

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 19, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members attention to the gallery on the right where we have 8 students of Grade 12 standing from Sageen School under the direction of Miss Janet Savage. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West)** introduced Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Rent Stabilization Act.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris)** introduced Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor.)

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel)** on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act (2).

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli)** introduced Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur)** introduced Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Farm Lands Protection Act.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** - The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the First Minister consider the residents of Tyndall Park to be in a special category with regard to the receipt of compensation for flooding in their basements in view of the fact that they entered a new development and because of negligence on the part of the engineers the storm sewers are not sufficient to take the water that goes into that area when there is a storm so that these people have been flooded, I believe, three times in the last year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, aware of the problem that is faced in basement flooding, not only in Tyndall Park but in other scattered areas of the greater Winnipeg area, and the letter that was delivered by the Minister of Urban Affairs to the Mayor of Winnipeg last Friday dealt with the application the City of Winnipeg had made to the province some time ago with respect to provincial assistance in that flooding, and the answer that was given was in the negative.

I would suggest with respect to the preamble that my honourable friend has given to the question, that if in fact, as he alleges, there is negligence, he being a lawyer of some repute, that he could certainly advise the residents of Tyndall Park as to what other remedies might conceivably be

to them. But in any case, their submissions and so on must be addressed, as he would appreciate, in the first instance and always to the City of Winnipeg. Any arrangements that the City of Winnipeg may make with other jurisdictions, be it the province or the federal government, of course, would be subsidiary and a different matter altogether. But primarily, as between the residents and the municipal corporation which serves them, there can be no doubt as to where they must look in the first instance.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a supplementary to the First Minister. Would the Minister say that the province's reply is based in part on the fact that the citizens have an alternative remedy against the city, which has in the past been a reason for refusing provincial participation? Would the Minister say that, in part, the province's reply is based on the fact there may be an alternative remedy at law to the citizens in Tyndall Park?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to answer that question either categorically or otherwise because my honourable friend is seeking a legal opinion. I don't think I can give any more useful response than that.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, is the cutoff in funds from the community school at Shaughnessy in the north-west portion of Winnipeg, whereby there was a Day Care Program — will the funds cut off from that program be used by the government for the purpose of giving public taxpayers' money to assist people who wish to send their children to private schools based on ethnic divisions or private schools based on the teaching of ideological doctrine.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the question as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address a question to the Minister of Education relating to the Winnipeg Centre Project which he undertook to investigate and to try and reassure the students that the program will be ongoing. Can he indicate to us what is the present situation and what efforts has he made to ensure that students are more aware of the program and its plans?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I have been endeavouring for some time to reassure the Member for St. Johns that this matter is being taken care of. I spoke as recently as Friday to the Director of the projects and asked him to contact the students concerned and make sure that any particular apprehensions that they might have would be removed. That was, of course, on Friday; whether that has been achieved at this date I would have some difficulty in saying.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Minister that it's not important for him to reassure me. It is much more important to reassure the students who are affected very seriously by the plans, or the lack of plans. Can he indicate whether or not the agreement which has been outstanding for quite a while has been signed, as between the University of Manitoba and the University of Brandon?

**MR. COSENS:** The particular agreement in question is very close to being signed, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister. I believe it was close to being signed for a matter of weeks now. Would he not indicate that until the agreement is signed, there is no definite confirmation available to the effect that the program is going on or is not going on.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns is quite free to draw that conclusion, but I would suggest that if in fact agreements have not been signed it does not necessarily mean that the different items under those agreements have not been agreed to by all parties concerned and that in fact the policy in the forthcoming year is quite clear.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. Following upon his letter to the congressional leaders in the United States concerning the Garrison, I wonder if he can confirm reports that the United States Congress, in a Public Works Appropriation Bill passed this last week contained instructions to the President of the United States that appropriations already allocated to Garrison be spent and that a resolution to that effect is presently being debated by the Senate and the House of Representatives that would require by a simple majority vote that the President do spend the funds that have already been appropriated. Could he indicate whether, if that goes through, it will have the effect of introducing some form of new waters or foreign waters into the Red River or the Lake Winnipeg system?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Well Mr. Speaker, to give a complete answer to my honourable friend would probably require a lecture on the workings of the American Congressional system which he would agree I am probably not equipped to give, and secondly, which would probably bore the Chamber. My information is that the Lower House, that is, the House of Representatives, did pass an appropriation relating to the Garrison Diversion which has some of the effects at least, that my honourable friend has indicated. I have no further information as to the status of the debate or the position of the appropriation before the Senate of the United States, but I can certainly endeavour, or the Minister of Mines can endeavour to find that out through the usual channels and if it has not already appeared in the press, then we can so advise the House.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If in fact it appears that there is a resolution on the Order Paper in the American Congress that would require the President of the United States to release the moneys that he is presently deferring, is there any inclination on the part of this government in company with the Federal Government, to make representations to the Congressional Committee concerning that resolution pointing out the potential impact and damage it would have if such an appropriation was released and the money spent?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, if not to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, when this question arose last week, or at least when I spoke to it last week, that we would be quite willing to have representatives from the Government of Manitoba appear before any or all committees of the U.S. Congress with respect to this matter — if the Department of External Affairs so communicated to us or received in answer to our query, it would prove to be productive in protecting Manitoba waters from the negative effects of Garrison, which we and the majority of the people who have looked at it, all agree will occur if Garrison recedes.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the First Minister could then indicate whether the communication with that particular intent in mind has been submitted to the Department of External Affairs, and whether there has been any response to it.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice because of the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Mines.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism, relating to the number of lifeguards that are supposed to be positioned at the various park locations in Manitoba which have beach facilities. Can the Minister give us a status report as to the level of staffing for beach patrols and lifeguards at the various beaches in Manitoba? I understand as of a week ago, those lifeguards were still not in place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

**HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, I'll check into the matter and get an exact count. As I mentioned a while ago, some of the lakes where there is colder water wouldn't have lifeguards till the ice was gone, but we will check into the matter. I know that the Red Cross is working very closely with the department to provide those 70-plus lifeguards for the province, and I'll report back to the Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the reduction of operations at Hooker Chemicals in Brandon, and the layoff of power engineers at that company, is the Minister now prepared to lift the exemptions from Simplot Chemicals Limited in Brandon so that it will now be required to have the appropriate number of qualified engineers on staff?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a report as to who is being laid off, but I will check in to see what type of engineers are being laid off.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for her answer and we look forward to her report. I think it will confirm that they do not have adequate categories of engineers on staff at the various times. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister another question with regard to Simplot Chemicals. Will the Minister advise whether it is still the case that the Department of Labour inspectors are being prevented by the Minister from inspecting Simplot Chemicals at night even though Simplot Chemicals is a 24-hour continuous operation?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I have never prevented the inspectors from carrying on inspections — I leave it to the director of that department.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would also take this as notice and look into this matter to make sure that this is the case. The information I have is that inspections are not going on at night, and I think the Minister should report back to the House whether that is the case or not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the question put by the Member for Brandon East. During the course of our Estimates' discussions the Minister of Labour had indicated that there were instructions issued to the staff not to inspect other than during certain hours of the day. The answer she has given is now a contradiction to that. I wonder if the Minister would clarify.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, in my Estimates I made the statement that our inspectors are not going at the turn of every shift around the clock on a 24-hour basis. I would like to tell the honourable gentleman across that Simplot just got a certificate recently for their safe achievements in their workplace.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** I'd like to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs if he's been able to make a decision yet in regard to the Pakwagan Log Milling operation at Wabowden, whether the decision of to whom he was going to sell that operation that was to be made three weeks ago, or two weeks ago, or last week, will be made this week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the decision will be made this week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education in regard to questions asked last week and the week before in regard to the BUNTEP and IMPACTE programs. I wonder if he has any further answers as to whether or not the funds of those programs are being used for the purpose to which the province has assigned them to the president of Brandon University.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I accepted several questions from the Honourable Member for The Pas last week in regard to the IMPACTE, BUNTEP programs. One, I believe, asked about the termination of the positions of two native people in those particular programs who were on sabbatical leave. I can report that there are two people away on sabbatical leave but only one of those is native. Neither has had his contract terminated. I am pleased to report that both will be working for the projects this coming year.

A second question from the honourable member asked whether there will be any native people working in the programs this fall. I can assure him that this fall there will be at least three native people working on these particular projects.

A third question dealt with community liaison. One of the staff who is returning from sabbatical will be looking after this specific responsibility when he returns to his duties in July.

As far as the question as to the utilization of the funds, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have addressed that previously and I can reiterate that we are satisfied that this is being looked after very adequately and for the first time within these programs, we now will have a formal agreement signed very shortly with Brandon University that will enable us more easily to monitor what is happening in these particular programs.

Mr. Speaker, I also accepted a question from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition last week and I would like to reply to that also at this time. It was in regard to a particular school in River East School Division. I can report that in January, 1977, the River East School Division submitted a preliminary Notice of Intent for a school in that particular area. Because little development in that area had taken place at that time, the Public Schools Finance Board asked the division to resubmit their request in June, 1977. This was done but because little change had taken place between January and June, it was apparently agreed by both the Public Schools Finance Board and the school division that the matter should not be proceeded with for the time being. To date, the division has not signified that it wishes to proceed with the project. If and when such a request is received, the Public Schools Finance Board will deal with it in the usual way. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is sufficient space in nearby schools in the division to accomodate the pupils that are there.\$

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, in asking a further question to the Minister on the same subject, I would just remind him that there were some other questions that I asked a day or two before the ones that he answered so maybe when he has those, he could also supply that answer.

I wonder if he could also indicate and report back on the number of staff reduction that there will be for next year in the BUNTEP and IMPACTE programs and the number of native staff reductions there will be in those programs and also whether or not he has received a letter from The Pas Indian Band and whether he has responded to that letter in regard to these programs.

**MR. COSENS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the last part of the honourable member's question, I received a copy of a letter that was sent to the Board of Governors of Brandon University and also a copy of a letter that went back in reply to The Pas Indian Band which I think in many cases will erase any misunderstandings that may have existed in that particular situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, in view of the fact that Simplot now has adequate qualified engineers, when is she going to lift the exemption with respect to The Power Engineers Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, it is under constant review.

**MR. FOX:** Since that is a non-answer, Mr. Speaker, is she indicating that Simplot will now have an exemption in perpetuity and have an unfair advantage over other plants that have to have power engineers?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Honourable

**Monday, June 19, 1978**

Minister of Labour in relation to the questions she answered about inspections at the plants in Brandon. Could the Minister indicate whether or not there is ongoing provision for routine, random, unannounced inspections of plants which are open on a 24-hour a day basis?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** The inspections routine is going on exactly the same as it has for the last number of years. The only change that was made in it was last August when the directions were given to the inspectors to inspect around the clock. It's back to where it was prior to that, exactly the same as the honourable members across had.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether she is relying on past practice to justify her failure to see to it that there are ongoing inspections 24 hours a day during the three shifts or whether people can feel free today, under the present government, to carry on as they like for two shifts of the three knowing that there will not be any inspections. In other words, is the Minister prepared to continue without a proper routine work on the part of her inspectors to make sure that the laws are being complied with?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, the inspections are being carried on under the direction of highly expertised men in my department and they are being carried on in a fashion that we feel is quite safe for everybody concerned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister now confirm that there are no inspections being carried on by her department for 16 hours out of the 24 in a day and that people who are likely to be inspected can feel free to know that there will not be any inspection during those other periods of the day, other than the daytime period?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, there aren't advance notices at any of the workplaces that there are going to be inspections carried on and we are quite satisfied that the inspections, at the rate they are going on now, meets with all the safety requirements.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker, on this past weekend, there was a celebrity bonspiel held at the Provincial Exhibition in Brandon of which members from both sides of the House participated along with the Lieutenant-Governor. I would like to report to the House, Mr. Speaker, that it was a very competitive bonspiel at which the Member for Brandon East participated, who I am sure can confirm this, and that I would like to congratulate the members on this side for winning the trophy and representing the province at that occasion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, in response to that non-political statement, I, too, would like to comment that it was a most enjoyable weekend. I would like to point out, however, to the members of the House that it was a tie game except that the two skips had to throw one last rock each and fortunately for the Conservative team, their skip threw the closest rock, so it was a pretty tight race.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the federal announcement that there would be new regional centres of research and development established, can he indicate to the House whether the Province of Manitoba has yet made any submissions to establish such a regional centre for industrial and technology development in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, we have had contact with the Federal Minister in charge of Science and Technology. Also I should point out to the member that in the DREE Agreement which was

signed, the industrial DREE Agreement, a fairly substantive part of that particular agreement, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$17 million, has been earmarked for R and D, Research and Development work, so we are monitoring the situation very closely. Also, the Federal Minister in charge of Small Business is also asking for input from the provinces with regard to different areas of development for venture capital and that type of thing dealing with technology. So we are monitoring closely; we are in contact with the Federal Government to try and make sure that as much of that much needed research and development is brought to Manitoba as possible.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister was: Do we intend to submit a specific proposal to have a regional centre like that being established in other regions of the country located in the Province of Manitoba and, if so, is the government developing any ideas to determine what kind of research and development centre could be established in this province using that federal proposal money? .

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we have identified several sectors in the industries such as the Food Products Centre in Portage la Prairie, established a year or so ago, which is opening up. We have identified certain areas that we will be researching in; again, it's got to do with the DREE Agreement, and we will be consulting with the federal Ministers as far as further assistance in technology and development, R and D work is concerned.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'll put the question this way: will the Minister undertake to contact both the industrial and academic research bodies in the Province of Manitoba in order that a specific proposal can be developed which would be submitted to the government to establish that centre of technology and research in the Province of Manitoba under the new program that was announced last week?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that we will check into it. I should point out that we do have the Manitoba Research Council and several other agencies which are dealing with research and development and these agencies, I hope, will be working very closely with any federal initiatives.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Minister for Urban Affairs has returned to the House. I would like to direct another question with regard to the flooding problems experienced by citizens in Tyndall Park. Does the Minister confirm that in particular with regard to the new development in Tyndall Park, the people there are in a special category because the development was planned and their houses were built, although there was not sufficient storm sewer coverage, and that these people were therefore enticed to go into a development which the city knew, or should have known, would not provide proper storm sewage?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the First Minister has already answered the question. On Friday last we advised the city that the Provincial Government, for a number of reasons, would not participate in flood compensation related to the storms of last year.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know what relationship that answer has to the question that I put. I will repeat the question: would the Minister confirm that with regard to a particular group of people in any event, that is, those residing in the new development in Tyndall Park, that the problem of flooding arises because the storm sewerage is not sufficient to cover the problems that arise by flooding that would not cause problems in other areas, and that the city knew or should have known, when the people moved into that area, that the storm sewerage was inadequate? Does the Minister have facts which would confirm that that is the case?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Urban Affairs, in deference to the citizens that are in this position, would look into the matter and see whether these citizens are not in a particular position, because they went into a new development which did not have adequate storm sewage coverage?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that is a question that, if it is to be put, should be put to the City of Winnipeg.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. Is the Minister going to take the advice of the Free Press editorial of June to stop the subsidy of the city transit buses so the city can free tender and buy its buses from General Motors instead of from our publicly-owned Flyer Industries?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, there has been no request by the City of Winnipeg to participate in any purchase of buses this year and that question has not been dealt with.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it correct that about 85 percent of the mailing costs of the Free Press are paid by the taxpayers through postal subsidies?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I think that's a matter that will have to be put to the honourable member's federal member of parliament.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the Free Press insists a business should not receive subsidies so that people can know the true costs of what is produced, will the Minister propose to the Federal Government then, to stop its subsidy to the Free Press so we can see how many people buy it when we must pay the true cost instead of having our pockets quietly picked by a subsidy.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would perhaps suggest to the honourable member that he might follow the example of the Member for Inkster and take out an ad.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I took as notice a question from the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and supporting questions from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland having to do with a child neglect case in Little Grand Rapids involving a five-months old infant — five months now; five weeks then — who was sleeping on the floor of an unheated home. There was concern expressed because a media report of Saturday, June 10th had stated that officials of my department were planning to return the infant to her parents. I have received a report on the incident, Mr. Speaker, from officials of my department, and can advise the honourable members that the media report was wrong and that our officials were not planning to return the infant to her parents until such time as they were satisfied that homemaking conditions in that particular home had improved. I might note, Mr. Speaker, that the parents concerned were pressing to have the infant returned to their care.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the information. In that same press report it was also indicated that the presiding judge who dealt with the case of the parents had also expressed concern of the role played by the Department of Health and Social Development in trying to return the child to the custody of the parents, and that this is the reason for the decision taken by the judge to put them in jail. Does the Minister intend to discuss this matter with court officials and to follow up — I think the second part of the question I raised — examine the kinds of procedures that are followed in the reserves related to the custody of children in these kinds of circumstances? He indicated at that time he would be prepared to make an announcement of that kind.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I am doing that, Mr. Speaker, and can undertake to complete it, but I would point out that all things being equal, where there is reasonably good parenting it is desirable to have children maintained in the homes of their parents. These two particular parents were substantially regarded by the RCMP, by members of the community, by officials of my department. They lapsed into periods of neglect, unfortunately, but their children were well-loved, well-fed and well-attended, generally speaking, so that the philosophy of the department would be to return the children as soon as they were satisfied that those lapses of neglect had been corrected. The parents unfortunately are serving sentences now for child neglect and so the children are all under the care of the Department of Health and Social Development.<sup>67</sup>

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister two



questions. One is, what procedures are followed to determine when there are lapses — who provides the judgment or evaluation as to whether a child should have returned to a home under these circumstances? And secondly, would he indicate whether there are alternative care facilities in remote areas like this where children could be placed over a period of time pending that kind of evaluation or assessment, whether the parents would take proper care of the child?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, yes, there are, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member's last question, and in fact the infant in question was placed in a foster home that very day, the day that she was removed from the parental home.

In answer to his first question, the determination is made by either federal or provincial officials, in this case, Little Grand Rapids Treaty Status Reserve. Primarily the responsibility there rests with the Federal Government, although naturally the provincial Department of Health and Social Development does not turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to critical situations involving children and we had personnel from Child and Family Services, our Eastman region office, participating with a federal nurse, with the RCMP in that particular case.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I've been advised that there has been a suggestion that no one be accepted as a resident with the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the Health Sciences Centre unless he or she is ready to perform or at least assist in the performance of an abortion. Now my question is this, would it not be discrimination and against the Human Rights Legislation if, during the interview for those people that are seeking acceptance at this hospital, the question of religion and moral issues are discussed to determine their stand on abortion, would not my honourable friend be ready to consult with his colleague, the Minister of Health, and inform the hospital after proper investigation by the hospital and the College of Physicians and Surgery Medical Faculty, that this kind of discrimination will not be tolerated in Manitoba?

**MR. MERCIER:** As the question was put, Mr. Speaker, that would appear to violate the Human Rights Act, but obviously it's a question that would perhaps require some further investigation if necessary, and some further consultation with the Minister of Health and Social Development before a final determination of that question could be made.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Then, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister take proper steps to have this matter investigated and discuss it with his colleague?

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that the Thompson City Council has petitioned both himself and the Minister of Labour to take action in regard to the strike and the lockout of retail clerk members in Thompson,

and can he indicate what action, if any, his government has taken in response to that request?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, there was a special council meeting called in Thompson and out of that meeting it was felt by the city that telegrams should be sent to the Honourable Minister of Labour and myself asking if it would be possible to appoint a conciliation officer to see if then he could get the two parties sitting down to the table. The only action that we have taken, and I think it's a very responsible action, is I discussed the situation with the Minister of Labour and I understand that a conciliation officer was appointed Friday afternoon, and I understand that both parties are sitting down today talking. I think that's where we like to see them; you can't resolve a thing if you're not at the table.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of reports in the press from government sources regarding the Trade Development Branch and the Manitoba Trading Corporation and certain inadequacies thereof, can the Minister advise whether the Trade Development Branch or the Manitoba Trading Corporation are either being phased out or are their functions being reduced in any way?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe we had some 12 people involved in that particular function, whether it be Manitrade, the direct sales function organization, or the people helping in trade development. I believe that is an adequate amount. They are busy right now dealing with different clients. We have one special person that was left on contract; namely, Mr. Armstrong, who is exclusively working with the new fighter offset program trying to get as much offset on that new fighter aircraft program to Manitoba as possible, so I think they're doing an adequate job. There was funding allowed for them in the Estimates and those Estimates have been passed by this House.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then is the Honourable Minister telling us that the Trade Development staff is being maintained as is, in effect, and that he is now ignoring the recommendations of the Task Force on government organization — that this function either be terminated or reduced substantially? In effect is the Minister telling us that he is not going by the Task Force recommendation, he's going to continue with the Trade Development. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, Order please. Order please. The question is out of order. We have now reached the time when the question period has expired and we'll proceed with the Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two changes on the Economic Development Committee; substitute the name of Mr. Steen for Mr. Craik, and Mr. Kovnats for Mr. Brown.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the Orders of the Day I should like to just remind the honourable members that the Economic Development Committee will be meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock to consider the Communities Economic Development Fund Report and the report of Manfor. If that is not concluded then that committee will meet again on Thursday.

Also the Municipal Affairs Committee will be meeting in Room 200 to consider Bill 18, and if that is not concluded tomorrow it will reconvene again on Thursday. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the

Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Civil Service Commission. .t\$

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Lady and gentlemen, we have a quorum, we are on Page 16 and 17 of the Estimates Book, Civil Service, Civil Service Commission 1.(a) Salaries — the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

**MRS. PRICE:** I'd just like to give a few highlights of 1977 for the gentlemen. There has been 942 competitions conducted by the Commission; there's 18,200 applications received for these competitions for an average of 19.4 applicants per competition; 36 appeals were received and processed by the Commission, most for reclassification reasons; 97 employees were referred to Employee Health and Counselling Service, over half of them responding well to the treatment and working productively.

There were 61 seminars held with over a thousand Civil Service supervisors on how to handle unproductive employees with health related problems; seminars conducted with government departments throughout the province on an equal employment opportunity concepts and practices.

The Commission staff participated in many Career Days at high schools in Manitoba. Guest lectures were also given at universities and community colleges.

Brandon and Thompson Regional Offices continued providing Central Agency Assistance to departments in rural areas.

Full-time Chairman M.B. Newton appointed to Civil Service Commission along with two new members, Shirley Bradshaw and Mr. R.O. Hunter.

The overall reduction in the 1978-79 proposed Estimates in Expenditures of \$57,900 or 10 percent for the Civil Service Commission are in accordance with the restraint program. The reduction was brought about primarily by discontinuance of Career Planning Branch. The funds are being transferred to the main appropriation of the Civil Service Commission to provide for the maintenance of the Equal Employment Opportunity Program in the Civil Service. This mainly accounts for the increase in Other Expenditures of \$17,700.00.

In addition, staffing officers will be charged with the additional responsibility of interviewing and providing career advice to the disadvantaged minority groups. Since this is an additional responsibility of existing staff it is not reflected in the cost figures.

Arrangements have been made with staff of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour to assist the Civil Service Commission in counselling women in the Civil Service with respect to training and employment opportunities. Once again, this service is being provided and therefore it doesn't register as an increased Expenditure Estimate.

Moreover, the existing staff of other Central Personnel Agencies will be involved in maintaining an equal Equal Employment Program through the analysis of jobs and the development of training programs for target groups.

While the external recruitment activities of the Civil Service Commission have decreased with the restraint program, operations involving internal redeployment and re-employment of staff by the Commission have increased substantially and will continue for the balance of the fiscal year.

Modest increase in funds is required for the two additional part-time Civil Service Commissioners who were appointed, as I just mentioned. The regional Commission offices in Brandon and Thompson will be retained to provide ongoing personnel services in these areas.

The Civil Service Commission has established an Employee Health and Counselling Service Program, which operates in liaison with, and its services are available to, all Manitoba Government departments, branches and bureaus, as follows.

**The education:** Appropriate educational workshops or seminars are provided consistent with the time available and the target group designated by the particular department. Films, pamphlets and other education aids are used. Top management are made familiar with the program and involved in the development of the relative administrative details relating to their own departments or branches. Supervisors are trained to identify signs of a health problem, to understand the requirements of an employee with such a problem and to make appropriate referrals in accordance with the program guidelines. Staff are involved in various educational programs outlining the nature and symptoms of behavioural health problems and the procedures and resources available to them.

**For the treatment:** The Service provides for case consultation and assessment with the supervisor and employee, accepts referrals, arranges for appropriate treatment and provides case

The treatment guidelines: The objective of this program is to retain employees in all departments of the government throughout the province who develop health problems by utilizing every reasonable means to restore them to normal work performance and productivity. Job performance is the criteria on which the supervisor shall base any actions relative to behavioural health. The decision to seek diagnosis and accept treatment is basically the responsibility of the employee. Self-referral should be made to the appropriate agency or be requested from the supervisor. Where this is not done voluntarily or response to treatment is negative, a mandatory referral shall be made by the supervisor. Continued unacceptable performance due to refusal to accept treatment or inability to respond adequately may result in termination of employment. When the illness has been identified the employee may utilize accumulated sick-leave credits for the purpose of participating in public or private treatment and rehabilitation programs which have been recommended by Employee Health and Counselling Services and may be granted other assistance as required.

Provincial employees suffering from alcoholism or other forms of substance abuse will receive the same consideration extended to employees having other illnesses. Confidentiality of records and personal information shall be maintained at all times. No provincial employee shall have job security or promotion opportunities jeopardized by a request for counselling or referral assistance.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Any members of the committee wish to make any remarks regarding the Minister's statement?

The Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the overview of the department. I believe I would like to, at this point in time, specifically go into some of the questions related to the Commission and dealing with the aspect of recruitment and hiring. I would like to ask the Minister whether there has been any change in terms of policy in the hiring practices within the Civil Service Commission over the last six or seven months.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister.

**MRS. PRICE:** Incidentally, I must apologize. For the new people here I would like to introduce Mr. Bob Best who is with me. He is the Director of Personnel in the Civil Service. He has just advised me that there has been one major change in the employment and that is that once a selection has been made it goes to the Deputy Minister instead of the Minister, thereby taking the political figure out of the picture.

**MR. URUSKI:** In the recommendations that are made, how are the recommendations going forward to the hiring authority? There were two approaches that have been taken in the past and that is, in the regular employment, in the lower echelons of the Civil Service, there was either a direct recommendation made on the employee who was the preferred candidate for the selection or a list of three possible candidates who were equally applicable or qualified for a choice of the hiring authority. Is that practice still continuing in terms of both procedures?

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe previously there were three names went forth, three preferred candidates. Now it is one that goes forth.

**MR. URUSKI:** The one candidate goes forward along with a list of candidates who were also qualified for the position?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have been advised that just the one name goes forth. If the Deputy Minister should want, for one reason or another, to know who the other candidates were, he can go to the selection board and ask them and he will be given the names.

**MR. URUSKI:** The names of the . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** The other candidates.

**MR. URUSKI:** . . . are made available to him if he so requests them. To whom does the Deputy Minister report?

**MRS. PRICE:** To the Minister.

**MR. URUSKI:** Therefore, in essence, the suggestion made by the Minister that the politics, so-called politics, of the selection process has been taken out — could the Minister elaborate on what she

really means by that statement?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have been advised that there is nothing to stop the Deputy Minister from speaking to the Minister anyway. It's just a matter of before they used to go to the Minister and now they consult with the Deputy. If the Minister wants to see fit to speak to the Deputy, then that's . . .

**MR. URUSKI:** So then what the Minister really is saying is that basically other than the formality of the change, the procedure is basically the same other than the formality of the selection forms being signed by the Deputy Minister who is acting on behalf of his Minister and who is appointed by the Minister responsible for the department, whoever the Deputy is. Am I correct in assuming that?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Could the Minister indicate whether the Civil Service Commission is keeping a record of the numbers of actual staff, not positions but actual staff that have been laid off since October or in the last year, department by department? If the Minister can supply the figures prior to October and say at the end of March, at the end of the fiscal year. Is that available?

**MRS. PRICE:** It will take a while to figure it out. If you like, we can come back to you.

**MR. URUSKI:** That's fine. You will be able to, department by department, and . . . yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Perhaps the Minister does have certain figures available which she could leave with us and then whatever remains to be brought forward, could be brought forward later.

**MRS. PRICE:** As of June 6th, this year, there have been 165 people on the re-employment list, 81 civil servants and 84 term of more than a year. Of these, 29 have been re-employed and 21 have resigned. There are 115 remaining on the list.

51-30 **MR. URUSKI:** As of June 6th, there were 165 on the re-employment?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, there were 165 that had been laid off.

**MR. USKIW:** Had been laid off? Oh, yes . . .

**MR. URUSKI:** Right, actual persons, all right. And of those, 81 were civil servants full-time ?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** I don't want the staff man years, I want the actual persons. And 84 were term positions. When you talk about term, does that include contract positions as well?

**MRS. PRICE:** No.

**MR. URUSKI:** There are contract people in addition to that. Did you say of those 84, some 21 or 29 resigned?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, 21 have resigned and 29 have been re-employed elsewhere in the Civil Service.

**MR. USKIW:** 29 out of how many?

**MRS. PRICE:** Out of the 165.

**MR. URUSKI:** So of those 50 that we're talking about of resigned and re-employed, some of them could have been term, some of them could have been civil servants.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** So it's a mixture of both of the 50. All right. Would you have any figures dealing with other classes of employee, like casual, that may have been hired for a long period, unlike the term employee, or are there any on the employment rolls that would be classified as casual but still have been employed within the government's services for a long period of time?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm advised the 84 takes in the bulk of the long-term; the others would be casual, seasonal, on a short contract.

**MR. URUSKI:** Would you have any figures with respect to actual contract employees that contracts have been terminated or the Civil Service Commission, do they keep a record of those employees?

**MRS. PRICE:** Those figures are all in the Management Committee.

**MR. URUSKI:** So you would have no information with respect to contract employees then.

**MRS. PRICE:** Not of that.

**MR. URUSKI:** Okay. Could the Minister indicate how the Re-employment Committee is functioning and what are the terms of reference and who sits on that committee in terms of staff?

**MRS. PRICE:** The gentleman who is with me today, Bob Best, Paul Hart and two members of the MGEA sit on the committee.

**MR. URUSKI:** Has that committee met since it was established and could the Minister give us some information on how it has functioned? What are its terms of reference and I see that there have been 29 civil servants re-employed. The remainder of 115 civil servants, could the Minister comment on those as well as to the work that the committee is doing?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, this committee has met several times and they are meeting regularly. The two MGEA members of the committee bring the concerns of the association to the committee and this is how they determine their problems and how best to go about them.

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes, what I'm getting at is, what authority has this committee received from the Minister or from the government in terms of whether the government is giving priority to the hiring of these civil servants? I want to know how the government views this committee. Is this committee being viewed as window-dressing or is there an intent on this committee really doing something with respect to the layoffs that have occurred?

**MRS. PRICE:** They are just in the throes of signing an agreement to this effect and they've got the authority to go ahead with their hiring as they see fit.

**MR. URUSKI:** Could the Minister elaborate a little bit more. When you say hiring, the committee has been given authority, as vacancies arise and the people who have been laid off — they are trying to match laid-off persons with job vacancies as they arise?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. There is an agreement being signed between the government and the MGEA giving preference to the people who have been laid off to have the first chance at re-employment.

**MR. URUSKI:** They will have the first recall, they are on first recall on the basis of the committee meeting and the authority vested in that committee.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for St. George, I have other persons that have indicated they wish to ask questions. Can I go on to them?

**MR. URUSKI:** That's fine, okay. For now, that's good, okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell us, as of the most recent statistical data that she has, the total number of employees in the Civil Service and the date of that statistic.

**MRS. PRICE:** Civil servants as of December, 1977, it's in our annual report, is 11,073.

**MR. USKIW:** There is no more recent date, Mr. Chairman?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm advised that these records come under Management Committee and that they can be obtained through them.

**MR. USKIW:** As of that date then, how many contract positions did we have, additional to the 11,073?

**MRS. PRICE:** There aren't any contract in this figure; this is civil servants.

**MR. USKIW:** No, no, I recognize that. In the government system, how many contract positions did we have as of the same date?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm advised that all these figures are in the Management Committee.

**MR. USKIW:** So we have no figures to deal with here at the present time.

**MRS. PRICE:** It doesn't come through the Commission.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, I'm wondering whether it wouldn't help us if the department was willing to get us the information.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, we're willing to get them. We'll get them.

**MR. USKIW:** Perhaps the Minister would take notice of the questions then. The number of civil servants, at least to the end of, or at the end of the last fiscal year; the number of contract positions; the number of vacant positions but which are positions that have not been dropped and then, how many vacant positions have been eliminated and how many vacant positions have been filled.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, we're prepared to bring the figures back to you.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** In those figures, could you also, to make them meaningful, could you compare them to the annual Manitoba statistics, or take into account the number of term and casual employees to make them comparable to the previous figures?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, we'll do that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, I wonder if this is the place that the Minister would want to tell us why it was found necessary to let the chairman of the Commission — well, they didn't let him go, that's the problem — to change the role of the chairman of the Commission. What was the circumstance that sort of led to the removal of Mr. Duncan from the chairmanship of the Commission? What logic or reason lies behind that?

**MRS. PRICE:** To the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think that would best be asked of the First Minister in his Estimates because that comes under him. —(Interjection)— I know, but he was gone before I came into the portfolio and I believe it would be best answered by the First Minister.

**MR. USKIW:** But, Mr. Chairman, is the salary of the Civil Service Commission not in these Estimates? Do these Estimates not show an amount to cover the salary of the Civil Service Commission chairman?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they do.

**MR. USKIW:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it's a debatable point.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, he's equivalent to a Deputy Minister, the Deputy Ministers come under the Premier and I believe he would be the best one to answer that for you.

**MR. USKIW:** Is the Minister indicating that she had no knowledge as to why that decision was made?

**MRS. PRICE:** I can't answer that. As I say, he was gone before I came into the portfolio and I would have to leave that for the First Minister to answer. —(Interjection)—

**MR. USKIW:** Well, I believe it's not so.

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm not the one that relieved the Commissioner of his position. It was the Premier that . . . to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that I'm speaking to right now . . . and it's the Premier that . . .

**MR. USKIW:** I'll defer to the Member for St. Johns who wants to pursue the same subject.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Just on this one point, the Minister has said twice that Mr. Duncan, I think she used the word left, before she came into the portfolio — I think she should check her memory.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I had nothing to do with his termination. That's what I'm saying to you. It was right at the beginning. I had nothing to do with his termination and I'm sure that the Premier would be more than willing to explain why he has let him go. I can't answer the reasons for it, if I could I would tell you, but the Premier's the one that had the dialogue and is the one who released him, and I think you would be best to ask him for the reasons. The Commissioner is the same status as a Deputy Minister, and as you know, they come under the Premier and so does he.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I interrupted because I was concerned firstly to make sure that the record was correct, and I think it can be clearly established that the Minister took office before Mr. Duncan was let go. I think she has now agreed that that is the case, that she was in office at the time when he was the Commissioner, and that he was later set aside for another Commissioner. I think that's correct, is it not?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I had never met the gentleman. I had no dialogue with him whatsoever and as you know it was right in the first days, I knew nothing about the circumstances and that's why I would prefer that you speak to the Premier about it. His Estimates haven't come up yet and they come under his jurisdiction.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, secondly, the Minister said she never spoke to Mr. Duncan, is



that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's correct.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** She has never had any interview or conversation with Mr. Duncan? All right.

Then third point is, just to clarify, Mr. Chairman, my impression is that the Commissioner can only be appointed by the Cabinet, not by the Premier, not by the Minister, and that although it is the convention that Deputy Ministers report and are responsible to the Premier for appointment, that that is not the case with the Civil Service Commissioner, and I think she was incorrect in saying that it comes under the Premier. I think we ought to clarify again. I believe he does not come under the Premier and he's not like a Deputy Minister, and, in fact, he cannot be let off the Board without, I believe, it's a two-third vote of the Legislature, so let's establish that his position is . . . Well it's almost unique, I think he and the Ombudsman and the Provincial Auditor. —(Interjection)— And the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, fine. So that he is in quite a different position from any Deputy Minister, and the Premier can fire Deputy Ministers left and right, and appoint Deputy Ministers right and left, even without consultation of the Minister. This does not apply to the Civil Service Commissioner.

And I think further that in the case of Mr. Duncan, he was not fired, and that's really what I'd like to get clarified. I think he was replaced as chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** That's correct.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Is he still on the Board?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes he is. I think I answered those questions in the House for one of the members the other day. He is still on the Board, he's not in the Commission, he asked for early retirement and as of the 1st of April he has been getting his superannuation.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Does the Minister suggest that this is a voluntary decision on the part of Mr. Duncan that he should retire, or ask for early retirement, or is it only after the Conservative Government set him aside and took away from him the role of the Civil Service Commissioner? Is that not true?

**MRS. PRICE:** I imagine his decision was made after the Conservative Party, definitely.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to be insistant but I don't think it's a matter for any conjecture or imagination of the Minister, I think it's true, isn't it?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, it is true, it's very obviously true.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, do I understand that the appointment or the temporary appointment of the previous Civil Service Commissioner was done without her participation at all?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it was done with my participation in Cabinet, I guess, but I was in there for two days when the transaction took place. It was our first Cabinet meeting and it was the Premier who was looking after it. As I say, I had no dialogue with the individual at all. I knew nothing of his background or his performance. It was the Premier that handled the arrangement, so I think it would be best if you refer your comments to him.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm even surprised to hear that it took place two days after the Cabinet was sworn in. My recollection was that it was longer than that. I would just like to check — was it only two days after the appointment that he was let go?

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe it was around the first Cabinet meeting. We took office on the Monday, and I can't swear to it but I'm pretty sure it was right at the beginning. However, I had no dialogue with the individual and I would suggest that you ask the Premier. He still has to come before the Committee and that would be the place to get your answers from.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I got into this conversation is that the Minister obviously did not have a correct recollection of when it was that Mr. Duncan was demoted, if that's the word, because she had stated earlier that it happened before she was sworn in but that's clearly

incorrect.

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't say that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, the Minister did say that, Mr. Chairman, she did say that. And what she wants to say is that she takes no responsibility for the decision that was made, that it was all made by the Premier and she had nothing to do with it. So I would then have to ask, what was her relationship with the Commissioners, the members of the Civil Service Board of whom Mr. Duncan continued to be a member for quite some time? Did she meet with the Board, has she consulted with the Board, has she exchanged opinions as to the way the Board should operate, and if so was Mr. Duncan present at the meeting?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have mentioned to you numerous times, I have never with Mr. Duncan. I would also like to say that I am not going to say any more about Mr. Duncan because I don't know anything about the gentleman or his work habits or his capabilities and I suggest that you ask the Premier. I think that should be satisfactory to get the answers you want. I can't give you the answers, I don't know the individual and I'm not prepared to discuss it any further.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Could the Minister answer the question I asked unrelated to Mr. Duncan. Has she met with the Board of the Civil Service Commission to discuss policy with the Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** Not at that point.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, no, I'm saying, at all.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have since, yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, how recently, or how early, and how many times has the Minister met?

**MRS. PRICE:** I meet with the Civil Service to discuss the operation of the department but prior to that time I hadn't met with them.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I want to clarify, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says with the Civil Service, does she mean with the Commission or with the staff?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have met with the staff.<sup>37</sup>

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, well, I'm asking about the Board.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have not met with the Board.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, of whom does the Board consist? Who are the members of the Board?

**MRS. PRICE:** Shirley Bradshaw, Mr. R.O. Hunter, John Pankiw, Hazel Allan, Doug Duncan and Mr. Chris Schubert.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And the Board's responsibility — or the Commission, rather, its responsibility is to operate the Civil Service Commission, I thought, and I marvel that the Minister has not met with them in some seven months, since she was appointed. How is that workable?

**MRS. PRICE:** I meet with the Commissioner on a regular basis and the senior men that are under him, the Board meets infrequently and I have not met with them. However, we have spent most of our seven months in session which doesn't leave that much time to be meeting with them. But, however, I'm not going to discuss it any more with you. You can ask the Premier about Mr. Duncan, because I don't know anything about the man and I'm not going to discuss it any further.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I wish the Minister would realize that I stopped asking about Mr. Duncan a little while ago when she said she wouldn't answer any more questions. I am at the moment more concerned about how she relates to the Commission of whom there are about, it seems to me, six or seven members that I heard her list. What is their task and how can they carry on their

Monday, June 19, 1978

function without meeting with or consulting with the Minister responsible? Who runs it, who decides, who makes the decisions about the Civil Service Commission? Is it the Minister or is it the Commission and the members who are part of it?

**MRS. PRICE:** I would say that after the Board meets, then it's the decision of Cabinet, any changes or any workings of it that are of a major importance. I have not met with the Board and I've met frequently with the Commissioner and the senior servants.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, I assume that Mr. Newton is still the Chairman, is he?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And then he reports to the Minister on behalf of the Commission itself?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And she has never met any of the members of the Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, not as a body.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that the Minister does not deem it important to meet with the Civil Service Commission as an agency of the Crown appointed by the government, by the Cabinet, to discuss the question of their role and policies of the government with respect to the operations of the Commission. What is the status of the new Commissioner?

**MRS. PRICE:** What is the status of the new Commission?

**MR. USKIW:** Yes. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that that's a temporary arrangement.

**MRS. PRICE:** You mean the Commissioner?

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, the Chairman of the Commission.

**MRS. PRICE:** He is going to be retiring at the end of June.

**MR. USKIW:** All right. Can the Minister tell us what is going to take place with respect to a replacement for Mr. Newton?

**MRS. PRICE:** There hasn't been any designation at this time.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes. Is the government going to advertise for that position, or . . .?

**MRS. PRICE:** I couldn't tell you at this time; it hasn't been discussed. We just got word on Friday that the end of June would be his last and we haven't sat down with the Premier or anyone else.

**MR. USKIW:** Could the Minister indicate to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, just what it is that Mr. Newton, who has already retired, just what it is that he was able to bring back to the Commission that was not already available at the Commission before his appointment?

**MRS. PRICE:** He was here for 20 years in the Commission. Again, I hadn't known Mr. Newton before, but I know he came back with a wealth of experience. It was the pleasure of the Premier and the Cabinet that he come in to work in the Civil Service and that's why he was back again. I can't discuss personalities with you because I didn't know them.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, the reason I ask that question, Mr. Chairman, is because the Minister alluded to what she considered a political role in the hiring process, and that she has now taken steps to remove that by referring the recommendations from the Commission to the Deputy Ministers, which, by the way, are appointed by politicians, by Order-in-Council, so that it doesn't remove it out of the political arena, if she wants to be technical about it. Does that in part explain the reason why Mr. Newton was brought back in after retirement?

**MRS. PRICE:** As I say, I can't answer that. It was the desire of the Premier and the Cabinet that he be brought in and I am not able to answer that for you. I believe they decided that he would be a more competent individual to handle the Commission. He had 20 years of experience.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I find it rather strange that the Premier of this province is running a one-man show; that his Ministers don't know why the decisions that are being made are being made with respect to their own departments. I find that incredible, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, if you'd like me to put it bluntly then, he was not found to be the man for the job, that he wasn't doing the job as well as Mr. Newton, and that's why he was replaced. Does that make you feel better, now that I tell you that?

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a very interesting statement that the Minister has provided for the Committee, because she told us that she never met the previous Commissioner, she didn't know whether she could evaluate his performance one way or the other and that she wasn't going to assume any responsibility for removing him from that position. And now, within minutes, she tells me that there was some question of competence as between the outgoing Commissioner and the incoming one. Mr. Chairman, I have to say, I'm completely confused now.

**MRS. PRICE:** It isn't a decision that I made; I didn't know the gentlemen; the people that were here, the former MLAs and the Premier knew the capabilities of the two gentlemen and I would say that they thought that Mr. Newton's were overshadowing Mr. Duncan's. I never met the individual; I never met Mr. Newton before either, so I can't place judgment on either of the gentlemen.

**MR. USKIW:** We now have the admission from the Minister as to why all this is taking place. She has told us in this Committee that it is the MLAs now that have had an input into deciding who shall be the Commissioner of the Civil Service. Mr. Chairman, I find that extremely interesting because I don't ever recall MLAs participating in Cabinet decision-making in the appointment of Deputies or Directors or whatever it would be at those senior positions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa on a point of order.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Yes. The Member for Lac du Bonnet is reading something into her statements. The MLAs that were in the House previously ended up in the Cabinet . . .

**MR. USKIW:** That's not a point of order.

**MR. BLAKE:** . . . and I'm sure that's what the Minister is referring to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's not a point of order. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. BLAKE:** Sorry about that, Mr. Chairman, I'll make sure that I have a proper point of order next time.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister just indicated a moment ago, and if I am wrong I am prepared to be corrected, but as I heard her statement she said that the information and advice came from her MLAs, or the MLAs of the Conservative caucus, and that that was the basis for the hiring of Mr. Newton and the basis for letting go perhaps the previous commissioner. Now that is not the way that I perceive government operating, Mr. Chairman, and I don't believe that that is the way it is structurally set up to function. It is the Premier and the Cabinet who determine the senior positions — who they are, the salary range, the terms of reference for the positions, and now we find for the first time, I presume, in decades or maybe ever, Mr. Chairman, that the MLAs are now making these decisions. And they are not answerable, Mr. Chairman, other than to their constituents. They are not here in a position where we could cross-examine them, question their contribution to the government process. I can't understand how this government is functioning, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, what I was referring to, and I thought that it would be understood, some of them were former Cabinet Ministers, others had just been MLAs and are now Cabinet Ministers. But they were here and knew the functioning of the two individuals.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister's answers unfortunately raise some questions because I think that she's not particularly accurate when she talks about the functions of the Commission and that of the full-time Commissioner. Now, I think that there is a Civil Service Commission and on that Commission sit a number of people. That Commission has a Chairman. I believe that Chairman in the past used to be Mr. Schubert. I do not believe that Mr. Duncan was Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. That was someone else. I don't know who the present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission is. Could the Minister tell me who that is right now.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Newton is the Chairman of the Commission.

**MR. PARASIUKE:** Is it correct that Mr. Schubert used to be the Chairman of the Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** When the Chairman was a part-time Chairman.

**MR. PARASIUKE:** So Mr. Schubert used to be the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Duncan was then the full-time Commissioner. There were part-time Commissioners and there was one full-time Commissioner. The full-time Commissioner was Mr. Duncan. Now, the Minister has said that Mr. Duncan was let go as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He never was. I assume then that she means that Mr. Schubert was let go as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and that at some time Mr. Newton replaced Mr. Schubert as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Also at some time Mr. Duncan was terminated, or fired, as full-time Commissioner of the Civil Service. He couldn't be fired as a Commissioner of the Civil Service. That would require a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. So what happened was that he was fired as full-time Commissioner of the Civil Service. Could she tell us when Mr. Duncan was fired as full-time Commissioner of the Civil Service?

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't know the exact date but his full-time work was reduced to part-time some time in October.

**MR. PARASIUKE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm of the impression, and I think the Minister can produce the documentation to confirm this, that her departmental accountant sent Mr. Duncan a letter either December 12th or December 16th. Now it's important that you note those dates — it's in December, not in October, in December — and this is a letter from her departmental accountant to Mr. Duncan since it came from her department because the Minister is the employing authority of the full-time Civil Service Commissioner. She is the employing authority so the letter didn't come from the Premier; it came from someone supposedly authorized by her as Minister. I came from her department, the department which she is responsible for and accountable for to the Legislature. This letter came from her department. Could she tell us when the letter was sent to Mr. Duncan and what its contents were?

**MRS. PRICE:** The letter that the Member for Transcona is referring to on December 16th to Mr. Duncan by one of the departmental accountants was a routine payroll matter which was required to make it possible for the ultimate payment of superannuation funds to Mr. Duncan. Mr. Duncan had informed the Commission as early as October, 1977, that he was not interested in another Civil Service position but would appreciate it if arrangements could be made for him to receive his early retirement and the benefits. This matter was discussed with Mr. Duncan's solicitor who, it is understood, later made contact with the Civil Service Superannuation Board. It was deemed necessary to sever Mr. Duncan's association with the Civil Service in order to facilitate the liberation of pension funds for him. Mr. Duncan has been receiving his pension since April 1st, 1978.

**MR. PARASIUKE:** So, Mr. Chairman, what we're finding out is that Mr. Duncan who was full-time Civil Service Commissioner, was terminated as full-time Civil Service Commissioner according to the documentation, not according to any verbal statements but according to documentation, December 16, 1978. The letter says, "Two weeks' pay in lieu of notice." Now, according to the way the Civil Service, the public service of Manitoba, operates, two weeks' pay in lieu of notice is a termination. That is when Mr. Duncan was terminated, and I don't know if that's for routine payroll accounts or what. This is a very important item when a Civil Service Commissioner is terminated or fired, and I don't know if it's handled, frankly in such a sloppy manner, where someone is sent a letter by someone internally within the department saying, "Please accept your payroll cheque. Here it is. It's in lieu of two weeks' notice." That is the official termination, and I think

that the documentation that the Minister has would confirm that that is the official termination date. Is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's debatable whether that letter even had to be sent, but it was sent on the advice of Mr. Tallin, our legislative counsel, to Mr. Goo.

**MR. PARASIUK:** No, to Mr. Duncan. You're getting the firings confused, I think.

**MRS. PRICE:** There was a suggestion from Mr. Tallin to Mr. Goodison that the letter be sent. If you like I can read you the memo from Mr. Tallin to Mr. Goodison.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Please.

**MRS. PRICE:** "I think that the change in Doug Duncan's position on the Civil Service from full-time employment to part-time employment should be for the purposes of the Employment Standards Act as termination of employment. This would mean that Section 35 of the Employment Standards Act would apply and Mr. Duncan would be entitled to not less than two weeks' notice of termination, or two weeks' pay in lieu of notice. For the purposes of the Unemployment Insurance termination information slip you should indicate that two weeks' wages were being paid on termination and that amount should be offered to Mr. Duncan at this present time." If Mr. Duncan hadn't received the termination then he wouldn't have been able to start collecting his superannuation. That's the only way that he could, and he requested it.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, what we're finding out, I think, is that the legal counsel recommended to the Government of Manitoba in order to clarify any procedure that possibly wasn't followed with respect to the letter of the law which possibly could have been illegal, or conceivably just was administratively counter to the Administrative Manual, that this letter be sent out and that, from what the Legislative Counsel says, is the actual termination. That is the termination, it's December 16th, and I think that does bring into question the entire way in which Mr. Duncan was terminated, and this is quite ironic, Mr. Chairman, because we are talking about ensuring that the Civil Service operates properly and we find that he was improperly released, improperly terminated and legal counsel, who was acting, thankfully, on behalf of the people of Manitoba because the full-time Commissioner is responsible, ultimately, to the Legislature. It was the Legal Counsel of the Legislature that sent a letter advising the government as to how it could clear up the mess of its improperly terminating Mr. Duncan. And the point is then that if the Legal Counsel has said that this was necessary as of December 16, 1978, raises tremendous questions about how he was terminated, whether this was done fairly, and I assume that that is something that Mr. Duncan will in fact be pursuing with the means that he has at his disposal, because at this stage it would appear that he was improperly terminated.

It also raises the question of who was operating as the administrative head of the Civil Service Commission from October 24 to December 16, the legal date on which Mr. Duncan was terminated. Was anyone appointed full-time Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission from October 24 to December 16, 1978?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I might mention to the Member for Transcona that earlier the Member for St. Johns asked the Minister a number of questions relating to Mr. Duncan, and at that time she said that she was of the opinion, meaning the Minister, that those questions should be answered by the First Minister, the Premier, and that she was not in a position to elaborate any further on Mr. Duncan, and so why I'm mentioning this to you is that the Member for St. Johns did ask the Minister a number of questions relating to Mr. Duncan, and so some of your questions have been asked already. Whether they have been answered satisfactorily or not, I can't . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, you know, with all due respect, I was sitting through those questions. They were questions about assessment of Mr. Duncan and the present Minister, who is responsible for the Civil Service Commission, has said that although she is responsible she couldn't answer the questions and that somehow the Premier would have to answer those particular questions. Now, I'm not asking questions of that type; I'm asking questions regarding how the full-time Civil Service Commissioner was terminated. I'm asking question that relate directly to her legal responsibility as Minister responsible for The Civil Service Act. It's not the First Minister who is responsible for The Civil Service Act; it's the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Now, if you are saying that we can't ask questions pertaining to her responsibilities, and if she is saying that she will duck her accountability to us in that respect by just saying, "Well, ask that of the First Minister," I think that's quite unfair of her, and I don't think she means that. I think that she is

Monday, June 19, 1978

willing to answer questions pertaining to her responsibilities. And the only questions I'm asking is, who was the full-time Civil Service Commissioner as of October 24? Was anyone else appointed full-time Civil Service Commissioner between October 24 and December 16? She was appointed Minister October 24; surely she would know if someone was appointed as her full-time administrative head between October 24 and December 16. That is something that I don't expect the First Minister to know; that is something that I expect the Minister responsible for the department to know. Can she tell me if anyone was appointed full-time Civil Service Commissioner between October 24 and December 16?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before the Minister responds, I might mention to the Member for Transcona that the reason for my comment was for guidance. I never made any reference to repetition or anything else; I just was pointing out to him the series of questions that were asked by one of his colleagues, the Member for St. Johns, and the fact that the Minister said that she was not in a position to answer some of those questions. So it was strictly for guidance.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister.

**MRS. PRICE:** Merlin Newton was appointed the Commissioner at the same time that Mr. Duncan was demoted and he was hired on a six-month basis and he has extended it until the end of the session, as he said.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, can we get dates on that? Could she tell us when Mr. Newton was appointed full-time Civil Service Commissioner?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I can get the date for you.

**MR. USKIW:** Could she also tell us when Mr. Duncan was fired as full-time Civil Service Commissioner? I think it's very important. We may find that we had two supposed full-time Civil Service Commissioners if you follow the letter of the law and if you follow the law.

Secondly, could she tell us when the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission was terminated or just removed from that position as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission? Can she also tell us when Mr. Newton was appointed as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission replacing Mr. Schubert?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I will get the exact dates for the Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I think the information provided by the Minister to date indicates that I don't think she was clear about the structure, operations and responsibilities of her department, the one that we are presently reviewing, and I think it is very important that the Minister responsible acquaint herself fully with those operations and know exactly what the divisions of responsibility are between the Minister, the Civil Service Commission, and the full-time Commissioner. I think it's very important that she acquaint herself fully with The Civil Service Act. It may turn out that Mr. Duncan was illegally fired; it may turn out that The Civil Service Act has been contravened.

I think it's quite important also for the Minister on taking a portfolio, and if she is assigned another portfolio some time in the future, I hope she would sit down immediately with the senior staff of that department in order to be briefed on what the division of responsibilities is. She is telling us that she hasn't met with the Civil Service Commission . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I did not say that — I said I haven't met with the Board. I've met with the Commissioner and the senior members of the Commission.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has the right to interrupt I certainly would like a reciprocal right to interrupt her when she is speaking. The point is, I said very clearly that she didn't meet with the Commission — I didn't say Commissioner; I said the Civil Service Commission — and there is a distinction between the two. There is a definite distinction between the two that the Minister doesn't recognize or understand. The Civil Service Commission is a Board, it's a board of people who hear appeals and generally comment on the conduct of the Civil Service Commission. There is a full-time member of that Commission who is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Civil Service, and that's the Commissioner. Now, she hasn't met with the Commission; she is indicating that she didn't meet with Mr. Duncan, and yet, if you look at the Act, it would appear that between October 24, 1977 and December 16, 1977, the termination date of Mr. Duncan, she

has admitted that she didn't meet with Mr. Duncan. She didn't feel it imperative for her to meet with the head of that department to ask that person what the status of that department was, what the activities were, what the division of responsibilities between the Minister, Civil Service Commission, full-time Commissioner and staff of the Civil Service, might be; what the division of responsibilities between those bodies and management committee might be, and there is some confusion and it's very important to try and determine the differences in roles and responsibility. I think that what happened is that the Minister might have heard some negative things said about Mr. Duncan and decided to avoid him, but in avoiding the full-time Commissioner, I think she didn't get a clear enough and accurate enough impression of what her functions were as Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

I don't know if she met with Mr. Newton in that interval between October 24, 1977 and December 16, 1977 — that's a period of about seven or eight weeks. And if you can recall, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of other civil servants with full Civil Service rights under The Civil Service Act who were fired during that period of time. I don't know who was observing what went on at that time. Certainly the Minister wasn't that closely involved; certainly the full-time — legally full-time — Civil Service Commissioner wasn't involved. The Minister wouldn't meet with that person and I think that we had a vacuum for seven or eight weeks, and that's very critical, if we've had that vacuum because there were a number of civil servants who were fired.

So I think rather than trying to make the Civil Service operate properly, I think what's happened is that the Civil Service has been treated very improperly; I think the Commission itself has been undercut. I think that the status of civil servants in Manitoba under The Civil Service Act has been put under a cloud, and I think it is very important for the Minister, before she casts stones about what was taking place in the past, to very carefully review her own behaviour and the behaviour of her government and her colleagues with respect to the Civil Service Commissioner and with respect to the full-time Commissioner, and determine whether in fact there was anything that was done that was illegal or anything that was improper with respect to the procedures of the administrative manual, because this could have very, very serious repercussions right down the line with respect to every one of those civil servants who may have been improperly fired, and it also will have tremendous repercussions with respect to the case of the deposed or terminated full-time Civil Service Commissioner, when I think he seeks to get some redress from the government for its improper way of firing him.

**MRS. PRICE:** I understand that it is on a very rare occasion that my predecessor or anyone else in a ministerial position has been meeting with the Board. They have worked through the Commissioner and the senior staff, such as I have done. The Board meets something like once a month in an evening and they bring their findings to the Commissioner and I, in turn, have met with them, so I don't think there is any more neglect now than there has been in the past.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, you know, I find it really surprising . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just before the Member for Transcona carries on, it's 4:30, and in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

I have on the list the Members for Transcona, St. George, Selkirk and Winnipeg Centre as . . .

## SUPPLY — DEPT. OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN****Mr. Abe Kovnats:** I would direct the honourable members to Page 64, Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. Resolution No. 95, 1. General Administration — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, in tabling the Estimates for the Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, I would like to inform the House of the following minor errors in the printing of the Estimates. On Page 63, the last line of 1977-78 Estimates reads \$40,692,300.00; it should read, Mr. Chairman, \$40,962,300. The same transposition of figures occurs on Page 68; on the left-hand side of the bottom line, it reads \$40,692,300, and it should read \$40,962,300.00.

In presenting the Estimates, I would like to advise the honourable members that the Estimates presented for the Year Ending March 31st, 1978, were presented as the Department of Northern Affairs, and separately, as the Department of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. For the Year Ending March 31st, 1979, the Estimates of these departments are submitted in a combined form as authorized by Management Committee of Cabinet, and the Department of Finance,



and as shown on Page 63.

To reconcile, the Statement on Page 63 indicates the 1977-78 Main Estimates of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services; Allocation of General Salary Increase to these departments in the Allocation of funds from Canada-Manttoba DREE Agreements to both departments. Transfers of functions which have been made in preparing the Main Estimates from the 1978-79 year indicate that C \$554,600 budgeted during the 1977-78 year for the community Planning Services was transferred in the budget exercise to the Department of Municipal Affairs. An amount of \$100,600 budgeted in the 1977-78 Department of Northern Affairs Estimates for financial co-ordination of DREE Agreements was transferred during the budget exercise, to the Department of Finance.

Similarly, an amount of \$200,000 and 12 staff man years for the Home Advisory Program, budgeted under Northern Affairs, was transferred to the Department of Health and Social Development. The transfer of these functions results in a 1977-78 Adjusted Vote for both departments of \$33,487,800, to which Schedule "B" voted in The Loan Act of 1977 in the amount of \$3,431,600 for Northern Affairs, and \$1,806,300 under General Development Agreement, and \$2,236,600 under Renewable Resources, adds to a total Reconciliation of the 1977-78 Estimates of the corrected figure that I gave you, being \$40,962,300.00.

On the basis of the Reconciliation provided in the Estimates, which include for the first time Capital Budgets noted as Item No. 9, Construction of Physical Assets, the total for Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, is \$34,340,800, as compared to the previous year's budget of \$40,962,300.00.

I would also advise that all services provided by the two departments in the Year Ending March 31st, 1978, with the exception of the Municipal Planning function the DREE financial co-ordination and the Home Advisory Program, which represented \$845,200, are now provided under one or all of the divisional structures displayed in the Estimates.

I would advise that the combined budget and the structure of the departments was arrived at through a detailed review of programming including in many areas, application of the principle of zero-based budgeting. I hope that the members will be prepared to review the Estimates in detail, and that I will be able to readily answer and demonstrate the organizational changes that have been affected in the department. At the same time, I hope that the honourable members will bear with me because of major changes and shifts that have been necessitated by providing a consolidation of divisional responsibilities and financial control, which were necessitated by certain overlapping of functions and objectives in the two departments, and unfavourable reports of the Provincial Auditor in the operation and accountability in certain areas. I hope that these remarks will not be construed as a blanket criticism of the administration of the department, or any person connected thereto. I merely mention them as being factual observations and recommendations on which the department has taken effective action to correct.

Regarding the policy changes which may be reflected by the budget Estimates, I have already made observations on the programs and functions that were transferred to other departments and pointed out that all services previously provided by the two departments are provided now by one or other divisions within the two departments. Policy changes reflecting directly on the budget in the area of fish and wildlife include a substantial reduction in Capital Budget Allowances for Land Acquisition and for wildlife purposes. It is the intent and the policy of the department to co-operate as much as possible with private landowners in creating and maintaining wildlife habitat. This is of particular importance in the southwestern part of the province where 90 percent - plus of lands are privately held.

The department has also adopted a policy of carrying out fishermen's training in local communities which resulted in the closure of the National Training Centre, a facility which has served to train some Lake Winnipeg fishermen in the past, but which we feel has now served its purpose and would require extensive travel costs, and operating costs, to service northern and remote fishermen.

In the area of Resource Development and Employee Services, the department has adopted policies which would permit ownership and management of certain Crown corporations by private interests. This measure has tended to reduce substantially the administrative and overhead costs formerly borne by the departments in this area.

In Administration, the department has moved effectively to consolidate two rather large administration groups and to adopt streamlined accounting audit functions, vouchering procedures and financial control.

In Construction and Transportation, the department has moved to rationalize and review the northern transportation infrastructure and a report to be prepared jointly with DREE and due in September of this year will provide additional direction to these programs.

The department has, in keeping with policies of the present government, adopted a policy of restraint on air travel resulting in a reduction of approximately 45 percent in aircraft usage by employees of government and a proportionate decrease in the number of aircraft and personnel

in air division has been made accordingly. Further measures will include the examination of the total requirements of the division, its method of operation and the most economic means of meeting the transportation needs of the province.

In Community Services, the department has effected a major consolidation of the structures formerly established and established a regional system which will encompass all aspects of services to northern and remote communities.

The department has, through a process of operational review and elimination of duplication, established a more uniform and tailored management structure where previously the departments were served by a Deputy Minister, two Associate Deputy Ministers, three Assistant Deputy Ministers and four positions equivalent to Assistant Deputy Ministers. The new structure will include one Deputy Minister, two Assistant Deputy Ministers, and seven senior Directors. These changes will, in addition to reducing the heavy upper and middle-level management structures borne previously, result in a focussing of authority, responsibility and accountability within the two departments.

Finally, the department has moved effectively to exercise restraints in all areas of its operation and to assist in the overall need of the province to reduce its expenditure, staffing and unwanted or unneeded programming.

I would like at this moment, Mr. Chairman, to acknowledge the positive attitude and the dedication of many of the people within the department who have demonstrated a willingness and a positive attitude towards improving the level of efficiency and services of this department.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)(2) Salaries and Wages—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments to the introductory remarks that in the . . .

**MR. JORGENSON:** That first item has now been passed over and we're on the Administrative item. I would not want my honourable friend to assume that he can speak now on the Minister's Salary, because that is not the case.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, in every other Estimates of every other department the people on this side of the House have in fact commented on the Minister's instructions. Is the Minister now enforcing some kind of closure against their own procedures that have been carried on in other Estimates?

**MR. JORGENSON:** No, Mr. Chairman, that has always been the practice. The item that my honourable friend can speak on is the following item, the Administrative item, not the Minister's Salary; that is the last item that is discussed, and my honourable friend should know that; he's been in this House long enough to understand that.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I've been here long enough to know that the Honourable Government House Leader is often incorrect in what he says in the House, and so that's why I question what he says now, whether it is correct or not. I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that in the past the members on this side of the House have had considerable latitude after the Minister's introductory remarks, to make comments on the Minister's introductory remarks, and I'd like you to so rule if that's not the situation.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I will . . .

**MR. McBRYDE:** If he's now changed the procedure.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I will repeat again.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** The rule, as stated in the Rule Book, if my honourable friend will take care to look at it, suggests that the Minister introduces his Estimates on the first item, that is, Item 95, 1.(a), then that item is delayed and my honourable friend then has an opportunity to make a few comments on Item 1.(b) Administrative Support Services. But I assume, Mr. Chairman, and you neglected to indicate, that we are on Item 1.(b). Item 1.(a) is not passed; it is simply delayed until the end of the Estimates, and that's the last item that is considered. I just want that

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are now considering . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable members of the House. On all the other Estimates that we have gone through, after the Minister's introductory statements we have moved to the very next item, which is Salaries and Wages, but not on the Minister's Compensation. We are on item (a)(2) Salaries and Wages — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** There was a point of order on the floor and I wanted to speak to it before you said anything, and in speaking to it I'd like to quote from the Debates and Proceedings, Page 3250, in the Estimates of the Department of Labour, and I quote from the Chairman of that Committee, on that page: "I would say to you and other members, the Minister, like most Ministers, makes an opening statement which embraces all aspects of their particular department, and then what we usually do is go to the critic for the opposition, and that person sort of responds to that opening statement. What we have been doing in a number of other department Estimates is sort of going to everybody on the opposition who wishes to respond to that opening statement, and then from that point on we try to allow the items in the booklet item by item. We don't always succeed in following them item by item, but that is our wish, according to the Chairman, your colleague in the other departments." Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to make that response within the context of the item before us, but I do intend to respond to the statements of the Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I have no objection to my honourable friend responding, but he's going to be responding on the next item, which has been customary since the rules were adopted in 1975, and I don't know why he insists on changing the rules at this stage because the practice has been, always, that once the Minister introduces his Estimates we move on to the next item and then at the conclusion of the Estimates, after all the items are passed, then we move back to the first item and open discussion then is held on that particular item. But on the Administrative item, my honourable friend can, and that's the proper occasion, when he makes the remarks that he now chooses to make. And I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's Salary now be delayed or deferred until the conclusion of the consideration of the Estimates, when we will come back to it; that's all I'm suggesting; I'm not attempting to preclude my honourable friend from making whatever remarks he chooses to make, but he will not make them on this particular item.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I intended to do, and I'm not sure now why the member spoke at all or raised the point at all, because all he did was repeat the procedure that everyone understands and which it appeared that he didn't understand when he first spoke. So, Mr. Chairman, in addressing myself to the first item and the remarks of the Minister in his opening statement, I want to talk, Mr. Chairman, on the general administration of the department since the coming into office of this government, the general administration of the department since the coming into office of this particular Minister.

Mr. Chairman, there are three main points I want to make in discussing this item and in discussing the opening comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs, and what I want to do, Mr. Chairman, is trace how the present Minister of Northern Affairs and Resources has sold out northern Manitoba in his administration of this department, how the present Minister of Northern Affairs and Resources has misled the people in regard to what's been happening, and that the present Minister of Northern Affairs has completely mismanaged this department and, Mr. Chairman, in order to do this, since there are so many examples that I have to give, I decided that probably the easiest approach would be to proceed in chronological order in terms of what has been happening with the Department of Northern Affairs and Resources since last October.

One of the first items that was dealt with by the new Minister of Northern Affairs was the shutdown of the Easterville Harvesting Company. The Easterville Harvesting Company, Mr. Chairman, was created through close field co-operation of the two then separate departments of Northern Affairs through the extension services, and then with assistance from the Resources in the actual setup and management of a fence post harvesting operation in agreement with ManFor at that particular time. Mr. Chairman, this was one of those ventures in northern Manitoba where it was not 100 percent economically viable if you only considered the economics of that operation. It's one of those operations where the previous administration had a cost benefit study done in terms of the total cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba, and the conclusion of that study was that the operation was indeed beneficial or passed a social cost benefit analysis in terms of the total cost to the people of Manitoba. The very first action taken by the department, even slightly before the taking of office by the new government, was the shutting down of that operation, the phasing down of that operation

and then the total shutdown of that operation.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the many examples where we will see that the economic activity, the close down of jobs available in particular communities, has had serious effects on the community, and in fact, an increase in costs, an increase to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba, and therefore, is mismanagement of the department and of this particular project. Shortly after this operation was shut down, the department worked with the people there, and the community worked with the department to try and see if there were ways that could be found to continue the operation. This was not possible; there were some problems in regard to the sale of fence posts because the market did decline quite drastically after the initial start-up of the operation and the department took some time to find markets within the United States, but this they finally did, having the treatment done in other areas of the province.

Mr. Chairman, this January and February, there was a special meeting in the community of Easterville to deal with all the delinquency, all the crime, and the crimes of violence and aggression in that community. Mr. Chairman, I would say that in this case and in other cases that we will look at during the examination of these Estimates, that the lack of economic development, the lack of employment, is a direct cause of social disruption and social problems which in the end cost the people of Manitoba more money, more money than a subsidy would cost to continue this kind of economic development operation.

The next example of the efficient administration by the present Minister of Northern Affairs, was the classic case of the missing tapes. When there was a general meeting at Thompson, Manitoba, on the INCO closure, the Municipal Affairs Department instructed the Department of Education to keep track of these proceedings, because they were concerned about Thompson and the fate of Thompson, through the use of videotapes. The Minister felt it necessary, after appearing on the tape on Sunday, to rush into the office on Monday morning and take the tapes away from the FOCUS office in Thompson and bring them to the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, I was not at that meeting, but I understand that the Minister did not look very good on those tapes and that is probably the main reason why the tapes were removed from the office and not available to people in Thompson.

The next example, Mr. Chairman, is the problem of the senior staff within the Department of Northern Affairs. As the Minister mentioned in his opening remarks on the executive administration of the department, there was a Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs and there were a number of other persons who would be classified as ADMs although that's not the official classification that they had. None of these people were political people, none of them were politically active but all were executive people within the Department of Northern Affairs, having the function of Deputy Minister, or head of the local government development, or head of engineering services, or responsibility for the northern manpower corps, each one at an ADM level. Professional civil servants whom the Minister for some reason found the necessity to force out of the department; to force them out of his department because for some reason they had been effective civil servants when the NDP were in office, and I can see no other reason for him taking that step, taking that move with the senior staff. Mr. Chairman, I think that the effectiveness of these senior staff can be shown in that all of them were immediately offered jobs with other governments in other senior positions, but in fact two or three of these people chose to opt out of government services because they were being forced out of the department, and go into private industry. Two of them are doing very successfully now in private industry and they tell me they find it very easy to operate in private industry and that they are able to make considerable money operating in that regard. The others, as I mentioned, have accepted the senior administrative positions with other government departments.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps because these senior people were forced out, and forced out shortly after the coming to office of the present Minister, these people who had served the Province of Manitoba for some time and had done a good job in carrying out the functions assigned to them, and who had been involved in the executive of the department and in the decision-making level of the Department of Northern Affairs, it is perhaps because these people were forced out or undermined or had people placed over top of them, that we now see many mistakes and many problems, administrative and management problems, within the Department of Northern Affairs and within the Department of Resources. And some of those mistakes will come to light as we proceed with the consideration of these Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

In some sort of chronological order, the next item that the present Minister had to deal with was the Churchill Prefab Housing Plant which had operated for many years. In fact, when making his announcement on the closure of the plant, the Minister did not have the correct date for the start-up in the operation of the Churchill Prefab Housing Plant, which was initiated by the citizens of Churchill. The citizens of Churchill came to the Provincial Government and said there is a redevelopment going on in our community, there is to be a redevelopment of Churchill; the province and the Federal Government have signed an agreement for the redevelopment of Churchill, and

we don't want to be left out of the employment, we don't want to be left out of this development, as has been the case in the past when outside contractors have come into Churchill and carried out most of the work to be done in Churchill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in conjunction and co-operation with the people of Churchill, we began to move into the area of prefab housing in the community of Churchill and providing employment for a considerable number of people in that community who had not previously had steady employment, who had not previously had steady employment, people that had basically been dependent on the government for a number of years, especially those who were relocated from remote areas into the community of Churchill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there were initial problems with the operation of that plant. The manager hired for the operation of the plant was a local contractor. The workload and the number of houses to be constructed increased at a rate, I believe, that was beyond the managerial capacity. Although he was very capable of the small operation, when the negotiation of large contracts came in, there were considerable losses experienced by the Churchill Prefab Plant. Those were about three years ago, Mr. Chairman, three to four years ago when the fairly substantial losses took place in the operation of that plant.

At that time the Department of Northern Affairs asked the Provincial Auditor, made a request of the Provincial Auditor, to come in and assist us in resetting up the administrative mechanism and the control mechanisms within the operation of that plant and external consultants were hired to assist in the control of that plant and in the estimating and bidding operation of the Churchill Prefab Plant. So in the last two years the operation operated at fairly near, fairly near a break-even point but still had losses from the previous years that had to be dealt with.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the government made a decision to close down the operation. In this case, the basic decision was to close down the operation because the subsidy that was given to the operation — and the subsidy was basically, Mr. Chairman, in the form of manpower training grants that were cost-shared 60 percent by the Federal Government and 40 percent by the Provincial Government — because they no longer wished to pay a small subsidy in order to keep people employed, in order to keep people contributing through their income tax, in order to keep people productive in the community of Churchill.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat ironic that the present Minister of Northern Affairs got very upset when the CBC was going to close down their station, their local station, in the community of Churchill. The Minister of Northern Affairs made protest to the Federal Government and the Federal Government said, "Well, it's more efficient to move the operation out of Churchill. It will cost a little less money to move the operation out of Churchill." Mr. Chairman, for the sake of some assistance or some subsidy to the Churchill Prefab Plant this Minister made a decision to close down that operation and, Mr. Chairman, the results in Churchill are the same and will be the same when the final close-down takes place as in other remote communities where people do not have the opportunity to be employed, where people do not have the opportunity to work productively and contribute to the society in which they live.

Mr. Chairman I'm not sure I got the chronological order in place but one of the things that happened then in the Department and in the government as a whole, was the implementation of a Task Force, the task force to look at overall government operation. Mr. Chairman, that overall task force caused a considerable amount of slow down of production within the government services in the Province of Manitoba as people began to become concerned over what was going to happen to their job, what was going to happen to their department, what was going to happen to their section of the operation. When people are in that situation, they just don't produce any more. They spend most of the time trying to protect themselves and ensure that they have some form of continued employment.

The other thing that happens, Mr. Chairman, is that there are many people who, because of this insecurity, then start to run to the Minister or run to the Task Force and try and beat out their colleagues and their fellow civil servants by somehow spreading tales or suck-holing or whatever method they find that might be the most effective in terms of maintaining their own job or attempting to ensure their promotion.

But, Mr. Chairman, the biggest insult to the people of northern Manitoba came in the Task Force Report, the Report on Government Organization and Economy, Volume II, April, 1978, Page 124. Mr. Chairman, this is talking about the local government development, the aspect of the Department of Northern Affairs to assist remote communities for the first time to move into their own local municipal government in northern Manitoba and the Task Force, in their enlightened review, and in their one-page summary of the Department of Northern Affairs, have a sentence in there in the last paragraph which goes: "The local government development division appears to be the case of too much, too soon. Services to the communities should continue but at a reduced level, one which local communities can absorb and accept."

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I would be too strong in using certain words to describe that Task

Force Report in relation to the northern communities but what it says is that the people in northern Manitoba are incapable, in the remote communities are incapable of running their own communities. They are incapable of running their own communities. They can do it in the City of Winnipeg or they can do it in Mo den or they can do it in The Pas, or they can do it in the Local Government District of Piney, but in remote northern communities, people are incapable of running their own affairs. Mr. Chairman, I think that shows the southern bias and the ignorance of people who dealt in the Task Force Report to have, Mr. Chairman, what some might call a racial statement like that included, that the people were incapable of providing their own municipal services and their own local self-government in the communities of northern Manitoba. That's basically what the report says and that's basically the tone of the report when it comes to the Department of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, then came the big move by the Minister of Northern Affairs, the move by the Minister of Northern Affairs to consolidate himself in the Cabinet of Premier Lyon, the First Minister, to show that he was a tough and driving Minister and to show that he could make cuts within his own department. This is the action of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, where I say it was basically a sell-out of northern Manitoba. Of all the departments in the Government of Manitoba, the Department of Northern Affairs and Resources were hit harder than any other department in the government and the people of northern Manitoba had more services cut, had more services eliminated or exterminated, had more services reduced than any other geographical region in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but I have to lay the blame squarely on the Minister of Northern Affairs and Resources for that action. He took that action, he supported that action and he cut programs that served especially the remote communities in northern Manitoba.

But, Mr. Chairman, here comes the inexperience, the problems that arise because he got rid of so many of the executive people. They didn't even fire the people correctly within the department. They had to send out a firing letter, a correction, "Re: Firing Letter. You were fired but you were fired incorrectly. Here is your new letter of being fired." And they had to send out a new letter because they couldn't even fire people correctly and had to make corrections in the original letter. Mr. Chairman, at that time, this Minister of Northern Affairs, who ran on a program, who ran on a platform and his slogan was: "There when you need him." That was his slogan and, Mr. Chairman, there were many citizens in the community of Thompson who needed their MLA and needed the Minister and they could not get ahold of him. For a couple of weeks he was not available to the constituents of Thompson who attempted time and time again to reach him, who apparently stayed away from the phone or had his telephone disconnected but he was just not there when people in Thompson, people in northern Manitoba needed him. Mr. Chairman, I don't blame him that much. With that kind of action, with the kind of action taken by the Minister, I would hide for a while too. I think I would have to hide for a while too if I was to take that kind of action that affected one area of the province and one group of people in the province more than any other area of the province.

Mr. Chairman, this was not a question of improving the efficiency, improving the effectiveness of government operation, this was a straight matter of eliminating programs and reducing programs. That is how positions were eliminated and how people were let go.

The next matter that came before the consideration of the new Minister of Northern Affairs was the Pakwagan log milling operation at Wabowden and the Minister's decision was to also attempt to sell that operation. The Minister was to make a decision on the bids for that operation three weeks ago and we are still waiting for the Minister to announce or come to a decision on that particular operation. What he's doing though, Mr. Chairman, by delaying this long, I mean, basically that operation is going to survive it appears economically on the basis of producing logs for log cabins in the Thompson region, that would be their main market, and outside of the Thompson region, and certainly we have already produced a number of logs for cabins that are built. I know there are some in my constituency and the Flin Flon constituency and some in the Thompson constituency that have been produced. But, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister doesn't make a decision pretty soon, they are going to lose the whole year's operation in terms of producing logs for the log cabins because the construction season and the time necessary to prepare the logs will soon be too short and so the new owner will be put into a difficult position of really having to wait a year before he has firm sales and is able to operate in the black in terms of that operation. Again, Mr. Chairman, it was an operation that required some subsidization and there was not a complete study done, a complete social cost-benefit analysis completed on the Pakwagan operation and I know that the Minister does not have those kind of figures or that kind of information in terms of a detailed cost-benefit analysis when you consider the other costs to the Province of Manitoba if this operation is shut down or sold out.

The next decision that faced the Minister was the future of Minago Contractors. Minago Contractors, a small Crown corporation, set up initially to do clearing operations at Jenpeg, to clear the bush there and to provide a vehicle for training and to provide a vehicle for the employment

of northern native people. It was quite capably set up and managed in the early days by one Cecil Smith, an employee of the Department of Northern Affairs, later to become a Conservative MP for the constituency of Churchill, Mr. Chairman, and I think that the success of this operation might have helped him in his campaign for election to the House of Commons, the fact that he was in fact a manager of an operation that when it was cutting, when it was clearing the forebay near the community of Cross Lake, had 96 percent native people on staff. The kitchen staff, the whole crew, were native people and at night time, the same machines were used for training programs for Keewatin Community College. Mr. Chairman, that operation, the Minister, without, without I say, real information, and it must have been without information for when I questioned the Minister in the House, he didn't know the answers. He didn't know that in the report that he himself tabled in this Legislature the company had made a profit. He wasn't aware of that. I don't know if he didn't read the report before he tabled it. When I questioned him on it, he didn't know. When I questioned him on the value of the assets of Minago Construction when he had made the decision to sell it, I asked him if the assets were worth nearly a million dollars. He said, "I would question the honourable member's statistics, Mr. Speaker," and sat down again. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I used, turned out to be quite correct. The auction sale of the assets of that company has been completed and the assets were over \$1 million, \$1 million of assets built up over four to five years of operation in northern Manitoba, assets built up employing native people in northern Manitoba.

That operation also then expanded into road building and there was one contract where that operation lost money. Mr. Chairman, I think that anyone involved in this kind of venture learns from each experience and in that case there was split management. We had two projects going at the same time. One project lost money. As a result of that, the project manager was let go and the general manager was let go. The project manager of the successful project became the general project manager and is a person still involved in northern Manitoba. I think that the people who had the opportunity to be employed through Minago Construction Contractors, the people who had the opportunity to be employed through Minago Construction, the contractors, the people who had the opportunity to be trained by them owe some thanks to Mr. Jim Benoit, who did a good job as the general manager of that operation, who had the operation turn a profit, \$84,000, the last report that we had, and built up assets in that company of over \$1 million. Mr. Chairman, that million dollars is now being put into the general revenue or general coffers and I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, how that money will be used, whether it will be used to reduce the deficit of the present government or to make it look like they are somehow more effectively managing the affairs of Manitoba, because there is another million dollars there that they can put in the books as revenue. But, Mr. Chairman, that money has been lost; that money has been lost to the people of northern Manitoba; it has been lost to the economic development and employment creation in northern Manitoba and, Mr. Chairman, I don't even think that the Minister understood, knew about, or comprehended the operation of Minago Contractors when he made a decision to sell it. It was a decision made without the proper information, without the proper backup, and a decision made in haste, and not a rational decision in terms of the performance and the opportunity.

The Minister said that one reason why we're selling that is because there are no more contracts, and a few days after the auction — or was it a few days before the auction, I can't remember — the government called tenders for the remaining 17 miles of the Moose Lake Road that Minago Contractors had worked on; excuse me, the remaining 15 miles. Minago had already completed the first 17-½ miles of that road, had a camp set up, was employing people from Moose Lake, was employing people from Cormorant, was employing native people from the community of The Pas, and the Minister says, "well, they didn't have any work to do," even though there was another 15 miles of that road, which would have successfully taken through this construction year, the road on which they made a profit last year, the road on which they could have made a profit this year, had the Minister not made a hasty and ill-considered decision in regard to the sale of Minago Contractors.

Mr. Chairman, the next item, as I proceed chronologically to show the problems and the mismanagement of the Department of Northern Affairs and Resources, and the loss to the taxpayers of Manitoba because of that, was an interesting case, Mr. Chairman, of the Inter-Universities North Program. Mr. Chairman, it was a very interesting situation. The Minister of Northern Affairs, through his column or discussions with the Thompson Citizen, and I think he must have had to do it, Mr. Chairman, because he was in considerable political trouble in his own community, in the community of Thompson, in the Thompson constituency.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, the honourable member has one minute.

**MR. McBRIDE:** Mr. Chairman, that is not enough for me to complete the story of the Inter-Universities North, so I will close off, Mr. Chairman, by just repeating what can be shown by just looking, looking at the efforts, by looking at the record, by looking at what has happened to the

Department of Northern Affairs and Resources since this Minister came to office, and that is that the Minister has sold out northern Manitoba, especially the remote communities, that he has misled the people in northern Manitoba, and that he has completely mismanaged the department so as to cause a loss to the taxpayers of Manitoba, and loss of services to the people of northern Manitoba..

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are on Item (2) Salaries and Wages \$170,400— pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that my colleague, the former Minister of Northern Affairs, has brought forward many of the concerns of the opposition with respect to the administration of this department. I think it would be advisable to get into the meat of the various items within the program, and to see exactly in what areas there have been the so-called streamlined administration that the Minister spoke of in his remarks at the beginning of the Estimates. I think there have been some problems in administration that have been brought to our attention which we would like to discuss in detail. I would like to as well know more fully what he is talking about when he says that he is doing an analysis of northern transportation; who will be doing this analysis, and what the scope of that will be; what the future ramifications of the study will hold for the north, and also the restraint on air travel which he claims to have achieved. I note in the Estimates it is not as much as he has alleged in his opening statement. The Estimates do not bear out the reduction that he claims to have made, so that will bear some investigation by this side.

The level of efficiency in service I think is one which will be seriously debated in the course of the Estimates as we go through them, because the kind of morale problems that have resulted from the actions taken by the government generally and by the old Department of Northern Affairs in particular I believe, have caused some serious morale problems within the department. These morale problems comes to the attention of the opposition from time to time either through moccasin telegraph as they say in the north, or from various communities who detect a drop or a significant change in the service that they were accustomed to under the previous administration. I think that the kind of changes that the Minister has brought about, the many disruptions in the Department of Northern Affairs, has resulted in a very serious drop in the morale of that department, and just generally I think that there is a problem in the entire department, not only in the old Northern Affairs section but in the Renewable Resource section, of the staff not knowing where this government wants them to go. I think that they had good clear direction under the former administration with respect to where the government wanted them to go; what direction they had they could clearly understand and could follow in terms of how they should relate to northern communities, how they should relate the resources of the province to the users of those resources.

There were very clear directions on those things, Mr. Chairman, and I believe from the reports I have at the present time, that there has been a serious disruption from October until the present time with respect to what the present government wants the departmental people to do. I think that's a very serious problem, and I am hoping that the Minister is addressing himself to that problem. I am hoping that the new deputy and those senior officers in the department are addressing themselves to that problem, because I think that it is only reasonable and fair that the staff in the department on both the old Resources Department and the Northern Affairs DEPARTMENT, KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM, AND TO HAVE SOME REASONABLE ASSURANCE OF WHAT THE NATURE OF THEIR JOB WILL BE IN THE FUTURE, AND SOME REASONABLE ASSURANCE OF THE FACT THAT THEY'RE GOING TO BE THERE NEXT WEEK AND IF THEY ARE GOING TO BE PERFORMING THEIR JOB, I think they have to know what the government intends of them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to favour us with a reply to some of the things which have been brought up by the former Minister of Northern Affairs and myself, and under this item which is before us right now, which is 1.(b) Administrative Support Services; I assume we're on 1.(b)(1), Mr. Chairman, Salaries and Wages. To get down to the nitty-gritty of the Estimates, I would ask the Minister directly if he could reply to some of the things that we have brought up, an addition in this specific case here, what changes have been made from the Estimates of the previous fiscal year, and those that are proposed before us under the present time under that item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of dealing with any of the comments that have flowed from the mouths of the members of the opposition in relationship to a variety of departments and various divisions within the department. We will deal with them as we come to them. We are dealing with the Administrative Services, and I can simply say to both the previous Ministers, that they left a pretty sorry mess behind them when they left office. I don't really know what faith either one of them puts in the opinions or documented statements of the Provincial Auditor,



but I would like to think a year from now, when they drag out the Provincial Auditor's statements, that they would be quickly on their feet if they find errors or faults in relationship to the departments that I am associated with. And so being that the case, and being that they both were responsible officers of the Crown and held that position as Ministers, I think we have to just, while we're under Administration, talk about some of the concerns that the Provincial Auditor expressed and some of the reasons that we found it rather difficult in the last few months trying to put the pieces together.

On November 14th, the Provincial Auditor reported on Department of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services accounts, which ended ' March 31, 1977, and I would think after my few years of kicking around in this world and being involved with service clubs, and Legions, and unions, and city councils, and planning commissions, rec. commissions, and yes, running a department in the Personnel Department with International Nickel in Thompson, and that if I ever, as an individual in any one of those particular organizations, had an auditor's report come down on me at the end of the year, if it had been a volunteer position I would have been asked to leave; if it had been an employed paid position, I would have probably been fired. I think that's what really took place in October, that a lot of what the Auditor was saying and a lot of what the people in the province, and in Northern Affairs in particular, and in the northern communities became aware of the mismanagement and the wanderings of your departments. They became aware that there was really no control and they didn't have to listen to the Auditor, but I think just for a moment today, we should.

The Auditor says, as can be noted from the Provincial Auditor's memorandum to me: "There appears to be serious lack of effective administration organization, resulting in deficiencies which were noted. The present operations of the department in a number of areas are unsatisfactory; it is recommended that appropriate steps be taken to correct the situation." The Auditor's detailed report, which you gentlemen I am sure have a copy of, cited continuing problems in the use of emergency purchase orders, unproper preparation of shared cost claims, lack of proper management committee approvals, improper handling of cash receipts and late accounts. The report also criticized the division's inability to meet its controllership function, its failure to supply financial reports — this is the Member for Rupertsland; this is your report that I inherited — failure to comply with Department of Finance year-end procedures, lack of revenue reconciliations, voucher processing difficulties, questionable expense accounts, the failure of the administration division to exercise its controllership responsibilities also contribute to the problems in the administration of the winter works project by the marine transportation and construction division.

Here again, specific problem areas cited included the following: inadequate financial reports; weaknesses in physical and accounting controls over inventories; lack of delegated authority for signing of contracts.

Now, we will move on to the Member for The Pas — his department, the one that he is claiming that I have destroyed in some way — the most recent report of the Provincial Auditor. . .

**MR. BOSTROM:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

**MR. BOSTROM:** When the member is making the allegations that he is making there, reading from the so-called Auditor's report, can he indicate if that Auditor's report was ever made available to myself, in the course of my administration of that department, and also would he be more specific as to what division he is talking about when he says that there were problems with the emergency purchase orders and so on? What specific area of the department is he discussing?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas on a point of order.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I wonder if the Minister would be able to . . . there's the General Auditor's Report, which we all have within our files somewhere, and then there's the Auditor's report directly to Deputy Ministers or Ministers, and if the Minister is quoting from those documents that are not public, I wonder if he could then send us over a copy so that we know exactly what he's quoting from.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, the Department of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services in a document, the first document dated January 14, 1977, several matters were brought to the attention of the Minister.

The document that I'm reading from of which I can get — the Auditor's report — to give to you if you wish, the first section — do you wish me to read it over again — was the section of

Monday, June 19, 1978

the Department of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, that entire page was in relationship to the operation that you claim fame to of being a good administrator.

—(Interjection)—

Failure to supply finance reports, failure to comply with the Department of Finance year-end procedures, lack of revenue conciliations, voucher processing difficulties, questionable expense accounts — they were in and had been referred to and again they're referred to in November of the year ending March 31, 1977, of which you were responsible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

**MR. BOSTROM:** On a point of order, I don't believe the Minister answered my question. My specific question was: Was that particular report that he is alleging has come from the Provincial Auditor, was that made available to my office, because the specific things that he is talking about, the last items he read off, were not forwarded to my office. —(Interjection)—

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** On a point of order, on a matter that my colleague may not be aware of but I'm sure will be aware of very shortly, it's the practice of the provincial auditor to, during the course of a year, bring those matters to the attention of the individual ministries that he sees are awry or that are wrong. Now if the honourable member, the former Minister, can't recall — can't remember receiving any of these directions from the provincial auditor, who is after all the auditor not of the government but of this Legislature, that is even a stronger condemnation of what the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs is just repeating to this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** On a point of order, I believe the new Minister is saying that he received that report on November 14th, the latest report that he's quoting, and it is a report that I did not receive.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Rupertsland will dig in his files and pull out the Auditor's Report ending March 31, 1977, which I'm sure he received. If you dig that out and you go through it, and you check with Hansard, you'll find the relevant sections. —(Interjection)— Talking about the Department of Northern Affairs. The most recent report of the provincial auditor on the Department of Northern Affairs was in preparation at the time of the amalgamation of our departments and many of the issues raised had already been resolved. These issues were as follows:

And this is in relationship to November 17th, and he refers back to his previous auditor's reports — your revenue deficiencies, payroll procedures, commitment monitoring, accounts advanceable and travel costs, inventory controls, community council audits, departmental expenditures by the Thompson Trust Account.

I understand, and the Member for The Pas again can check his previous audit reports, his major concern was the Thompson Trust Fund, which was being used to hire staff and initiate projects for which funds had not been approved by the budget process. Procedures have recently been introduced to severely limit the use of this fund, they were introduced by ourselves, and confine it to its original purpose of serving the communities.

Further problems found within the department that have now been corrected — so he's referring to problems that existed before. There were several persons employed by the department for which there was no proper hiring authority. That is the Member for The Pas' department. There was a lack of co-ordination between Winnipeg and Thompson Trust payroll section . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for The Pas on a point of order.

**MR. McBRIDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise that point of order that there is the general Auditor's Report that all members should have, and that the Minister shouldn't have to table, but there are those internal auditor's reports that I think, in fairness, the Minister should send across to us, if he's quoting from them. —(Interjection)— He's quoting from these reports and we should have the opportunity to see those reports, and the reason I say this, Mr. Chairman, because there is a problem all the time — it happened when I was Minister — of members opposite quoting certain sections of the report without quoting the section that said that certain remedial action had taken place and the department had improved the procedures over the past. And that's why I'd like to see the full document and not just have the member read selectively from a document which I don't have before me. I think that's the normal procedure of the House, if the member's quoting a document

that other members don't have, that he table that document and let us see it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Will the Honourable Minister make those reports available to the honourable member?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I think you'll find that if the two members, previous Ministers, wish to check their departmental records, or check the records they took with them, or find the previous auditor's report, they will find the deficiencies I'm talking about.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member of The Pas on a point of order.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I am making a request that is always agreed to in this Legislature. If the member is reading from a document that we do not have in our possession, then the member tables that document and makes it available to us, and unless the member is willing to do that, then I don't think he should read from the document. I don't think he should pass it off. It is a request I am making that is always met in this Legislature.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Honourable Minister make those reports available to the honourable members?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, I'll get a more complete one than even that I have here, if that will make satisfy the member's particular concern.

It's an auditor's report, and it refers to previous auditor's reports which, I say to you again, left me with a great deal of difficulty when I inherited both the messes, that's really what it was — the accountability and the lack of it. You talk about mismanagement, my goodness, there was no management, not from your levels, either one of you. There was very little accountability. In checking with departments we find that various divisions — they had difficulties, wondering what directions you wanted them to go and how you wanted to get there. So that's part of the problems we've had, that's part of the administration problems we've had, and I suggest to you, and I challenge both of you, this time next year to have a look at our auditor's report and I'm sure you'll find a fault or two, but I don't think you'll find twenty or thirty like I found with yours.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is in for a rude shock. He is going to learn something as he is Minister of Northern Affairs and Resources for awhile, as I'm sure his colleagues, some of them, have already learned, and that is the provincial auditor calls things the way he sees it. Maybe Ministers don't always agree, maybe the administration of the department doesn't always agree that that's the way it should be done, but if the provincial auditor sees that it should be done, that's the way it's done.

But the thing is that yes, when I was Minister of Northern Affairs I got reports from the auditor, I went over those reports with the executive or with the head administrator of the department and found out where we could correct those things. The next year there would be another report saying these following things have been corrected and these following things should be looked at, and the same process would be gone through again.

And the Minister, when he gets his first auditor's report, since he does get upset very easy, is going to be very upset, because the first auditor's report is going to be very critical of his administration of the department, and of the administration of the department generally, and that won't necessarily mean that he's all that bad, although in this case I would maintain that it does. But all the Ministers opposite are going to get that kind of a report from the provincial auditor that says this should be done, this should be done, this should be done, and sometimes, sometimes there'll be a distinct disagreement between the provincial auditor and the Minister and the administrators of a department, and we had more of those disagreements probably in the north than they had in other departments, because certain things have to be done within a certain period of time, and if there is something that has to be done in terms of a winter road or something has to be done during a certain season of construction, etc., sometimes the full procedures were not carried from A to Z, and somewhere along the line when it looked like approval was going to be given, work would start. And the auditor was never happy with that, and we never saw any way to get around going through all the Management Committee procedures etc., etc., etc. And this is one of the reasons when I was Minister that I was appointed to Management Committee, because that particular committee had very little understanding of the north, the particular problems of the north, the particular functions that had to be carried out in northern Manitoba.

And Mr. Chairman, the Minister, although he thinks he has good ammunition now, maybe he could agree, since he's tabled and read from the internal documents when we were in office, maybe he would agree that the first report he gets from the provincial auditor he'll give it to us. I wonder

if the Minister would agree to do that. When he gets his first report from the provincial auditor, if he would share it with us as he shared the auditor's report with everyone now? Would the Minister agree to do that?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Member for The Pas is making reference to the shock that I may have with my first audit report. I supposed that he was shocked with his first, but I wonder what the shock was as they kept getting progressively worse. Surely to goodness your first one wasn't worse than this one.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a specific question. Since he feels that his audit report is going to be good from the provincial auditor, and since he's quoted from internal reports that were sent to myself and the present Member for Rupertsland, I wonder if he would just agree — I don't know what it is going to say — he doesn't know what it is going to say, but maybe he will agree now to table his first auditor's report that goes to him as Minister, and then we can make a comparison between the reports? And I'm sure that if everything has improved the way he says it has, then, Mr. Chairman, he'll have no trouble tabling that report. I wonder if the Minister would answer the question? Would he agree to table that report when he gets his first one that reflects upon the operation of the department since he's been the Minister?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the auditor's report is a published document, and therefore the members opposite can get their questions out of it that they wish to ask, and I don't think —(Interjection)— Will you wait? They can get the questions that they wish to ask from it, and I haven't been a member of this House that's run from questions, I've attempted to always answer them. If the Member for The Pas or the Member for Rupertsland or any others wish to question me on the audit report that will come out whenever they come out — yearly, monthly or every six months — I'm easy, I'll answer them.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I think the Minister said no, that he wouldn't agree to table his first auditor's report, because this is an internal report, this is the report that goes to the Minister. If the Minister then doesn't take action, it appears in the general report, I don't know if the Minister's aware of that, but what he's quoting from are internal documents and not public documents. Would he agree to table his first internal audit report, or is he afraid to do that?

**MR. McBRYDE:** You question me on the first internal audit report, and I'll answer the questions. If there is a relationship to a personality in there I'm not going to file that particular document.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, and will return at the call of the Chair. Committee rise.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

### RESOLUTION NO. 3 — EQSAL PAY TASK FORCE

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business is the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and the sub-amendment moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

I have perused the matter of the amendment and the sub-amendment and I find there is a possibility, and I suggest it is only a possibility, that it could be argued that the present wording of the amendment could possibly place a burden upon the consolidated revenue of the province; likewise an argument could be made that the way it is presently worded it would fall entirely within the limits of the Department of Labour and as such would be handled internally. I find it rather difficult to come to a ruling on that particular matter and I would seek advice of members of the Chamber on that issue. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for drawing this to my attention before the Session this morning, and discussing it with me. Just to remove any doubts which were in your mind, I think that the best way would be to substitute from my amendment words which would leave the concept of considering the advisability within the amendment. So there wouldn't be any question about it, I am just at the moment rewriting the amendment, which I think I would possibly have to have leave of the House to substitute for the one which you have taken under advisement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the Member got leave?

**MR. GREEN:** Let's hear what he says first.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think normally one does give leave under the circumstances, but the Member for Inkster is a little more particular I guess.

Mr. Speaker, what I had in mind was that instead of deleting the words, "consider the advisability of continuing to monitor and," I would also suggest deleting the word "study" from that and leave in the words, "consider the advisability." If I may just clarify how it would read then I can give you the revised proposed amendment to the amendment. So that it would read, "consider the advisability of studying the situation with respect to equal pay for work of equal value with a view to introducing measures to ensure that the wage gap for work of equal value be reduced." The new wording would therefore be, to delete the words, "of continuing to monitor and study" and replace those words with the word "studying," and to delete the words "as it considers necessary." If that takes care of the doubt you had, I would ask leave to substitute this.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would find that perfectly in order. As such the amendment and the motion, the amendment, and the sub-amendment are now open . . . Will the page bring me the change in wording?

So the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns would be to delete the words of "continuing to monitor and study" and replace with the word "studying," and to delete the words "as it considers necessary" in the amendment.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** This is just technical, if you don't mind. Did I write in the word "of", "of continuing?"

**MR. SPEAKER:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I think that word "of" should remain. I don't think it should be deleted. In other words it should be deleting the words "continuing to monitor and study."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Resolution now is open for discussion. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I don't wish to speak on the amendment. I just simply want to indicate that as far as we are concerned on this side of the House we are prepared to accept that, because I think it requires leave to move that change in the amendment that my honourable friend proposed last week. We have no objections to accepting the change in that amendment.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable House Leader if he means that the government is prepared to accept the amendment.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I am not saying that we are not prepared to accept it. My honourable friend will wait and see. All I am suggesting is that my honourable friend requires leave to move that kind of an amendment at this stage, and we are prepared to allow him to have that leave. That is all I said.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Resolution is now open for debate.

**QUESTION put, sub-amendment carried.**

**QUESTION put, amendment carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now on the amended motion — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to this motion as amended, which I certainly intend to be with the rest of the members in this House to apparently support and let go on, Mr. Speaker, in order to delve into what I consider to be a very difficult question. My problem with this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, is that it will raise aspirations, in my view, that will be difficult of fulfillment. I say difficult, perhaps impossible of fulfillment, and, Mr. Speaker, would further have the danger of building in to our society a wage system which will not, in the last analysis, result in equality to the people of our society.

I think that the people who believe that there is some way of measuring equal work and measuring

value of work, sincerely believe it to be the case, sincerely believe that it will remove inequities, but I know no system, Mr. Speaker, of such evaluation that has worked. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it implies that somebody is able to mathematically ascertain the value of work, and that once this value is obtained it will properly reflect the wage differential as between different people. It may be, Mr. Speaker, and I say only "may" because I don't know — it may be that some group of evaluators will come to the conclusion that, for instance, secretaries are worth only one-third of executives, and they are now being paid one-half. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, will a group of secretaries say that they would be bound by such evaluation? I know that if I was a secretary I would not be bound, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that as a politician who has long felt that one of the responsibilities of the elected representatives is to try to create a more equitable society, that I would find that this way was not indeed achieving it.

However, Mr. Speaker, the concept is to look and to see and to determine whether such a system can work, and although I will admittedly say that I have a somewhat prejudiced mind on the subject, I am not so prejudiced that I am not prepared to look and see. I will have a great opportunity of arguing against structuring salaries in a way which I object to if something was ever attempted. But there has been throughout the country a suggestion that possibly such an evaluation can take place, such mathematics are possible. I merely wish to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know that they are possible and I have some views as to the difficulty of the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand something that weighs a great deal. It is an ashtray; it is made out of some type of glass compound. And I am holding a coin. I want the members in this House to pretend that in one of my hands I have a piece of iron that sells for 40 cents a pound approximately. Am I too high or too low? —(Interjection)— The Member for Seven Oaks, who was in that business, says I may be too high. Well, let's assume that it is 50 cents a pound. I am holding in my other hand a coin and I ask the honourable members to imagine that in my right hand I am holding a piece of gold that sells for \$150 an ounce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some mathematicians might come here and tell me that the iron is more useful, that there are many more things that can be done with it; that it is far more utile; that it has a much greater value, and that really what I am holding in my left hand. . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside won't let me have fun with him or with the members of the House in what I think would be a useful example — that you may get a group of people who will say to you that the iron is more useful, that it is more valuable, that there are more things that you can do with it; that the gold is very unuseful and that it can only be used ornamentally, that it will last a long time but during the lifetime of a person he can do much better and much more with iron than he will with gold. You could get a group of people, Mr. Speaker, to say that the iron should be valued at \$40 an ounce and that the gold should be valued at \$150 — you could get somebody saying the reverse, that the iron should be valued at \$150 an ounce and that the gold should be valued at 50 cents a pound.

Mr. Speaker, a group of people could say that. They could go further, Mr. Speaker. They could even pass a law saying that that will take place, and within a very short period of time, Mr. Speaker, hardly a day, you will find that the public will pay \$150 an ounce for the gold and they will start being able to get the iron for 50 cents a pound.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the gold in this case is valued — and I made some fast calculations, the members can correct me if I am wrong — not 40 times as much, but I think 6,400 times as much as the iron. For some reason, and this is not a unique thing to a free enterprise system, you can go throughout the world, you can go to Russia, and you will still find that no matter what they do with the price system, that people will pay far more for the gold than they will pay for the iron. Not only is that happening in the Twentieth Century, it has happened for as long as we have had centuries to remember.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this must say something to the members of this House with regard to the termini, the measure of value. The fact is that if you said, Mr. Speaker, that work of this value or work of a certain kind was valued at ten times as high as work of another kind where the situation is now reversed — for instance, you can say, Mr. Speaker, that office boys or office persons really perform a great value and they should be paid ten times as high as what they are getting or they should be paid the equivalent of doctors. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the citizen has to go out and spend money, no matter what the law says you will find that he will look for the doctor and pay him and, if necessary, pay him Black Market in order to get his services and he will find others willing to work at much less than the price. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is what occurs when you start attempting to make these types of valuation systems. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that this task of determining work of equal value is first of all, and I'm willing to be taught — that it's first of all incomprehensible, that, secondly, if it does not reflect what people are willing to pay then it will not work in any event.

But more important than that, Mr. Speaker, this resolution. . .

**MR. ENNS:** I wonder if the honourable member would permit one question before he moves on to the other subject. I apologize for the earlier interruption because I am now intrigued with the dissertation on the subject matter that he just made but am I understanding the Member for Inkster — is he making an argument for the future of the Commodity Futures Market and allowing the

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, if the member will permit me, he will not go along with me quite as far as I would like him to go because, Mr. Speaker, I say essentially the difficulty with this resolution is it looks for equity in incomes on the basis of wages, and that wages has never been an effective way of reflecting the equalities of income. It has not been, and I don't think that it will be. The wage system first of all will not be able to determine value because people will pay for what they need and what they can get and, secondly, Mr. Speaker, nobody who has been valued lower will accept it, nor will they accept the fact that somebody else is valued higher, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, it has always been my particular position that the ability of society to establish a relative equality of income has far more chance of being successful in the area of equal services than it has in the area of trying to determine what is a fair wage.

The lower income groups in our society gain far more from universal education than they do from the minimum wage which is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage is an attempt at reflecting value of work, and it says that there will be this minimum. I'm not suggesting that it be done away with, but certainly the fact that every individual in our society, regardless of his income, will have available to him a fine educational system at no personal cost but at the cost of all citizens generally has done far more to establish equality of income.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the same is true with regard to Medicare. The same is true with regard to hospitalization, and for my friend, the Member for Lakeside, much more is able to be achieved through sensible marketing and through the ownership in the right areas of public resources which then do not constitute a rip-off on the population but constitute resources which they share equally than is establishable through the wage system.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, want to say that I don't oppose the resolution. I don't say that it should not be considered. I think that perhaps a lengthy consideration of it will be useful, a lengthy consideration of it will show perhaps just how illusory a remedy it is to the present problems reflecting disparity in income.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I've said on several occasions and I guess it's almost inevitable that I'm going to be repetitive, but I can't speak for 16 years without repeating myself several times on several occasions, that one of the main reasons for being in politics as far as I'm concerned is because I believe some people work very little and make too much, and some people work very hard and make too little, and that really the secret of having a more equitable society is to enable people to more equitably gain the benefits that society has to offer, and I think that the wage system, although it's going to be necessary and although it's a necessary product of any society that I can think of, the attempt to make substantial gains in equity through the wage system is doomed to failure. Therefore, if society is to provide a more equitable means of resolving this question of disparity of wealth, it will have to be, Mr. Speaker, through different means —(Interjection)— I've suggested, yes, Mr. Speaker, I said immediately, I said that when I start talking this way the honourable members are going to say two and a half to one. Mr. Speaker, I said last year and I repeat this year, to me the figures two and a half to one, although they have represented the Leader of the Opposition's at least relative suggestion with regard to equality, don't mean anything to me whatsoever. What I have said — I said last year, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be greater equality, and when we get to this possible two and a half to one there will still be, Mr. Speaker, a desire for greater equality.

I have yet to meet, Mr. Speaker, despite the guffaws from the other side, I have yet to meet the Conservative who will say that there should be less equality in a society, that there should be a greater disparity of wealth, and yet the logical extension of that position when they guffaw the two and a half to one is that they say that if it's now ten to one the possibilities that it should be 20 to one and 100 to one and that there is no element of disparity that is not satisfactory provided that it results from the free market system. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with that. I think that one of the elements of a just society, a more just society, is that people should have relatively more equitable availability of the resources that society produces and which they have worked on. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, not because I am opposed to developing the context, but because I believe that the concept relies too heavily on the wage system and that I fear that it will not result in greater equality, as a matter of fact has a danger in resulting in greater inequality on the basis of trying to mathematically fix values which I think that I've demonstrated has little chance of succeeding.

There is, Mr. Speaker, one notable, and it's not the only exception but there is a great exception to what I have said. I don't know how many members in this Chamber have read The Admirable

Crichton, but in the Admirable Crichton indeed they found that the value system greatly changed, that when there is some degree of plenty, yes, one can afford the luxury of gold, but if water were scarce then I suggest to you that water would be selling at much greater prices than gold and people would fall over themselves trying to get rid of their gold if they were thirsty and dying of thirst, that suddenly water would have a much greater value.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** So value depending, Mr. Speaker, so heavily on the circumstances and so heavily on the kinds of considerations that I have given, I would like to pursue this resolution further but not with respect of work of equal value but a greater equality of the human condition which is a phrase that is so often used by the Leader of the Opposition.

So I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that Resolution No. 3 be further amended as follows: That the final paragraph be deleted and replaced by the following:

Be it resolved that the government analyze the disparity of income in the Province of Manitoba and recommend — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, if we're going to be consistent I guess I had better say that the government consider the advisability of analyzing the disparity of income in the Province of Manitoba and recommend measures having as their objective the bringing about of a greater degree of equality of incomes in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, trust the Member for Inkster to introduce a subject that is so intriguing that it would be very difficult for me and I'm sure other honourable members on this side of the House to allow that motion to go without further comment.

What my honourable friend has introduced are so many varied and intriguing arguments that I was not quite sure just exactly where he stood. After listening to him the other day talking on the bill to amend the Commodity Futures Market I got the impression, although after reading his comments I found that he said very little about the Commodity Futures Market. He dealt with — and I have some feeling for my honourable friend, the Member for Pembina, because I made the same mistake in one of the first speeches I made in this Legislature. Although my honourable friend was unable to penetrate the soundness of my argument at that time — and it was on the question of feed mills — he did pick me up on one mistake that I did make and that is when I referred to the Private Member's Resolution that we were debating at that time as a stupid resolution, and the entire burden of his assault was directed at me because I referred to the resolution as being stupid. It's a lesson that I have learned from my honourable friend and it's a lesson that I think the Member for Pembina is going to learn because my honourable friend did not refute, nor did he offer any argument against what the Member for Pembina said about the Commodity Futures Market, and now today when my honourable friend rises to his feet he makes what I consider to be a pretty good argument for the Commodity Futures Market. He holds in his hand an ash tray and a coin and asked us to imagine that the coin is a piece of gold which would be worth very many more times than the ash tray, although the ash tray is considerably heavier. What establishes the price?

It's, and my honourable friend I think conceded, that it's what somebody is prepared to pay for it. What establishes an income for two hockey players of \$1,700,000 over a period of — what is it, three years or so? A year? What establishes that other than the fact that somebody must have felt that those two players were worth that much that he could make money with them.

It's the same thing that establishes wages, and the same argument that my honourable friend presents against this resolution, against the attempt to make a determination, a determination by politicians, we who sit here, as to what should be the relative wage between a male and a female doing the same kind of work. That's a decision that is made not by politicians — my honourable friend is rising to his feet . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the member will permit me to ask him a question because he is now dealing with a different issue. Equal pay for equal work as between male and female is a matter which we now have, or should have in the Province of Manitoba. What we are now dealing with is the concept of equal pay for work of equal value.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, I thank my honourable friend for drawing that distinction because it is an important one. Well, who makes that distinction? Again it's the person who's going to pay the



wages, and if he's prepared to pay one person more than he's prepared to pay another there must be a reason for it. I'm sure that my honourable friend will now be prepared to concede that it does make sense to allow the employer to make the decision — on the strength of the argument that he has now presented — to make the decision as to which employee is worth more. Is it the good employee? —(Interjection)— Well, you see, now he's changing the rules a little bit. They will bargain, he says, and as a group, as a group the members of a labour union are going to get a standard wage whether one shirks his responsibilities and makes no contribution, his productivity is very low, he gets the same as the person who works hard and whose productivity is much higher. Well, what is the result of that? The result is that the person who is productive and who does earn for his employer a profit is penalized and that very person is going to be a little less willing to contribute to the productivity of that particular company because he's going to ask himself a question: Why should I? Indeed, many many times I hear people who have moved from one industry to another, from a non-union industry to a union industry, tell me that they are chastised by union members because of their better productivity, because they are accustomed to working for an employer who compensates them for what he figures they are worth and moving into a union shop and finding that the strong union members will tell him to slow down.

If anyone ever read in Ayn Rand's article on —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friends are new or I would respond. In one of her books, I'm not sure if it was *The Fountainhead*, or *Atlas Shrugged*, she does a very good job, in my opinion, of outlining the ultimate result of what my honourable friend for Inkster continues to talk about. "From each according to his ability and to each according to his needs," and she illustrates the inevitable result of that kind of a philosophy applied in an industry. One may disagree with a great deal of what Ayn Rand says but anyone that understands human nature will be able to understand that kind of an argument. Because that's exactly what will happen and it's the kind of an argument that you hear from time to time.\$

Now, even in India — in an editorial in the *Country Guide* of this month there is an editorial that is entitled "Triumph for the Family Farm," and what this editorial points out is that in China and the USSR, because of the state controlled systems of farming that they have in those two countries, their productivity is continuing to decline. They are finding it more and more difficult to produce the quantities of food that is necessary to feed their population. India, on the other hand, uses the private incentive system in developing their farms. The article goes on to say, "In India there is currently a record stockpile of grain' about one billion bushels. Relatively few people are undernourished. Part of the credit must be given to a recent run of good growing seasons but it is also imperative that the program of research, irrigation and other technological improvements of education, of health, and of general economic development are finally coming together in India. Some forecasters now see real possibilities of a further surge in food production which will remove the spectre of famine forever. It has even been suggested that India might become a significant next exporter of farm products."

**A MEMBER:** As long as they stay away from state farms.

**MR. JORGENSON:** "These achievements will be due to many factors but the most powerful force at work is unquestionably the small landowners instinctive reach for profit when he can see a way to get it." It's a very natural instinct in human nature. It's one of the basic impulses in human nature and to attempt to deny it, for any government to attempt to deny it, is an effort to destroy the very productivity of that particular person.

Mr. Speaker, there are few people that are gifted with the ability to convert \$1.00 into \$2.00, to create wealth. Yet, Mr. Speaker, you don't pool everybody's minds and expect to come up with an average. There are some people that have greater intelligence than others; there are some people that have greater dedication than others; there are some people that have a greater ability and a greater desire to work than others and these are all factors. You don't paint a *Mona Lisa* by assigning to each of 1,000 painters one dab.

**MR. ENNS:** That's a good line, Warner. I wish I would have used that one.

**MR. JORGENSON:** It is the individual effort of one single person that is important.

You know, it wasn't too many years ago, Mr. Speaker, — I believe it was in the early sixties — when we did have some unemployment problems in those days and the —(Interjection)— . . . Well, it's a cycle that afflicts us from time to time for various reasons. But in those days it was being said by the government advisors, by the intellectuals, by the labour unions, and by all of those who purport to understand the reasons why these things happen, and how many times did we hear that if there was a better system of education and the people were better educated, the unemployment problem would disappear because they pointed very proudly, well not proudly, but they pointed very knowingly to the unemployment figures which show that it was the lower income

groups that were the ones that were unemployed. So a great effort was made to ensure that everybody got a better education. What do we have today? Instead of uneducated people walking around looking for jobs, we have college graduates looking for jobs. So the argument that was presented in those days that education would solve the unemployment problem just has not been true. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm not going to deny it's helped some people but the fact is that as a percentage of the unemployed today, there is a far greater percentage of those that have educations, good educations, that cannot find jobs and certainly cannot find jobs in those professions or skills for which they were trained. So much for government intervention; so much for government decrees; so much for government planning.

What my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, has made is — perhaps unwittingly but I find it very difficult for my honourable friend to make any comment unwittingly, I know him too well for that — but what he has done, at least as far as I'm concerned, is given us a fairly good argument and a fairly good illustration of how well that the free exchange of goods such as we find on the commodity exchange, how well that system really works, where instead of one person making the decision and making the decree as to what price will be attached to a given commodity, there are many thousands of people making those decisions each day, and a hundred times a day.

I recall the words of . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Harry Enns?

**MR. JORGENSON:** No, of a great philosopher who . . . No, the words of my honourable friend, the Minister of Highways, some will go down in the annals of history as . . .

**A MEMBER:** If not in history, but at least in Hansard.

**MR. JORGENSON:** . . . as notable contributions; others will go down as those that you wish to forget as quickly as possible.

But the former Minister of Highways, the Member for Churchill at that time, Mr. Borowski, . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Another memorable Minister of Highways.

**MR. JORGENSON:** . . . I remember when he happened to be in Opposition at that time, that was during that short session before the 1969 election, and I remember he was berating the Minister of Mines and Resources at that time, who now is the Minister of Highways, for decisions that the government had made. He made a very cogent observation. He said, "When you make a decision," and he was referring to the Minister, "and it turns out to be wrong, everybody suffers. But when I make a decision on my own and it goes wrong, I'm the only one that suffers." Another pretty good argument coming from the ranks of my honourable friends opposite for the value of a free exchange and the commodity market.

Well, if the resolution before us has any value, it is a resolution that perhaps will bring out the various aspects of this particular argument and I now invite my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, to join those of us over here who have been making an argument for a great deal more freedom in the determination of prices and wages rather than the type of approach that has been taken in the past which, in my view, has put more people on unemployment insurance than any other single factor.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question?

**MR. GREEN:** I wonder whether the honourable member would permit a question. I wonder if the honourable member would deal with the suggestion that I made that the equality won't be achieved through the wage system and therefore has to come, in many respects, out of the wage system.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** He says equality will not be achieved through the wage system. —(Interjection)— Well, you know, my honourable friend attaches a great deal of importance to the desirability of everybody being equal and what I have learned is that there are many many people who do not wish to have that kind of equality . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do recall during my early years in politics when visiting what I considered to be one of the more impoverished communities in my constituency, I was indiscreet enough to make some comment about the living conditions that the people in that particular area were having. I was immediately told to mind my own business — and very correctly so — that they were happy to live there. They owned the homes, such as they were, in that community and they didn't want anybody coming in there telling them what their standard of living should be. That may be a lesson to my honourable friends because some people . . .

**MR. GREEN:** They told me different.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . some people prefer to choose their own standards of living and in spite of the fact that many of us may not want to concede that those are standards that we would like to see in this country, it is the standard that these people would like. For us to presume to be able to set standards for everybody in this country on an equal basis is something that is not attainable because everybody has his own desires and his own standards that he wants to follow.

I think that points out again the burden of the argument that was presented to us by the Member for Inkster. It's very difficult to set those things by decree or by government or by regulation. An open and a free market, unencumbered by restrictive regulations will do a great deal more to help people achieve their own standards than anything that we can possibly do in this building.

### MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I stand, not to speak on this, but I stand on a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon, earlier, in trying to question the management of the Department of Northern Affairs when I was the Minister, the Minister of Northern Affairs read from a document which he didn't table which he claimed was a report of the Provincial Auditor. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this was a memorandum to the Provincial Auditor and in light of that, I would like to put on the table the last correspondence I had with the Provincial Auditor as Minister of Northern Affairs which I received October 6, 1977, which says, "All matters which require attention have been or are in the process of receiving the appropriate attention."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I am not privy to any of the matters the member has brought to my attention, however, I will take it under advisement.

The Honourable Member for The Pas, were you prepared to speak on this?

**MR. McBRYDE:** No.

**A MEMBER:** I thought you said you were.

**MR. McBRYDE:** No, I said I'm not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have, as you will count, had a variety of occasions to speak on this resolution, and the reason is because what started out as a specific resolution devoted to a specific problem has now become sort of a philosophical teething ring by which other members of the House may exercise their global visions about changing the world. It reminds me in part, Mr. Speaker, of the old saying about a camel is a horse created by a committee; I'm afraid that all the patching and rearranging and piecing that we have had has turned what — I guess if I can use the tactic of the Member for Inkster, which is to argue by analogy as opposed to specific — sort of say that what started out as a well-tailored coat to fit a specific body has turned into a very big tent covering all sorts of ills and grievances of the world. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that we along the way have lost sight of what the problem was and what the issue was and we have now sort of once again reverted to the Hegelian dialectic of those who are in, those who are out sort of, the collective versus the free market, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, it has been a debate that has been heard in this House many, many times and which may be soul-satisfying. In fact, it's amusing, Mr. Speaker; I find it partly amusing in that for all the comments I hear from members opposite about the impracticality of the academic world, I have heard far more of that kind of

wool-gathering on these kinds of items than I hear in terms of trying to relate legislation to specific problems, dealing with them in pragmatic, useful ways, and I think that it doesn't hurt politicians ever to talk in grand philosophy, but it does mean that we begin to ignore solutions.

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that's what's happened here. I regret deeply the amendment from the Member for Inkster, because I think that what he is really doing is totally obliterating the whole objective and purpose of the original resolution, which was to deal with a particular social condition, a fact of our economic and social life, and now turning it into simply another peg on his particular philosophical position, which I think many of us have deeply profound differences with. I certainly have had, and I find that that continues.

Let's go back, Mr. Speaker, to some of the arguments that have been used. First, they were saying, it is impossible to do evaluations; that, of course, is dead wrong. If the honourable member had bothered at all to look at some of the work that has been done already in this field, he wouldn't have been so assertive that it was impossible to do. And by arguing from analogy, taking an ashtray and a coin, as a logician he would realize that that is the worst form of argument is to argue from analogy. What he should have argued is to determine whether the practices that are presently being tried are useful or not.

I would refer to his reading the report prepared by the Health Sciences Centre and CUPE which in this city itself have in fact undertaken what he said was impossible to do. They have done exactly what he said couldn't be done; they have done it. They have analyzed jobs, they have related them to different tasks and they have worked out a bargain between the union and the Health Sciences Centre to arrive at that very thing which he said couldn't be done. So what he said was impossible in fact is very possible, has already worked and is in place, and the fact of the matter is that when we get to these great discussions about the free market as being the determinant of price, that is a lot of hogwash, Mr. Speaker. We are not dealing in a free market economy; we are dealing in an economy dominated by very large organizations that have three, four, five thousand employees, which have large personnel staffs, which spend most of their time doing exactly that, doing job evaluation and classification and applying to each of those jobs very specific criteria to determine what the task is, how the income and prices and wages should be related to them. So to talk about this kind of halcyon world of the 18th century, where we had a bunch of free market entrepreneurs, freebooters, in the Ayn Rand context, running around responding to market forces, is not the way the world works any more. It works on the basis that you have very large public service organizations, very large public organizations. If they think that General Motors or Health Sciences Centre or International Nickel or the Public Service of Manitoba are all making their minds up according to whether they're going to pay a stoker this, a maintenance man that, a secretary this, by some free market analysis, then they don't know very much about personnel policy and the way it's set. It's being set by very specific criteria, very specific evaluations are done and all the resolution was saying is take the same skills, the same application, and deal with the fact that because a large number of these classifications are held by females versus males, is to try to relate that on a more equal basis and make the transition.

So of course it's being done every day, and every large organization does it, and to say not simply flies in the face of reality, flies in the face of what is taking place, and simply lives in a world of philosophical star-gazing, not in the real world. And that, unfortunately, is where we have found ourselves.

Now, let's go back to another issue raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster about whether wages themselves have any relationship to equality. I found that an astounding statement to come from a member of the NDP caucus because I have now listened for the past months, in fact, had several of my own . . . interrupted as they would come storming into this assembly, having argued to the death the need for the minimum wage. Well, if it was so immaterial and so irrelevant and so inconsequential, considering the human condition, what was all the fuss about? Why do we have these great arguments about improving the minimum wage if it was so irrelevant? I would suggest the Member for Inkster should maybe consult with the Member for Logan and the Member for Churchill who have made these arguments in the House, who, I don't think believe that the wages paid to someone are so inconsequential as he claims. I think that they do suggest that they have a great deal to do with the ability of people to command goods and services, and when he says that wages are immaterial and that what we should really be doing, if we're trying to achieve equality, is deal in the area of education and services. I would suggest to the Member for Inkster that that has taken place, and that what we are arguing about is that women who have equal education and equal health care and equal services are still receiving 30 or 40 percent less for the kind of work that they are doing. And it has nothing to do with the provision of services, it has to do with the sex they happen to be, and the jobs that they are forced to take. That happens to be the case, and therefore you need to provide some response to that particular situation.

I would take the argument one step further which may be of more importance to members opposite. They say, "Do wages themselves have some importance?" Well, there has just been a

very interesting evaluation done in United States about the position of blacks in the United States, and they found it out, but there has been a substantial change in the economic position of blacks in the last decades. Why? Not because of many of the social programs, but because of the wages and incomes that they are now receiving, that they have closed the differential gap between them and white workers in different kinds of occupations. Now there were some reasons why that did take place, because they did get improved education along the way, but it was also because the wage area was opened to them. And what they found out is that those differentials tend to be reduced in times when there is the ability to provide jobs income on a more differential basis. So for the Member for Inkster to go around making a claim which I found — you know, the Government House Leader is right; the Member for Inkster really is a Blue Socialist as opposed to a Red Tory, that he really finds himself in total problems all the time and he comes so far around the circle that he ends up much closer to the Government House Leader's position than those on his own side of the House, that he sort of finds himself increasingly trying to argue by contradiction, and through contradiction, that he doesn't really recognize that part of the responsibility of legislators in this House is not simply to always be rewriting the great philosophical treatises of our time, but is to make responses to specific problems, to be practical and pragmatic in their responses, to recognize and understand that certain conditions exist, and that sometimes it is the role of this Legislature to take steps and initiatives. And I think that the Government House Leader has totally mistaken the purpose of the resolution.

No one was working by fiat, no one was going to have a great form of government intervention sort of treading on the toes of his marketplace. What they were suggesting is that the need and necessity to recognize that there was a condition that existed and that government itself could take a role because as an employer, dealing with its own public service, it was allowing those disparities to continue, in fact, become wider in its own role as an employer. And that the kind of analysis and evaluation that was done between the Health Sciences Centre and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 1550 — and I think it would be very instructive for members to read the agreement that they eventually arrived at — I think it does make sense. They say, "to establish an agreed-upon systematic method of job evaluation; to analyze and describe each position covered by the agreement, and to apply a method of evaluation of the positions to arrive at their relative worth." Which, Mr. Speaker, they did; they worked together on that particular program, they arrived at the kind of evaluation that would be applied and CUPE and the Health Sciences Centre eventually signed an agreement based upon it. There goes your impossibilities; there goes the fact that both the Government House Leader and the Member for Inkster were not prepared or able to understand that these things do take place and that no one is providing heavy-handed intervention on the one hand. What they are simply doing is providing guidelines by which jobs can be classified and which wages can be applied, and that then gives the employer and the employees a basis of bargaining in order to calm the disparities between male and female.

That was the original purpose of the resolution. I think it was well endorsed and I think that the amendments brought in by the Member for St. Johns made good sense; they didn't go as far as I would like but they at least were able to take the kind of vagueness that the Member for Pembina or St. Matthews, I can't remember, introduced, and bring it back into focus, asking the Government of Manitoba to apply itself to a specific problem, just as the Government of New Zealand has already done in legislation it passed in 1972, Great Britain and the United States; numbers of Labour Departments are doing the exactly same thing. They don't happen to think that they are caught in some sort of great philosophical trap. A number of governments are in fact now working on the problem, and the point of the resolution was to try to get this particular government in the Province of Manitoba part of that same movement so that we would be able to provide the proper research and information and to determine its feasibility. And as I said in the original introduction of this resolution, no one was going to guarantee that you could work out a foolproof system, but we should at least be looking at that specific problem and finding out how we can get answers to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because of a resolution from the Member for Inkster, he has wiped that particular proposition out and we are now back debating how many philosophers on the head of a pin question again, which he has done many, many times before. He has a point to make, it's a useful point to make, but how many times has he done it in his own resolution, and if he wanted to do it let him bring his own resolution in and do it, and quit trying to distort and pervert this particular resolution away from its original purpose. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I really regret, is that if the Member for Inkster had some mind that he wanted to debate the great issues of the day one more time, then he has the opportunity as a member of the Legislature to bring in his own resolution with that. But I think that to so totally turn this one off the track away from the kind of problem that we are addressing, I think really does do a disservice because it means that it lets the government off the hook. It means that the Minister of Labour, who is hung on many hooks already, can get off this particular one because she will no longer have to respond to this resolution, and that the kind of vacuity and ambiguity that she and members opposite express as

**Monday, June 19, 1978**

---

their escape hatch, which was brought back into focus by the Member for St. Johns, the Member for Inkster has now allowed them to slip away from one more time. And I'm sort of . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member will have ten minutes when this subject next comes up.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Fine, Mr. Speaker, I will need it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee at 8:00 o'clock.