will probably indicate why we have some concerns as to what happens within the Department of Natural Resources within Manitoba.

The Canadian Nature Federation has completed an evaluation of the environmental programs of the 10 provinces. This conservation report card assigns letters A-F under nine different categories. Basically what I'm trying to illustrate - Ontario scored highest with an overall average of 70.2 while Manitoba ranked last with a D, 52.4 average.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister cares, whether he wants to make himself available of the information in here, whether it's anything at all or not, but that is kind of the perception that is out there across the country because obviously everybody is getting this - it's the Canadian Nature Federation.

We have a major job to do in terms of turning around the perception. We have the natural resources here; we have tremendous natural resources.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You haven't got a Minister and a department though.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, we can't totally blame this Minister but I say, the people within the department, something has to be positive with some of the things that are - (Interjection) - happening.

Well, that is where the problem basically started and now we have that problem that's already been there for quite some time. That is why when we talk of Executive Council, in basically the first section here of Administration and Finance, I raised the possibility or the question in terms of a long-range plan that this Minister sees within the department. Let's say not long range; let's even talk of a year. What is he going to do to turn things around so that we are viewed in a more acceptable fashion across the country, that we're doing the right things in terms of all our natural resources, whether it is wildlife, whether it is water resources? Obviously - and we'll deal with that - very little money; there's less money being spent all the time, he says. I think there is great potential in those things. I was wondering whether the Minister maybe has some comments that he'll want to make in terms of where we're going with his department.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I want to indicate to the critic that I am in full agreement with him in terms of the resources that we have in this province. We have a great province, we have great resources and great potential.

With respect to the report card that was issued, I would never want to suggest that we shouldn't be aware and concerned about what the people in other jurisdictions are seeing. I would want to take the time to see what areas were of a specific concern, to see what groups were involved in making those observations. If we could learn from their input or from the input of any other group, that we could better serve the long-term interests of the people of Manitoba, by all means, I would be prepared to enter into those discussions.

In terms of the long-term outlook, I guess I want to say to the member that I don't think it is just a question of having a vision for one year, because in dealing with

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

matters, such as resources, it is not unlike dealing with matters in agriculture where you can't change things in one year and you can't build something in one year. It is something that has to be done with a longer-term view. It is in that vein that I wanted to make known in this Chamber again my concern and my hope that while I am in my role as the Minister that I could play some part in fostering a stewardship attitude. We would look to accommodate the interests of the various user groups. We have the consumptive and the nonconsumptive users, we have people with a recreational interest, we have people with an economic interest, and we have those who have a subsistence interest in the resources in the province.

What we require is a cooperative effort between the various user groups, keeping in mind all the while that our primary responsibility in Natural Resources and in my role as a Minister is to ensure that the resources are available for the enjoyment of future generations, so that while we are accommodating the current interests, the day-to-day interests, whether economic or recreational, we have to keep in mind always, always at the forefront, that we must protect these resources for future generations.

So it is that kind of a balance that I would like to strike and I see elements of that within the department. So when I indicate that this is my wish for the department and for the resources and for the people of Manitoba, I don't want to suggest that this something that I have brought in as a new notion totally my own. It is something that I believe in very strongly, something that I am committed to, but something that I find in a great deal of support for within the department. In any of my discussions with the general public, I find that same kind of interest.

I have some difficulty at this stage in projecting that image of the future through very specific projects, but I think when you look at the resources of the province we have to look beyond one year. We have to be looking to future generations. I, as the Minister, want to make some contribution to ensuring that those resources are there for the enjoyment of future generations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Well, the remarks of the new Minister in this department are very laudable, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate his vision and what he expects to accomplish in his term in that particular Ministry. I just hope that he has the clout with his Cabinet colleagues to give this department the attention that it so richly deserves which has been lacking over the last number of years with the series of Ministers that seem to be holding the portfolio on a temporary basis, I suppose waiting for the new Minister to come along with his vision and what he wants to see in this particular department.

But we have seen, Mr. Chairman, over the years, the gradual whittling away at the financing of this particular department. It's a department that I think has great potential. I share some of the Minister's views on protecting our heritage, especially our wildlife and our streams and our forests for our children and our grandchildren. I think that's something I feel has been neglected to some degree over the years and maybe even yet is not receiving as much attention as it should.

So I'm encouraged by the Minister's remarks, but we're going to have to wait before we write the report card on that, Mr. Chairman, to see if he does have clout with his Cabinet colleagues to restore this department to the position that it once enjoyed and should enjoy again, because we won't get into drainage and the various other aspects of it. That will come up in later sections of the Estimates as we go through them.

But there is a tremendous crying out for some direction and some positive action from this department that has been lacking over the last number of years. It's been mentioned before that the previous Minister who was under attack severely this afternoon and comes from many people outside was an absolute disaster in that portfolio and I think the department suffered for it. This Minister is maybe going to have to carry the can for some of the things that happened during that period of time and it's going to take all his strength, resources and clout within Cabinet and I hope he does have some. Several of his other colleagues don't seem to have very much, so we'll be waiting to see how much direction and force this new Minister is going to give to this department because it's dearly needed and it's a department that I think deserves much more attention from his Cabinet colleagues than it's been receiving.

I can only say I wish the Minister well in that department and we haven't had a chance to assess it to this point. By the time we get to next year's Estimates, by the time my colleagues on this side of the House lay out their concerns of this past Estimate review and what we expect in the future, when we get to next year, we may be in a little better position than we are now to attach some of the blame or give some of the credit where it's due, that we haven't been able to do up to now because the department has been in a state of flux with four Ministers in a period of 15 to 18 months. That's not fair treatment for the department and we hope the Minister has clout within his Cabinet to do better.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one other area that I'd like to just touch on briefly.

Under the last item in that first section, it indicates the internal audit and in the report it says: the internal audit and special projects section continue to provide a service to managers by reviewing, appraising and reporting on accounting, financial and other operations of the department. There is \$134,000 for Salaries and \$7,000 Other Expenditures. Is this the department that did the investigation with the alleged irregularities within the department?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Just for clarification, when the member is speaking of alleged irregularities, are those the same items that were raised with respect to the Director of Regional Services?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The initial reviews that I referred to in my earlier statements were carried out by an

administrative officer, not by someone in the internal audit unit. But the audit that is currently being conducted by the Provincial Auditor, supervised by the Provincial Auditor, will involve at least one person from the internal audit unit, but under the direction of the Provincial Auditor.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, is the Minister satisfied that that section there, the people working in there, that they have proper guidelines, know what the proper procedures are? Why would this aspect of it - because specifically it says, internal audit. Why would these people not jump on top of allegations of irregularities in expense accounts, etc.? Why would they not have been on top of it right away? Because you have a department that is supposed to be looking just at that, or are all these people partly responsible for some of the things that have happened?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The Opposition critic tabled a document in the House that led to the undertaking of the audit. That was the first specific information that we had. Up until that time, there were general statements being made, statements which the Ombudsman himself said could not be substantiated. So there really was not any basis to proceed further than we had. By asking an administrative officer to do a review in general, there was not a specific document that was tabled to say, this is evidence. But, when the Member for Emerson did, I believe it was in July some time, tabled that document; that was the first specific allegation that we had. It was the first item that we could say: check on this. It was at that time that a decision was made to have the Provincial Auditor come in. So up until that time, there really wasn't a specific issue to pursue.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I think the Minister missed the point a little bit. By looking at this item in here, I would assume that this is the group within his department that views all the expenses. According to the report here, it says: appraising, reporting on accounting, financial and other operations of the department. If this had not been raised and if there had been discrepancies, is this the department that would have caught any irregularities within the department?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is the branch that as a matter of course will conduct internal audits and could have spotted something. But there was an allegation that there was something inappropriate that happened. That may be substantiated; it may not. But this is the branch that will do the review of different aspects of the operation to ensure compliance. . . . that there is a regular cycle that they go through rather than just responding to specific items. There is a regular cycle of review.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** So, obviously, that internal audit group was satisfied that there were no irregularities going on. Otherwise, obviously they would have caught it, I assume, or is my assumption wrong? That if there had been irregularities this department would have picked it up.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** It could happen here but, just in terms of the magnitude of the department, it should

be indicated that each branch would not necessarily be covered each year. Most branches would be covered, say, at least every three years. The revenue for Parks is checked annually, but not every branch would have a total review by internal audit every year.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just for further clarification, is the Minister telling me then that this internal audit group would not be dealing with the day-to-day expenses or monthly expenses of staff within the department?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The answer to his question is yes, but it should be pointed out that, from the Provincial Auditor's Department, there is a pre-audit unit which would review all of those items.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) to 1.(j)(2) were each read and passed.

There will be no resolution yet with this particular part of the Estimates, because we have deferred budgetary Item 1.(a), relating to the Minister's Salary.

2.(a)(1) Regional Services, Administration: Salaries, 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, 2.(a)(3) Problem Wildlife Control - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Minister indicate, under Regional Services, this is the area that provides - the C.O.'s come under this aspect of it. Am I correct in that? Okay, could the Minister maybe indicate what changes there have been since last year in the staffing of our C.O.'s, because last year during the Estimates there was an indication that there were 140 C.O.'s in the field, and I think we were in the midst of getting six or seven additional staff hired. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the staff complement of C.O.'s in the field is right now across the province.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The level for 1985-86 was 139 and, for 1986-87, it will be 142.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Could the Minister indicate, based on the figures that appeared last year - I believe we had 140 last year, I have it in my Hansard here somewhere the amount that we had there last year. The Minister at that time indicated there were 140, and that they were in the process of hiring another six. Is the Minister now indicating that they did not hire the full complement that they were budgeting for and had allocated for last year?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I am told that the situation that existed at that time, though the complement may have been at, say, 140, there were only actually 134 employed and six vacancies. They were looking to fill those vacancies. So it was not intended to be an . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if the Minister could tell me. I'm not positive of the region number, say, the area from the west side of Lake Manitoba through the Big Grass Marsh area

**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

west of the Saskatchewan border, there's a fairly large area in there. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many conservation officers have to cover that particular area.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** If I'm understanding his description of the area correctly, it would be what we call the Western Region. There, last year, were 22 and I see, for 1986-87, 21.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Is the Minister aware of how that compares with the number of conservation officers or wardens, as they call them, in Riding Mountain National Park, which covers a fraction of that particular area? I think there are 68 there.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** No, I'm not aware of that. That's a federal jurisdiction, and I'm not aware of what numbers they have.

Just a guess on our part right now is that it would be comparable to the Whiteshell, where we have 12. They might have 12. We have 12 in the Whiteshell.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, my point is, it's probably the Neepawa office. I think there are four C.O.'s in the Neepawa office operating out of there. The territory they're covering, when you consider they have to enforce the fishing regulations on Lake Manitoba as well as the other game regulations that they have to enforce and it's a very heavily hunted area and a heavily fished area, it's just impossible. I may be not correct in saying four cover that particular area, but I think that's the number who are there. It's virtually impossible for them to do a job that's creditable in any way with the territory they have to cover.

Are there any provisions for increasing in some substantial way and providing more equipment, because there is a certain amount of nightlighting goes on in that area? It's a heavily game-populated area, and there is a lot of nightlighting and poaching going on. It's impossible for them to patrol it. Is there any provision being made to beef up that particular area?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The information that I have, Mr. Chairman, indicates that we have about 95 percent compliance from different resource users. So I suppose it's just a question of trying to determine to what extent should there be an expansion of the staff to look at that additional fine.

I guess I want to point out for my part and from the view of the department that the role of the conservation officers goes far beyond the role of enforcement. Recognizing that there will always be that pressure and the necessity for compliance with regulations, I would say that we are pleased with the high degree of cooperation from the using public, recognizing that at the same time as with any kind of enforcement, there will be a certain element that will challenge the regulations.

I think one of the efforts that substantiates the support of the public is the participation in the TIP Program, which has been raised for discussion in this Chamber at different times. We had a good rate of participation, and I think this again indicates the interest of the department in involving the general public and the

different users in the development, in the conservation, in the maintenance of the resource. If there is the view out there that is strictly for the department and the departmental staff to protect those resources, we cannot do it by ourselves. We need the cooperation of the public. We appreciate the cooperation of the public and their involvement through the TIP Program it was very heartening for the department because it demonstrated clearly that the public wants to play a role in the protection and the enhancement of our resources.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I thank the Minister for his comments. I agree with him. I think 95 percent of your licensed hunters are assisting in doing the job of conserving our game. There's always the element, of course, that has to be checked up. I think the C.O.'s have to go out and show the flag once in a while during hunting season to let them know that they're around. But I think their main concern - and I know there have been studies done in the past within the department on the poaching and the illegal hunting aspect - I know some areas in my particular region have taken some strong measures upon themselves, and it's had some effect, because one area has strictly been cleaned out of nightlighters and illegal hunting.

I know the local constabulary was handcuffed to some degree because there was a lot of Native hunting and nightlighting in there, that their hands were tied when they did apprehend them unless they caught them on private land. So I think I agree with the Minister when he says there is great cooperation from the licensed sportsman because I think they're well aware of what's happening to our wildlife and our heritage and they're doing their part. I think if the conservation officers could concentrate on some of the illegal aspects of it, it would certainly be more productive in the course of their duties.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to indicate to the Member for Minnedosa that another approach that is taken, though we have a certain number of people in a region, as I indicated - in the particular region there were 22 people in the Western Region - depending on the seasonal needs, the activity, people are redeployed from one region to another. So it's not as though we can't move staff. If there is a particular season on or if there's a particular problem in an area, staff could be redeployed. So that may give you a better sense of the extent of the enforcement effort.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Can we be advised when you're moving more into my area?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** It tends to follow the hunting season depending where the pressure is and depending on the part of the province you're in, the dates vary from one season to another.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell me what jurisdiction the conservation officers have over Crown land? For instance, a neighbour complains that his neighbour is pasturing

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

cattle on Crown land, whereas the first person has been denied a lease on that. Do the conservation officers have jurisdiction to force the person who is illegally using the land to get his cattle off there?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** The conservation officers do enforce The Crown Lands Act. I'm not sure that I understand the problem correctly. But if there was some indication that someone was pasturing livestock, for example, in an area that they did not have a lease to, and if they were made aware of that, they would be involved in seeking compliance from the offender.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** To what extent could they carry through with the law? Could they physically remove the animals from the said piece of Crown land?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, our first approach of course is always communication and persuasion. I just checked with the departmental staff and there has not been a known case where our people have impounded cattle. We've never gone to that point. But certainly we would have communication with other enforcement agencies, such as the RCMP, if it was necessary. I'm not aware that we have ever got to the point where we would impound stock.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** But you do have the authority to?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under this section, I just want to make a comment. I read an interesting article, a headline in the paper the other day, where some people from the Health Department were indicating that the government had 250 C.O.'s looking after the wildlife and forestry. I'm wondering if the Minister took exception to that and maybe corrected that by a letter to the editor, or whatever the case may be, because obviously that's erroneous and left the wrong impression that we have 250 C.O.'s out in the field when in all actuality, we have 142. I just wanted to raise that for his concern.

I want to just touch on a few items here. Could the Minister indicate whether last year a special project took place when we had a special Volunteer Surrender Program where, in combination with our friends from Stateside, checks were done at the port of entry. I made reference to that in the past, about the program that had taken place last year, which ended up in confiscating quite a few fish that were taken illegally above the limit and a number of fines that were laid.

I got the impression that the same program had been successful and that it was initiated again this year. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether that kind of a program was again undertaken.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the program has not been implemented this year. We have been focusing our attention more on the matter of illegal movement of fish products into the urban centres.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, my impression was - I think it was a one-shot deal last year when it was

undertaken, maybe the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - but it was my impression reading the reports in the magazines and from the C.O.'s in the Department of Natural Resources, that they felt it had been very successful. I wonder if the Minister can explain why that is not being pursued because there is always, maybe rightfully so or not, the impression that many of our friends from the south who come here for sport fishing and with the limits being what they are, they come up here for a week and they possibly take home more fish than they're entitled to, I raised this with the Minister in the House one time and he came back and gave me a little shot, and said well, one isolated case, and that had been corrected.

Is the Minister under the impression that those cases are very isolated or whether even undertaking a program, the fact that it was done last year and showed substantial results, I'm wondering - that leads one to believe there could be a lot of this going on and by doing this on an interim basis from time-to-time, it might ease people's concerns that there's poaching going on by people who are coming in from Stateside; and I'm just wondering why it was not continued.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I think in any element of enforcement, you do not want to be too predictable in what you do and I think variation and perhaps an element is useful. Certainly the activity that he refers to proved to be successful but there are other areas of enforcement, given the limited personnel we have, that we have to attend to as well. So certainly we do not want to concentrate our efforts in one area and people should not take it that we would not return to that. Just as the member himself has indicated, perhaps for a period of time we should return to a particular activity which was very useful and that we may have changed our focus for a period of time, but we would not want to close out the possibility of returning to that. So I think, in any element of enforcement, you do not want to have your hand totally exposed.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, certainly the Minister is not suggesting that once in two years is predictability, you know. When you consider the amount of tourists who are coming in from Stateside to fish, he certainly is well aware of it.

It turned out to be successful last year. He doesn't have to advertise the day or the weekend when he's going to be doing it again, but certainly once in two years. Everybody seems to admit it was successful. Now, the Minister's telling me that we don't want to tip our hand by doing it too often. I find that a little hard to accept.

Another issue that I want to raise is the TIP Program, which I believe would probably come under Regional Services here. At last years Estimates when we were discussing the TIP Program, there seemed to be acceptability - I certainly supported that concept and the Minister did as well - but what has happened since that time there's been some very confusing reports. I'm sure the Minister has figures as to how many calls were received and how many prosecutions took place because of it.

The difficulty I have with that program the way it has been set up is that it discourages people from really

phoning in, because I've had cases in the southeast part of the province where people - and there's a fair amount of poaching going on there - where people have phoned in at various times. From time to time, they've received an officer on there. From time to time, they've received an answering service. This I find most unacceptable because what it does is, it will destroy the whole concept of the TIP Program. All you have to do is have one farmer who has some people poaching on his land phoning in, and having a recording device indicating that it will be looked after as soon as possible or the next day, whatever the case may be, and that individual will not phone again.

I think the concept was definitely an asset to many of our C.O.'s in the field who have big areas to cover. It's very difficult for them to be able to take and pick up on all the infractions that are going on, and they are. I think the Minister must admit there's a lot of poaching going on all the time. If he doesn't agree with that, I think he's naive. It is going on, and that is why I have heartily endorsed the TIP Program.

I would just like to get the view of the Minister as to whether he is going to make a real effort in terms of getting that program off the ground because if it isn't being done within the next period of time - because we're coming into the period when the poaching is most extensive - if that TIP Program is not going to be fully endorsed by the department and managed properly, it will lose the potential of support that we have from the general public out there.

As I indicated before, all you have to do is have one farmer phone in and have an answering machine answering him and saying, well, maybe next day we'll look into it. It destroys it, not only for him, but he'll tell all his colleagues and friends and neighbours as well that this program is for naught. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what his view, what his perspective, what the objective is in terms of the TIP Program.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, before going to the TIP Program, I want to go back to the item that we were discussing earlier. I want to have noted on the record that it is not my view that our friends from the south are particular offenders with respect to fishing. I think we certainly recognize that there is an element of non-compliance amongst any of the users of our resources, but I would not want to leave the impression with anyone that we are somehow suspect of a particular group of users, namely, the ones referenced by the Member for Emerson, our good neighbours to the south.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Why do you have this program then?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** We did check in Manitoba some 20,000 anglers in 1985. The fact that a particular program may not be in place should not be interpreted to mean that we are not enforcing compliance with respect to angling.

There are other areas, as I indicated, that we want to do some enforcement on. There was the question of sturgeon poaching, the use of illegal mesh size in the commercial fisheries. We've paid some attention to those areas.

Certainly, as the member indicated, I've accepted there is an element of poaching. I'm not sure how you'd quantify that. There are different impressions of the magnitude of this problem, depending on where you receive your information. There are some who will paint a picture of fairly extensive commerce in illegal game. We are aware that it is there, and we are devoting effort to try to curtail that.

As an example of that, there was some indication to us that there was a great deal of trafficking going on in a given area. We've monitored four sites for two weeks, and there was no activity in that area. We will be repeating these in this current year from time to time and in different locations.

I should indicate to you that there are improvements in the technology that is available to the enforcement officers, and we do not have to rely on strictly traditional techniques to apprehend or to become aware of offences in this area.

I again, going to the TIP Program that the member referenced, want to point out that there never was the time when an officer answered the TIP number directly. They were the seasonal people, temporary people who manned the phones and referred these to the officers, but we never did tie a conservation officer to the phone to answer the TIP line.

As was discussed earlier in the Session, this was our first year. We've completed one year of the cycle really. The program was introduced on August 15 last year, I understand, and it was manned or personned in a particular fashion at that time, where people were taking the calls directly and referring them to people in the field. That was TIP during the fall where there is the highest incidence of offences.

From that period from late December to March, we were utilizing a recording device; then the program was changed to make use of an answering service, which is, if you like, a real live body taking the call in the same way that we had a temporary person on when the TIP Program was first introduced in Manitoba.

So we have gone through this experimental cycle and we are very, very pleased with the results. But the statistics which were tabled in this House show that clearly the largest number of calls were in that period from August to the earlier part of December. Then, there is a substantial drop-off in that period from January through to May and June.

If the member is interested in that period from August 15 to late December, we received 320 calls; from the period from late December to the end of March, 48 calls; and from the remaining part of the year, from April to August, 68 calls. So certainly there is evidence that the greatest concern is in the fall of the year.

But what we are attempting to do, and I think we have learned through this first year of the program, is we want to be effective in giving the public an opportunity to share in the care of the resources, and we have to be conscious of the costs at the same time. We feel now that, with the program that is in place, utilizing the answering service, not unlike that used by many commercial enterprises in the City of Winnipeg where people are accessed by phone just by simply using an answering service, the answering service in turn is aware of a duty officer in each region. Immediately, when the call is received and the information recorded, the call goes out to the duty officer in the region.

Tuesday, 12 August, 1986

So I, frankly, feel that the program is working well. We did try it in different forms. We feel that the format we are using now is both effective and efficient, and we're pleased this was the first program of its kind in Canada. It is now being followed with similar programs in Alberta and other jurisdictions I understand.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** The Minister is telling me that he feels the program is a positive program and that they're looking to expand on that hopefully. Has the Minister considered the possibility, like they do Stateside, where they offer a reward for anybody who makes a call or makes a report which leads to conviction. Apparently that from my information is that it's very positive on that side. I wonder if the Minister is considering expanding it to that extent.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** That dimension of the program is not actively being considered at this time, but certainly it's something that we would want to not exclude as a possibility in the future.

I should point out that the sense that I have from the public is that they really are not interested in a reward for their efforts. Their reward is the preservation of their resource. In fact, we've had communication with the Manitoba Wildlife Federation where they are quite anxious to participate in the program. They have indicated a willingness to contribute financially and to contribute some time. So my sense is that the people who are genuinely concerned about these resources do not have to receive some reward for it. I'm talking about a financial or a material reward, but certainly I would want to keep open the option of some form of recognition for participation in the program. But at this time, in terms of putting a dollar reward on it, I'm not considering that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to probably throw out a further suggestion to the Minister. We have many wildlife associations throughout the province and I would think, with the odd exception, the majority of them are very keenly interested in terms of wildlife preservation and in terms of poachers, etc. I would suggest to the Minister whether it's possible to maybe expand to some degree his contact to the point where they can maybe meet with the various wildlife associations.

I know that, at least in my area, the associations that I am involved with and know appreciate the fact that we could have some of our people come out there and do a little bit of promotional work. I think we probably, because of the financial restraints in terms of hiring more C.O.'s, certainly you could end up with a lot of allies in support of the cause for conservation throughout the province by just paying a little bit of attention and a little bit of stroking to the wildlife associations. I strongly promote that kind of concept.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate certainly that we are appreciative of the efforts of the Wildlife Federation. I have had meetings with the Wildlife Federation in my office. I had the opportunity to go to the annual meeting of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation at Hecla. It was a delightful meeting. I had very interesting conversations with many of the members.

They were discussing many of the issues that have been raised here tonight in the course of our debates. There are certainly common interests from the Wildlife Federation and the department. Certainly, within their ranks, there is a diversity of views just as there is within this Chamber on the different issues.

So I certainly support the position that you put forward that we should maintain that contact. I feel that we have established that kind of contact. Certainly after the Session is over and some of the demands from this time in the Chamber are reduced, I hope to get out into the field. I would look forward to meeting with these groups in the various parts of the province.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I get the impression the troops are getting a little restless here.

I just want to possibly suggest to the Minister, I have one little area that I wanted to cover under this area. I wondered if we could maybe leave the fire suppression end of it, and maybe leave this - you know, I'd like to raise a question, first of all, in regard to the C.O.'s, whether there's any consideration in terms of training programs for self-defence, firearms.

Is there any activity at all within the department to make provision for some of our C.O.'s for some protection, because I'm sure the Minister and his people must be aware that, from time to time, our officers in the field run into pretty precarious positions and have virtually no defence. Very often, the people whom they contend with are not always considerate. I'm just wondering if there's any movement afoot or consideration being given to provide some safety measures by way of whatever means. It could involve firearms, I don't know. Maybe the Minister could elaborate on that.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the member opposite that we do have a concern for the well-being of our people out in the field, and we recognize that they are going to be exposed to difficult situations from time to time, situations which will put them at risk. We do have driver training programs for them so that when many of them are travelling through the field, whether in terms of pursuit or monitoring, would have to be able to handle a vehicle under very stressful conditions. So we do have that training program.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'll tell you something, Leonard. Most of them are damn good drivers.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** We have the Stress Management Programs for the personnel and we have fitness programs and self-defence programs not involving armaments of any sort. I, frankly, have to tell you that I am reluctant to look at the area of suggesting sidearms for the conservation officers. I am aware of the discussion that has taken place amongst the conservation officers themselves. They are divided in their view on this matter. Some of the conservation officers feel that if we equipped them with sidearms, as an example, that will change the focus of their role. They, frankly, are not sure. I, at this stage, am not anxious to encourage that particular approach.

I feel that by way of the programs that I have mentioned - that is fitness, self-defence, stress



**Tuesday, 12 August, 1986**

---

management where they are trained to deal with people in stressful situations, and I think, frankly, that is what we want; we want to the greatest extent possible that they would resolve problems rather than resort to confrontation when a stressful situation arises - that, combined with the driver training program, I think prepares our field staff to deal well with those situations.

But we do recognize, and I think the people who enter that area of employment recognize that there is an element of risk involved in that program, and we frankly want to minimize that for our staff.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Minister, committee rise?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is the committee ready to pass any item yet on No. 2?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I've covered some of the portions of the C.O.'s. There's the area of Fire Suppression in this same section and I'd just as soon deal with that next time rather than go into it tonight with the agreement of the Minister.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** So we will deal . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** We'll deal with the whole section like I did with the first section. Once we're through with these items . . .

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Okay, so the only outstanding items then are on Fire Suppression from your part then?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Unless some of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, have some specific concerns in that area, other than that, it would be basically under these Fire Suppression agreements and then we can pass it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What is the pleasure of the committee?

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

### **IN SESSION**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos:** Is there a motion for adjournment?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Business Development, that the House do now adjourn.

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