



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVI No. 89

10:00 a.m. Thursday, July 13, 1978

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 13, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to table a Return to Order of the House No. 52 by the Member for St. Vital.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up with the Minister of Finance a series of questions posed yesterday by myself and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. I want to ask the Minister of Finance if it is the intention of the government to not show as revenues for the 1977-78 fiscal year something in the order of \$30 million received from the Government of Canada by way of a combination of the federal-provincial equalization and related transfer payments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, all the transfer payments that came in through 1977-78 are appropriated to the proper year and are contained in the report that is before the House. There is a reference made in the report that singles out two areas for special note, and those are highlighted in the report, and the only other outstanding feature that has been also highlighted is the change, which is the only change, Mr. Speaker, incidentally, and which reduces the former year's indicated deficit, which is a change in the Sinking Fund procedures.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question has nothing to do with sinking funds. I want to ask the Minister of Finance if there is somesomething in the order of \$30 million received from the Government of Canada within or relating to the 1977-78 fiscal year that has not been credited to the receipts of the Province of Manitoba for that same fiscal year.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way: Out of the \$30 million, or whatever the figures are, the proper figures have been appropriated to the proper year. It has been checked out with the Auditor. The figures that are here are the same figures that would have been here had they been put in by the former government. The only change at all in the procedure is the one that we have highlighted, and that is, to show what would happen if the Sinking Fund payments were in fact deducted, which is the procedure that has been recommended and will be followed in the following years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: For clarification, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he is saying that there has not been any receipt of funds from the Government of Canada that have been credited to a fiscal year other than the fiscal year in which those same set payments were intended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, on these transfer payments, the information that I tabled in April gave you some indication of what takes place on the transfer payments and there are far more than \$30 million involved if he is referring, and I think he did refer, to transfer payments. But it should be sufficient, and all I can indicate to the House, is that the appropriate designation of the payment or the cost or the receipt is credited to the appropriate year. This has been double-checked with the auditor and the information is presented in as elaborate a form as we can possibly give it. There may be more information come out in the Auditor's Report when it is available this coming fall, but as far as I know, it will be identical or the same allocations will be made as are contained in this particular unaudited report here.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, or a privilege of this House. We are in session, Mr. Speaker, and we ask questions — we have a Question Period — and the answers should be given here, not outside the House. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly I have asked the Minister of Health about the situation at the hospitals. We have asked the Minister during the Estimates and we get long-winded non-answers and, Mr. Speaker, now it comes out that the Minister is misleading the people of Manitoba and misleading the House. They have made a statement, Mr. Speaker, that there would be an increase of 2.9 which later became 2.2 from what was approved last year, and now we see that they are playing around with the base, that things that weren't approved that are supposed to be saving money, things that weren't approved last year are approved now. The base is increased constantly and so they can say they are still going on with 2.9. We have asked about the rationale of the 2.9 and we got no answer. Mr. Speaker, now we hear a statement made outside the House by the Minister that the hospital would be getting twice the amount of money that they received last year. I think, Sir, that there is no point going through a Question Period or the Estimates if this is the way that the House and the Minister will conduct themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that the Question Period is for the privilege of members asking questions of the Ministry, questions which they may answer or may not answer, and as such, if they don't answer in the House, then there is no way, as far as I am able to ascertain, which will force anyone to get them to answer a question.

Now, if the Member for St. Boniface is telling me that the questions that are being answered are not correct, then he has a different point completely.

Does the Honourable Member for St. Boniface have some further information for me?

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you ruling, Mr. Speaker, that the Question Period, which I know the Minister doesn't have to answer, and during the Estimates also, but then that they are free to go and answer the question outside the House? If you are asking that I'm saying that the Minister didn't answer the question correctly, yes, I'm making that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on both the point of privilege and point of order, let me say that I have attempted in Question Period, and certainly through my Estimates, to answer every question put to me by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and members opposite to the best of my ability and the extent of my information at the time. I want to assure him that nothing has been conveyed outside the House with respect to this particular question that has not been conveyed inside the House.

He asked me three or four days ago in this House whether hospitals would be receiving more actual money than had originally been indicated and my answer to him was yes. That is the same information as I have provided when I have been asked outside the House. The fact of the matter is that because of adjustments which are normal and customary mid-year adjustments — which were made, I am certain, during the tenure of Health Ministers of this province long before I became Health Minister — there is additional money available for hospitals in Manitoba to operate this year and it compensates them for expenses and adjustments and changes incurred during the past year and during a changeover period from calendar year to fiscal year bookkeeping. But the 2.9 percent increase in the operating budget is a constant, and I stand by it and it remains in place. We took the adjusted net budget figure for hospitals in Manitoba for the calendar year 1977 and we added 2.9 percent to it. Now, over and above that, there has been some adjustments made for

for the fact that there was a changeover to a fiscal year, and for deficits. This is not unusual, not exceptional. It means the hospitals have more cash immediately, yes, but it is cash that compensates for past expenses. It doesn't affect the 2.9 percent increase in the actual operating budget figure.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that it is not unusual, that it is an every day or every year occurrence that the deficit comes to twice the amount voted — approximately twice the amount voted — and does the Minister now say that he has never made the statement, or the government has never made the statement, that the 2.9 was to cover everything, deficit and so on, in fact, that their original announcement was that they were going to reduce the Estimates of the Department of Health, in fact, the amount of \$10 million was announced? Is the Minister claiming now that he could stand by and say yes, it is 2.9 and all he has to do is increase the base constantly? Is that what he means? He can play with figures as long as he wants, there is no doubt about that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has a point of privilege that he wants to raise, would he please give me the specifics of it so I can check it out.

MR. DESJARDINS: The point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is this: That two days ago I asked the Minister did he know what the amount was. I have been asking him constantly to know what the deficit was for the first month this year, and he certainly has that now if he is interested at all, that is for the month of April. He has constantly said — a lot of verbiage, Sir — but he constantly said that he didn't have the information at this time and the same day or a day later he goes outside the House and announced that there will be approximately twice the amount that was voted. Was this amount discussed during the Estimates and is it in the Estimates now, I would like to know?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Health on the same point of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege. I did not go outside the House and announce that there would be twice the amount of money given as had been originally suggested. As a matter of fact, I think that one particular interpretation that was put by one public medium on the situation is rather confusing if not somewhat misleading, in that it takes the approach that hospitals are being provided with more than twice the amount of money that they were originally promised. Mr. Speaker, that could be interpreted by some as meaning they are getting twice the amount of money that was voted to them in the appropriation exercised during the Estimates. That's not the case. They are getting precisely the same amount of money as was approved during the Estimates, but if one takes the adjustments that are being made and the allowance for the conversion to the fiscal year, then rather than 2.9 percent more money right now, they probably have something in the neighbourhood 6.3 percent in the way of additional money over the amount of money they had for operations last year.

Now, admittedly, that 6.3 percent is more than twice 2.9 percent, but that is the addition, that isn't the amount of money that hospitals are getting. The net budget for hospitals in the Province of Manitoba in calendar 1977 was \$247.6 million. Now, to say that they are getting more than twice that would mean that they were getting something in the nature of half-a-billion dollars, which is patently ridiculous. What they are getting is instead of just the 2.9 percent cost increase of \$6.9 million, they are getting an additional \$8.7 million to compensate for annualizations, for programs and services that were undertaken in mid-year that have to be computed on an annualized basis for budget deficits and for the conversion from the calendar to the fiscal year. But the increase in the actual net budget is still 2.9 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I will take the matter under an advisement and check it out. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then could the Minister of Health inform the House, are the hospitals receiving more than the \$269.423000 as indicated in the printed Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: The figure that the hospitals will be getting for 1978-79, according to the current

and precise calculations that I have from the Manitoba Health Services Commission at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, is \$263.2 million. \$263.2 million, compared to \$247.6 in calendar 1977. And I remind the honourable member, we're looking at fiscal 1978-79 compared to calendar 1977. Now, the question as to whether or not, whether this money was voted in the Estimates is irrelevant and academic. Of course it was voted in the Estimates. There is no additional money being sought from the taxpayers of Manitoba; there is no additional permission being sought from the members of this Legislature. That money was voted in the Estimates, was provided in the Estimates. There was a current carry-over in the account of the Manitoba Health Services Commission in which these contingencies were all taken into account.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister. Then he basically is clarifying the situation, and in fact, the hospitals of Manitoba will be getting what the Estimates book show, they will not be getting one penny less, and all this, the speculation in the newspaper — I'll call it speculation, because the Minister denies actually making that statement — the speculation in the newspaper is wrong, and I therefore ask the Minister whether he is today, and tomorrow, going to do something to meet the financial hardship which faces the hospitals.?

A MEMBER: We went all through that.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hospitals have discussed their budgets with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The measures that have been taken and implemented in the various hospitals, the requirements in order to meet their budget limitations, have been discussed and studied, and it's my understanding at this juncture that the hospitals of the province, with the adjustments that had been made for deficits and the other measures that I have mentioned, feel that they can live within these budgetary limitations. Now, obviously, I intend to remain sensitive to and attuned to the problem for each of them, for all health facilities throughout the year. I will stay in touch with them directly and through the Health Services Commission. At this juncture, I believe that my honourable friend's question is academic; they know what their budgets are, they know how much money they're getting; they have indicated at this juncture that they think they can live with it.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I gather the Minister looks with great equanimity on the fact that the hospitals are having to cut back their services, not replacing staff, not allowing for holidays, closing down wings in some cases, closing down other services, and the Minister tells us here that he's quite satisfied that this is in order. I'm wondering whether in fact I heard him right?.

MR. SHERMAN: I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on that point, because it gives me the opportunity to respond to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a question that he asked me yesterday about bed closures in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I want to advise both members and honourable members opposite that since November only one permanent closure has taken place in the hospital beds spectrum in Winnipeg. It involves a reduction of four beds at the Health Sciences Centre, from a total of 1,308 to 1,304. Now at the moment there are, Sir, a number of beds, a number of wards closed in Greater Winnipeg. There is a 20-bed ward closed at the Misericordia, there is a 25-bed ward closed at the Victoria, there is a 48-bed ward closed at St. Boniface. All three of these are closed for redecoration and renovation purposes which are customary at this time of year. The Health Sciences Centre is redecorating on a room to room rotation so it amounts to a number of single, individual rooms at any one time. Grace and Concordia have not scheduled any bed closures for this year.

Sir, the hospital administrations advise me that they customarily close beds during the summer months and that this year is no exception. They do so for purposes of renovation and redecoration; they do so because of under-utilization at this time of year.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me yesterday whether sickness takes a holiday in the summertime, I am sure it does not. The fact of the matter is though that slating for elective surgery does take a holiday in the summertime; doctors take holidays, patients take holidays, people electing surgery prefer to do it at other times of the year. The slates are substantially reduced and the demand on the hospital space, both in terms of operating rooms and acute beds is substantially reduced in the summertime.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that perhaps he could shorten his answers a little.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question either to the Minister of Municipal

Thursday, July 13, 1978

or to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of The Planning Committee who is diverted by the Minister of Finance. Can either of the two Ministers advise whether he is aware of a complaint regarding a municipality in Manitoba, having been given a building permit to build at the site of a graveyard, that the graveyard is now being bulldozed, that the people whose ancestors have been buried there are very disturbed by the fact that the graves are just being ignored, that the skeletons are being disturbed and I don't know that there is any provision being made for reburial. Can either of the Ministers advise whether he has received a complaint in this connection and, if so, is there anything that can be done to stop this practice. Mr. Speaker, when there was a suggestion of movement of a graveyard in Nelson House, there was certainly great anguish amongst the people concerned. In this case the movement is now taking place and I don't know that any provision has been made to deal with the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and make some inquiries about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the questions that were asked of me by the Honourable Meer for St. George and the Leader of the Opposition, I can report that an Order for Return that was issued, under the Votes and Proceedings, No. 15, dated Thursday, April 6, 1978 and No. 26, dated April 21, 1978 called for this information and that the data are presently being compiled by each department for submission to the House.

Mr. Speaker, some honourable members have also asked questions concerning the number of persons employed by the Government of Manitoba. The paper that I will table today provides information on the numbers of actual people employed in the various categories as of late October, the beginning of 1978 and early May. You will note that between October and May the information supplied to us by the Personnel Administration Branch of Management Committee indicates that the number of regular permanent civil servants declined by 258, the number of term employees declined by 392, the number of contract staff declined by 685. There were 1,335 fewer people employed by the Government of Manitoba in these three categories in May than in October.

Members should be aware that in the same fashion as the Annual Report of The Civil Service Commission, these attrition numbers do not include seasonal, hourly, daily, shift, departmental or casual employees of the government. However, they do include contract employees which have not been listed in the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to redirect a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs with regard to the question of the building permit. In view of the fact that what is happening is apparently happening now, and if there is anything to be done it has to be done immediately, would the Minister check as soon as he can with regard to what is happening? If he needs further information as to the location, I will be able to get that for him, but I believe that it has been fairly prominently reported.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will make immediate inquiries after the question period about that matter.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet . . . the Member for Inkster questioned the continued funding of the Shaughnessy Community School during the past few days. I wish to advise him, as he is probably aware, that in December of last year we approved a grant of \$11,440 for 64 man weeks of employment under the Provincial Employment Program. At the present time the department has not received an application from them for any further funding, but in any event even if an application were received, Management Committee has frozen all funds under the ICEP Program. I am advised, however, that the Federal Government through the Canada Works Program is planning to entertain applications for worthwhile community programs and it may be that under this program they would be able to receive continued financial assistance.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would the Minister consider the program to have been so worthwhile, involving community parental participation, a very successful program, that he could recommend another branch of the Provincial Government, perhaps

the existing employment program, under which these people could be funded.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly make inquiries as to whether there is a possibility of funding of the program under another department but I am not aware at the present time of any funds in another department that could be used to fund the program.tf\$

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked a series of questions from various members of the opposition about the sale of the Pakwagan log operation in Wabowden. We have completed the sale, the agreements are signed, Mr. Speaker. The operation had been sold to two gentlemen living in Northern Manitoba for the sum of \$33,384.30. I found it necessary to recommend to my colleagues in Cabinet that we take this particular action of selling the operation when we established that in the approximately two and one-half years of operation, there were 450,000 dollar losses and there was in the neighbourhood of \$800,000 worth of grants and costs that will be incurred to the government to clean up the outstanding debts. The specific question and I'm sure the concern that has been expressed by one of the members opposite, particularly the Member for Churchill, was whether continued operation and continued employment would take place. I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that we've been assured that the operation will continue and that the previous employees will be given first opportunity and first consideration for employment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I thank him for his answer and even though it took him two months to make this decision, it is a good thing that it has now taken place.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether he has sold the operation to the lowest bidder, or whether other considerations entered into his decision as to —(Interjection)— Excuse me, to the highest bidder. . . . or whether other considerations were taken into account when making the decision as to whom it should be sold?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the proposals for purchase were reviewed. Technically, it was the second highest proposal but in proper terms, it was the highest proposal. The highest proposal did not conform in any way, shape or form with the requirements re establishing credibility as to where finances would come from, deposits, this type of thing. So the highest proposal per se had to be disregarded and this is the second highest.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, how many proposals did the Minister receive in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: Four, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, further to the answer given yesterday with respect to questions asked by the Member for Inkster concerning Statistics Canada, I would like to table for the information of the House, a communication from Statistics Canada, along with a memo of explanation. The communication from Statistics Canada, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that the March, 1977 figures were understated by some 600, which would mean, Mr. Speaker, that a comparison of March, 1977 to March, 1978 there would have been a net reduction of approximately 500.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to ask the Minister reporting for the Civil Service Commission, relative to the document which she has tabled, a question in two parts: One, can she confirm more clearly whether the document is dealing with actual employee personnel numbers or positions; and secondly, I should like to ask her whether she can indicate, if she is aware, that the pattern within the public service as between October of a given year and April or May of a given year is always one of a reduction in the order of 500 to 800 personnel.

Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I know the question was asked of the Minister of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind having . . . The question may well be answered by the Minister without Portfolio, but the document was circulated in the aftermath of a verbal reply by the Minister reporting for the Civil Service Commission, and I really direct my question in two parts to her.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: The answer to the first question is yes, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the second question, from May to May there has been a reduction of 1,490.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Minister says May to May, the document doesn't deal with May. It deals with October, December and May. Now, I would like her to table the document rather than make such a facile off the cuff remark.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to add to the answer of the Minister of Labour, because the information supplied to the personnel administration comes from the Management Committee and I'm aware of the details. The purpose of indicating May to May was to indicate specifically that the reduction itself on a year-to-year basis has been consistent with the information supplied from October to May. Mr. Speaker, the information can be made available to the Leader of the Opposition from March to March, or it can be made available from May to May. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that has to be understood and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to accept it, is that the reduction is there in real people and it's been consistent and is increasing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. .

MR. SCHREYER: I would ask, then, Mr. Speaker, that a document be tabled dealing with each of the quarters of any year. We have a document here which deals with October, December and May, over a period of nine months. I would ask if they would be prepared to table documentation which is emanating really from Statistics Canada rather than from their own manipulation. —(Interjection)— I don't think that's an unreasonable request, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

MR. GREEN: It is manipulation.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, if it's anything analogous to the way in which they are treating receipts from the Government of Canada under Public Accounts, then it is some indication.

I am asking if they are prepared to table such documentation with respect to a run of say not less than two years, the last two years, in order to ascertain whether or not there is a clear and distinct pattern of variation of employment within the public service as between summer, autumn, winter and spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the answer is yes and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can ask for an Order for Return and that information will be supplied.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to the manipulation. Mr. Speaker, the information that has been presented has been presented by the very same officials who were in fact supplying the information to the members opposite when they were government and, Mr. Speaker, the question of manipulation is a reflection on them and I think it ill behooves the Leader of the Opposition to make that statement. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, they cannot live with the fact that there has been a reduction, nor are they prepared to accept any information supplied to the members opposite even though it is supplied and furnished to us by the

very same officials who were with them. Mr. Speaker, I have tabled in the House a memorandum from the Personnel Administration and I ask that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition examine that. I ask him to think about his statement and to apologize for the suggestion of manipulation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise on a point of privilege in the aftermath of that statement to assert as emphatically as I can, that nothing I said was in any way a reflection upon the integrity of the public servants who are involved with the collation of data. However, Sir, I happen to know, and I intend to assert my rights as a Member of this Assembly, to make direct enquiries of officials of the Government of Canada and the Auditor of this province with respect to the manner in which receipts of the Government of Canada are being manipulated — to my mind there is no question about it whatsoever — to artificialize the amount of a deficit . . .

If my honourable friends are suggesting that I am reflecting on the integrity of public servants, I say, Sir, that with respect to the manner in which the deficit of this province has been manipulated that I happen to know, Sir, that that was not arrived at on the advice or on the suggestion of any of the public servants of this province, including the Auditor, but rather a peculiar interpretation was chosen to be put on the way in which certain receivables and receipts from the Government of Canada were to be treated in the format that was tabled in this House. And Sir, that's not a reflection on the public servants, since it was not their idea or suggestion or advice that caused that to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I don't know how many points of privilege I can take at one time, but I am prepared to take another one.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise on privilege, because it's now clear that what the Leader of the Opposition — of the diversion operation across the way — is attempting to do, is to now cast aspersions in his jackal, roundabout way, on everybody that's involved in the production of the financial statement. And he wants to go to Stats Canada? I tell him, go. If he wants to go to Revenue Canada . . . But make sure he puts it right on the record this time, and remember that he referred to Revenue Canada when he felt bound to stand on his hind feet and refer to somebody else as a liar last April, Mr. Speaker. Let all of this go well on the record, and let me just tell him in one word what it is that he's trying to preach — it's nonsense and it's misleading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition further to the same point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the records of the Legislature over many years will show that I am not one to use those terms unkindly or frequently; very rarely, very rarely. But on that rare occasion, Sir, it is when I feel completely in conscience bound to indicate what I believe is being perpetrated. And it's not by the public servants, Sir — I've already said, without saying much more about it, that I intend to communicate directly with federal officials and the Auditor of this province.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force on a point of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the letter that was tabled in the Legislature from the Director of the Personnel Administration — and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will have it in front of him. It simply states, "I would like to confirm the net reduction in employment between the periods of October 21, 1977 and May 5, 1978 has been as follows: 1,335.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have several points of privilege which I intend to take under advisement.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Sir. I'm not raising a point of privilege. I wish, if time permits, to ask a supplementary question.

Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, but the time for questioning having expired, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): . . . of a famous Canadian politician, this question period was almost degenerating into a debate.

Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 67 and 68?

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 67 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FARM LANDS PROTECTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur) presented Bill No. 67, An Act to Amend The Farm Lands Protection Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in discussing the bill that is before us, The Act to Amend The Farm Lands Protection Act, the objective of the changes will be to place more stringent, effective restrictions on the purchase of agricultural land by non-resident Canadians, and the freeing up, or the making it available, for all Canadians and the majority shareholders of Canadian corporations to purchase farm land in Manitoba. The first change in the bill being changed from The Farm Lands Protection Act to The Agricultural Land Protection Act is merely a title change and states the intent of the protection, or the type of land that is to be protected.

The further change is to change the persons or corporations who are able to purchase land in Manitoba from being a citizen of Canada to a resident of Canada, as it is explained in the bill before us.

In explaining the bill, I may just briefly state that it has appeared in the past that individuals who are non-resident Canadians and have been desirous of buying land in Manitoba have just used the multiple of names to purchase additional 160-acre packages, which they are now allowed to buy. We have changed the restriction on the numbers of acres from 160 to those non-residents to 20 acres. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, we feel that this will make it far less attractive for individuals to buy that size of acreages in the Province of Manitoba. On the other hand, we feel that restrictions on fellow Canadians, people from all across Canada, people who are not farming in Manitoba and are owners of possibly a business as well as a farm, that they should have the right to invest in agricultural land in Manitoba.

I think it is traditional that the agricultural sector — not only in the Province of Manitoba, but in all of Canada — appears to have a shortfall for capital available to it, and I think I could just refer to the recent statement made by the Federal Minister responsible for the Farm Credit Corporation where there is a serious shortfall in capital for individuals who are desirous of buying land for farming. So, it is in freeing up the individuals who are able to invest, put their money in land, that I feel it is important that all Manitobans, Canadians, have the opportunity to buy as much land in Manitoba as they feel that they are desirous of buying.

The history has shown, in the past few months, that with The Farm Lands Protection Act that has been in place, that there have been very few non-farming Manitobans and Canadians that have actually purchased land, and it is one of those things that is another restriction over them, that is needless. It is not important to be there, but can cause animosity amongst Manitobans, whether they are farmers or whether they are businessmen in small or rural communities, or whether they live in urban centres. It also could encourage, Mr. Speaker, the move by people living in urban centres, or people involved in urban businesses, to introduce legislation that would restrict farm people from investing in other parts or business in Manitoba. I think that is very important, and I want to put that on the record. I think that we live in a province that individuals should have the opportunity to invest either in farms or in related businesses, or in another part of the province.

So I think, in the intent of the changes, that we feel that it is important that the people of Manitoba have the opportunity to buy and invest in the province. I think that as the legislation or the Act

now reads that some of the powers that the board have as far as administering the Act, it has been very difficult for them to restrict or to make decisions on individuals buying land in Manitoba and would like to give them a little more power of being able to control the non-resident purchaser of agricultural land in Manitoba.

I think that the amendments will clearly state that we have tried to make it as easy as possible for the farm people who are desirous of continuing to own the farm. We feel that if, for example, a father had two sons and the father owned a corporation and his two sons were desirous of farming, that he would not be restricted from helping those individuals by purchasing land and making available to them a parcel of land for them to farm.

So I think it has another implication of further helping the family farm or have one Manitoban help another one, regardless of the business that they themselves are in or an individual.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendments to the Act are very important. They are ones that will make it far more workable. The individuals who I think should be controlled, the individuals who have possibly a source of funds that our fellow Manitobans or Canadians don't have because of their currency rates being higher and the fact that it appears that the land in our province has not reached the price levels that it has in some of the countries that they are involved in, that some of our people have been put in a position where they have been placed in an unfair position.

So the explanation as I have put it forth, I feel covers the reasons for the amendments to The Farm Lands Protection Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 68 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT(2)

MR. DOWNEY presented Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Real Property Act — it's an accompanying bill to go along with Bill No. 67 — because of changes, proposed amendments made to the bill, No. 68 was necessary. The criteria for the occupation, to know the occupation of an individual on the declaration is no longer required because of the fact that there are no longer restrictions to resident Canadians and the deletion of the occupation of a person buying land is not necessary.

There is another change being made which will now require a corporation to state the mailing address of its registered offices and the mailing addresses of the principal office in Manitoba.

The changes, as I have said, will help facilitate the actions of the Bill No. 67 to now be carried out in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Would you call Bill 65, Mr. Speaker?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 65 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT (2)

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to speak on this particular bill except after hearing the Honourable Member for Selkirk make some statements with regard to possible discriminations in the Autopac section I started to wonder why, Mr. Speaker, that the former Minister responsible for Autopac would start to make the statements when he in fact, Mr. Speaker, was the gentleman in power, or the Minister at that time, and set up the regulations for Autopac that gives consideration to different rates for people under certain ages and whether they are married or not.

Then I also started to wonder how serious I could take his criticism when he is also the former Attorney-General and had the power under, I guess, the Human Rights Act to make amendments to that Act or in fact require that his honourable colleague, the Honourable Member for St. George, who was the Minister of Autopac at that time, to make the amendments.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I had to rise at this occasion just to draw to the honourable gentlemen's attention across the way there that these particular regulations were in existence for the life of Autopac.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that it's my belief — and I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. George would concur — that I believe Autopac has tried to establish fair rates based on practical reasons, with the long aim objective of Autopac being that if we can give the overall operator of a vehicle and user of insurance the lowest rate, let's do it this way. I think that it was common sense and good sense that these regulations were set forward under Autopac. So that I can't concur with the comments that the former Attorney-General made when he made his presentation.

I might suggest very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that if we were to push The Human Rights Act to its fullest length then I guess we would have to apply it to life insurance. You know, why do rates discriminate against people because they have a physical handicap. They might have had a heart attack. You know, where do we stop? The same thing could apply, again, I would suggest, in the Autopac, that they could go after Autopac and say, "Why can't I have a driver's licence," which is insurance, "because," heaven forbid but, "I don't have any arms?" That the Act is such laid out in The Human Rights Act now that if they wanted to, then people could go after Autopac and say, "Well because of my physical handicap, why can't I have a contract with you?"

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that what is being put forward is a practical approach, a reasonable approach and a sensible approach. So I support the amendments to The Human Rights Act.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, initially, had not intended to take part in this debate but seeing as we have had such remarks from the Member for St. James and we have had such a wonderful session until 3 o'clock this morning, I thought it would be appropriate that I would make a few comments with respect to Bill 65 and some of the amendments contained therein.

I would like to, firstly, Mr. Speaker, make some comments with respect to the statements made by the Honourable Member for St. James. He indicated — I believe, I will try and interpret his remarks correctly — that if we left the legislation as it is, some person who may be handicapped with no arms could come to Autopac and demand an insurance contract from them on the basis of license. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe if that individual — I will use his example — licensing meets requirements of The Highway Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicle Branch to be able to obtain a driver's licence on the basis of his handicap, then there is no reason for the insurance company, whether it be public or private, to be able to refuse that individual the request for insurance if he satisfies the licensing agency that he is capable and able to perform and operate a motor vehicle on the province's highways. If that is the case, then there should be no restriction imposed by any insurance company.

Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment within The Human Rights Act dealing with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation deals specifically with automobile insurance; it does not deal with any other classes of insurance, as the Member for St. James alluded to. It just deals with the area of automobile insurance, and I believe the Member for Selkirk yesterday challenged the government to indicate their intentions with respect to these amendments. There is no doubt that we in government, when we instituted the rates along the old system of insurance rates, we moved far away to equalize the rates in terms of the categories that were in existence prior to Autopac. We did not go all the way. And there is no doubt that I would have to say that we dragged our heels over the last couple of years with the Human Rights Commission indicating to us that we should be preparing to move either to do away with discrimination in this area and frankly, Mr. Speaker, I want to admit to the Minister of Highways, I initially was dragging my heels when I was Minister there, that I had some reservations, and I was to a degree influenced by the administration of the insurance corporation; there is no doubt that I was influenced to some degree.

However, there is no doubt that this move in this legislation really should not be implemented.

The present Minister of Highways responsible for the insurance corporation should go back, as he indicated several months ago when he was flying those trial balloons that he was putting out, he should go back and implement those so-called trial balloons one way or the other — leave this amendment right out of the Act — and put it in. Because, Mr. Speaker — oh, Mr. Speaker, Sir — your face has changed somewhat from a minute or two ago —(Interjection)— Your clothes have changed.

Mr. Speaker, there's two aspects of this amendment that concern myself, Sir, the area dealing with the move now to include marital status within the amendment where it really does not play any great significance in the insurance contract; and the other significance, Mr. Speaker, is that this amendment does not pertain to insurance contracts affected by The Insurance Act. This amendment, if implemented, I believe, really can be the first step along the slow, nit-picking route that the present government will take if they are intent on allowing the private sector back into the insurance industry; there is no doubt about it. Mr. Speaker, if they are intent on bringing — and they may as well; I'd like to hear them say it — if they are intent on bringing back that amendment — and I want the Attorney-General to indicate whether that is their intention — because certainly, I would say there is the private insurance sector, for all intents and purposes in the automobile insurance field today — not saying five or six years ago — is virtually non-existent. There are very few contracts for insurance. But even if they are, they are basically handling, and they are only able to handle, the extension insurance, the increased liability coverage, Mr. Speaker, or the increased collision covers the first party coverage on the automobile. So that these types of restrictions should not affect them one way or the other, in my point of view.

But if this amendment goes in, there is no doubt that that can — and I would want the Minister of Highways, or the Attorney-General to indicate by that amendment, by the inclusion of marital status, and the companies governed by The Insurance Act, because for all intents and purposes the basic coverage which is handled solely by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation does not pertain to The Insurance Act whatsoever. So that if it is their intention to allow the private sector into the market field, let them, as I have stated before, let them have the intestinal fortitude to say, "Yes, we are going to do that, and this is the first step. We are amending it, we don't intend to equalize the rates across the province; we intend to implement this, and that is the first step to allowing the so-called competition that they have talked about in the insurance field within the Province of Manitoba."

Mr. Speaker, I would want some comment as well from the Attorney-General dealing with the removal from The Human Rights Act, the section dealing with the Affirmative Action programs within the government and within the Civil Service, and that deals with the amendment dealing with the Special Employment Program. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there was an agreement between the Career Planning Branch, which has now been disbanded, of the Civil Service, and the Human Rights Commission, that they would be the agency handling all the plans as submitted by the various departments of government dealing with Affirmative Action, of which only, I believe, four or five were approved by the Career Planning Branch, and the other departments were being pressured by the Career Planning Branch to have those Affirmative Action plans in place, and their intentions with respect to special employment programs in motion. Now, this section takes away that agreement. I would want to know what the intentions of the government are, because the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, the Minister of Labour, indicated to us in Committee that it will be the staffing officers of the Civil Service Commission and to some degree, the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour, that will be the arm of the Civil Service now that will really be handling the Affirmative Action programs within the Civil Service. I want to know whether they have received any reaction, or asked for any remarks from the League of the Physically Handicapped, and as well, other groups that had been consulted from time to time by the Career Planning office when they were the agency that was dealing with the Affirmative Actions programs within the Civil Service. Because I personally have not spoken to anyone in the League or any of these groups with respect to what their position might be, and I would like to know what really is behind this change.

I presume, primarily, because you've done away with the Career Planning office, that this amendment is going in, but I would want to know what the intentions of the government are and whether or not there will be really no push, there will be just flowery words as there have been by the Minister of Labour that, you know, they are concerned about the welfare of handicapped people and the like, but really there is no concrete push and this is the first step to really say, well, we don't intend to do very much, we will put some flowery words within The Human Rights Act, we have disbanded our career planning office and we don't intend to do very much.

The Minister of Labour is shaking her head either in disbelief . . . I would want her to get up even in this debate, because she said they will have programs. I would want her to tell me whether or not they have moved ahead and whether there are other departments that her department is now pushing, either through the Women's Bureau or through the Civil Service Commission, to have their plans completed and have some concrete steps that she can come back and say, look, you

are wrong, all these departments are moving ahead. This is a priority of government, even though the employment situation in this province is at a critical high period, we are still intending to push ahead with the programs dealing with the physically handicapped, the disadvantaged groups in society, and we will use the affirmative action and the special employment programs such as New Careers, such as Northern Employment within the Department of North Affairs which has now been disbanded.

That is what I want to hear from the Minister. If she is indicating that I am all wrong, then she should get up and say, look, these are the things we are doing. But certainly we did not have those answers or any comments —(Interjection)— You didn't tell us anything in the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission. That's the point, Mr. Speaker, she did not tell us anything in the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission. She also told us in the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission that she would give us the detailed comparisons of positions and people with respect to the Civil Service — and if she goes back and has her staff check Hansard — and to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that she was to provide that information and she gave us this sheet of paper today, that is not the information that she indicated she would provide.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to rise on a point of order. The Member for St. George said that I did not give any information to them regarding the affirmative action and what we have done when the four people were laid off. I did tell them very thoroughly that we have a new committee. I told him in the Estimates, and if he will read it in Hansard, he will see that I have told him, and we have a member of the physically handicapped as part of that committee, and it is all in Hansard.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that was a point of order but I accept the Minister's statements that she did tell us that, but what else is new? I mean, nothing has happened since you disbanded the Career Planning Office. There has been no move. In fact, there has been a downgrading of any of the special employment programs within the Civil Service. Ask the Minister of Continuing Education, the Member for Gimli, as to how many continued employment within the new Careers Program his department is funding. How many northerners of disadvantaged status are being employed through the Department of Northern Affairs or within the agencies of special employment nature in northern Manitoba? How many have been laid off in those areas? She cannot get up in the House and act that they are somehow doing things in this area when she has to get up and admit that they are going backwards in this area, and no words less than that are appropriate in respect to the special employment programs. But from the legal point of view, I think the Attorney-General should explain this type of amendment specifically as to what is intended by the government. Is it primarily because of the disbandment of the Career Planning Office?

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government has to state very clearly some of its intentions with respect to these amendments dealing with The Automobile Insurance Act and specifically the special employment programs before they are put into law within this Province of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.tf\$

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSON: Will you call Bill No. 69, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 69 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 69, on a motion of the Honourable Mrs. Price, An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just spoke briefly on this bill yesterday in response to the Member for River Heights who was attempting, without very much success, to clear up the government problem with regard to figures which they had supplied to Statistics Canada. Mr. Speaker, let me

make that quite clear, the Minister without Portfolio today, in an attempt to deflect criticism, indicated that what we are criticizing is the civil servants who supplied materials to Statistics Canada. Mr. Speaker, those are the people who he says understated the figures for 1977. So my honourable friend would like to try, because he does not any longer, for good reason, rely upon his own credibility, he would now like to rely on the credibility of the Civil Service, Mr. Speaker, and is suggesting that the same civil servants who he says have to be relied on this year, understated the figures last year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look again at the quagmire that the government has got into by trying to deal with these statistics in a way favourable to themselves. First of all, let it be clearly on the record that the statistics that I gave to the House have been confirmed 100 percent by the government, that I did not do anything to mislead the House, and these are the statistics, Mr. Speaker, that I gave

That in March, 1977, there were 14,090 on the payroll of the Province of Manitoba. That in March of 1978, there were 14,192 on the payroll of the Province of Manitoba, which was 100 people additional.

Mr. Speaker, those figures were completely accurate and were confirmed by the Minister without Portfolio. He says that these figures don't include certain things, in explanation, Mr. Speaker, but he makes no suggestion that I came into the House with figures which were incorrect. As a matter of fact, they were completely verified. But because the government was embarrassed, they tried, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister came in and said that we should correct our research — isn't that interesting, Mr. Speaker? We should correct our research — and as a correction of that research, he said that the figure for September of 1977 was 15,336; that the figure in March of 1978 was 14,192, or a reduction of 1,200 people. That was his explanation for those figures yesterday. But, Mr. Speaker, it contained such an obvious anomaly that it was so easy to deal with that the Minister wound up with egg on his face, because we immediately got the figure for September of 1976 and found out that the figure was again 15,300 and if my honourable friend was correct that that represented a reduction of 1,200 or 1,300 civil servants between September of 1977 to March of 1978, then there was an exact same reduction, almost identical, Mr. Speaker, between September of 1976 and March of 1977. So the Minister, with egg on his face, had to run around and find out certain other things, and, Mr. Speaker, what we now have is a very interesting thing. We have a telegram from Statistics Canada to the Government of Manitoba saying that the figures include 600 additional casual. Where does that figure come from, Mr. Speaker? It's Statistics Canada all right, but after the event and after the argument. What has happened is that Mr. Edgeworth has phoned up Mr. Kerr and said that that does not include casual employees. And we usually have about 600 casual employees.

So what Statistics Canada has done is wired back to Mr. Edgeworth confirming, Mr. Speaker, that they have given him an additional 600 figure.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for River Heights on a point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is suggesting that that is what has happened then, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't know what he is talking about. And, Mr. Speaker, he either has to have facts to say that, because he is in fact reflecting on the director of the particular department.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I am suggesting to you that that is exactly what happened. My honourable friend, who has wound up morning and afternoon with his breakfast on his face, is now trying to extricate himself. I am using, Mr. Speaker. . . What is the point of order?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. The honourable member is talking about a civil servant and is saying that something happened with respect to a civil servant. It is not correct, Mr. Speaker. He has no knowledge of that. It is his own particular mind that is functioning now. He has no facts whatsoever. He is reflecting on a civil servant. He is completely and absolutely inaccurate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I relied for my authority — and I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, I do have a problem — I relied for my authority on the Minister for the Task Force. That's, I admit,

a very weak authority. It's the authority of a super-fraud. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, is that a problem? Is that word a problem? Is that word a problem?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The honourable member is reflecting on me, Sir. He has in fact called me a super-fraud. He has no basis for any information that he supplied to the House in the last few moments. In the course of it, he is debating that and he is reflecting on me, Sir, and I ask him to apologize and to take that back.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will apologize to the honourable member readily when he apologizes for the words absolute fraud which he used with respect to me. —(Interjection)— I will apologize gladly, Mr. Speaker, I will apologize immediately when the honourable member apologizes for the words absolute fraud which he used with respect to myself which the Speaker, who has been very very careful about correcting the length of a question when it's the shortest question on the Order Paper, or other such things, but never interrupted at that view, and I didn't, Mr. Speaker, because I intend to deal with that question. I intend to determine who are the frauds in this House and who is the super-fraud. But I will stop using that word; I will apologize for it immediately when the member apologizes for the use of the words absolute fraud.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface I will not use that word.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Honourable Member for Inkster in a debate that is not before us, I indicated his course of action and cited his position and statements, his public statements and statements in the House, and I made the statement that I had. The honourable member, in talking with respect to myself, is citing the the Personnel Airector of dministration and a course of action that did not occur, Mr. Speaker, and to that extent that is inaccurate and, Mr. Speaker, to that extent the statement which is deducted from that cannot be deducted because the statements are based on inaccurate and misleading and incorrect information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member interrupted me when I said that he wound up with egg on his face twice in the same day, that he behaved in such a way that he is a super-fraud. I intend to deal with the accuracy of my statements, but I would be very happy to withdraw the remark when the honourable member withdraws his word about fraud, because that is inaccurate and misleading, and on the same basis, and I intend to prove it. But if the honourable member has introduced a definition in the House which he says all honourable members can use when dealing with another honourable member, then I will use it and I will intend to prove it, and have stronger evidence with regard to the proof of it than has the honourable member. But if the honourable member will agree that the use of the word was probably not right and that he could have referred to it as weakness — any other thing, Mr. Speaker, but fraud, because there is no deception on my part whatsoever and he knows it — and if he will withdraw the word, then I will withdraw the word superfraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights is super-fraud in this House and I will prove that, Mr. Speaker, both in this debate and the other debate, came in after the figures were given and attempted — and this is the super fraud, Mr. Speaker — attempted to rationalize those figures on the basis that in March of 1978 there were 1,300 employees less than in October of 1977, and I showed that the same relationship existed in the previous years. So then other things happen, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member came in and told us that the place that Statistics Canada gets those figures is from our Civil Service, and that's what I said, that Mr. Edgeworth is having confirmed to him the figures which he gave to Mr. Kerr. The honourable member is my authority for that. And if that was fraudulent, Mr. Speaker, then I will withdraw it, but those figures are given to Mr. Edgeworth by our civil servants. That's what the member has said. And Mr. Edgeworth indicated to our caucus director that in the previous year the casual people were not included and this year the casual people were included, and therefore there is an over-statement in this year's figure or an understatement in last year's figure, however you want to call it. But the figures that I stated to the House, which the honourable member says are incorrect, were correct figures and the member confirmed them, that those are the figures that Statistics Canada gave me, and they were given to Statistics Canada by the people that my honourable friend says we should rely on. Now he says that there are some problems with those figures; that there are variations;

that there are casual employees; that there are contract employees and what have you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't indicate that I came into the House with the wrong figures; that indicates that I came into the House with the right figures and that the government has now had to try to figure out a way of rationalizing them. So they say, Mr. Speaker, this is their rationalization: Between October 21st — and look "what a tangled web we weave when once we practice to deceive" — from October —(Interjection)— No, I don't think so; I don't think that's Shakespeare. No, it's not Green either, but I don't think it's Shakespeare. From October 21st, 1977, 13,759 civil servants to May 5th, 1978, 12,424 civil servants; a reduction of 1,335.

But, Mr. Speaker, those figures imply something else. They imply a reduction in the Civil Service between March of 1977, Mr. Speaker, — and now they want us to add the casuals — March of 1977 is 14,090 and you have to add 600 casuals, which weren't in the March of 1977 figures, so we have 14,600, which means, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Party Government, according to the figures supplied by super-fraud, we have a reduction of 1,000 civil servants. 14,600 in March of 1977, if we are to add the 600, to their figure 13,759 in October of 1977. In those six months, Mr. Speaker, he is saying we reduced the Civil Service by 1,000 people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot compare apples and oranges, and that's why I took the figure which was given to me by Stats. Canada and now which I am prepared to amend by the figure — not the new one that is sent in the telegram — but by the figure that super-fraud gave us yesterday. Super-fraud came into the House yesterday and gave us a figure of 480 casual employees that were on the payroll in March of 1978. So let's add 480 to the figure of March of 1978 and what you will get, Mr. Speaker, is 14,000, roughly-400, 500 let us say. But we know that the net decrease would be 380 people, because there was an increase on the old figure and if you take 480 as a balancing figure, then you come down to 380.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to concede, although I am not sure that I should, but I am willing to concede that there may have been a difference of 380 people. But that's not 1,700 people; that's not 1,300 people and that, Mr. Speaker, is for a very temporary period. Because it was done in desperation. The Conservative administration came into power, said that they were going to reduce spending, reduce the budget, reduce the Civil Service. They went through the Estimates; they went to the Department of Health. The previous Minister was given a clean bill of health. They went through the Department of Mines. We were given a clean bill of health. They went through virtually every department in the Estimates and said it was a tight ship; that there was no fat; that there were no horror stories. Well, how do you justify to the people of the Province of Manitoba that you took over horror stories? So they did a desperate thing, Mr. Speaker. They sent pink slips to some 300 people to show that they were reducing the Civil Service. The total expenditures of the province didn't go down. They were making a joke of it. They went up. They went up, Mr. Speaker, almost the same in dollar amount as they went up the previous year. Smaller in percentage amount, the same in dollar amount. Still to be amended by supplementary supply. Still to be amended by special warrants. Still to be amended by various things which have not been included. But the amount that they said that they could reduce wasn't there, so they had to make some big announcements.

Essentially they said that in Northern Affairs there are going to be a whole series of reductions, and I would concede that there has been a series of reductions in Northern Affairs. But they didn't come, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a tight ship. As a matter of fact, many of those reductions will result in a net loss to the people of the Province of Manitoba, a net loss because they have reduced in an area where there was 50 percent dollars. That's right. —(Interjection)— 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it means that not only is money from other provinces no longer coming into the Province of Manitoba for worthwhile activities in Northern Manitoba but the people of this province are being taxed to do it in every other province. Because once you are dealing with federal DREE programs, the extent to which you reduce your own program is not only a reduction of moneys coming into the province from other areas and activities in these areas, but it also doesn't mean that the other provinces have reduced and your dollar, your tax dollar, continues to go to subsidize the other provinces.

Well, Mr. Speaker, long ago municipalities and governments found out that that was a losing game. Regardless of whether or not they agreed or disagreed with the Federal Government's spending, they tried to take advantage of every 50 percent dollar and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that not doing it results in a loss to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and that's the area —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says now . . . That's an interesting point. The Honourable Member for Pembina says that he is going to help the Federal Government reduce its deficit. —(Interjection)— That is right, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the Province of Manitoba will continue to pay their share of the deficit and not get the money spent in their own province, as a result of the genius administration. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting martyrdom, an interesting martyrdom, that has been expressed by the Member for Pembina. He says that by Manitoba sacrificing itself and immolating itself in gasoline and hurting itself by not using these federal dollars, we hope that the other provinces will stop doing it, stop using our money,

and that the federal budget will go down.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say good luck to the honourable member in his dream. Very noble. He is willing to be a martyr for the people of the Province of Manitoba subsidizing Quebec, subsidizing The Maritimes, subsidizing other provinces but not using in the Province of Manitoba the tax dollars that we are paying to the Federal Government and giving up that money.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that the honourable member is a martyr. I don't choose to be a martyr. We said with regard to the DREE program, with regard to that portion of it which is industrial development, which I note you are not disagreeing with, what we said is that as long as you have got that program, we will try to get every cent that we can. We don't agree with the program but we will try to get every cent that we can. And, Mr. Speaker, for the Government of Manitoba to sacrifice the DREE dollar for the martyrdom of the Meer for Pembina is interesting but won't be supported, Mr. Speaker, by the Province of Manitoba nor what is the position of the government of the Province of Manitoba or the Meer for Pembina when he went to his electorate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else left out of these figures and, you know, this is the greatest inaccuracy on the part of the government. What is left out of these figures is that we put on the payroll, during employment programs, which were paid out as part of these figures, employees as part of an employment program. The Conservative Government is still spending those moneys, it is still hiring those bodies, so even if we deal with those 350, it is still hiring them but they are paying the private sector to do it. And the honourable members on the other side seem to think in their perverted notion of priorities that if you pay an employee in the private sector and don't have him included on your list of civil servants, that that is somehow elegant, whereas if you employ him within the public service, that that is a crime.

Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, the Honourable Member for Pembina can go out and try to convince the people of the Province of Manitoba that somebody working in a massage parlor is better than somebody working in a hospital. He can go out and try to convince the people of the Province of Manitoba that a private employee hired to sell magazines is better than a hired employee teaching in a school. He can try to convince the people of the Province of Manitoba that an employee hired for the purpose of trying to promote a new product which will keep hair on somebody's head, that that is a dollar well spent whereas a dollar spent, Mr. Speaker, in the area of Northern Manitoba for the creation of better infrastructures for the communities is a dollar ill spent. But it is still a dollar. And if that's the position of my honourable friends that they can pay for employment in the private sector and don't have them on the list and therefore be able to show a reduction of 380 people in the Civil Service, well, Mr. Speaker, that's fine. That's the question that we will argue before the public of the Province of Manitoba from time to time and continuously.

But what we do know is that this suggested mass civil service and fat just wasn't there and whatever cuts were made were made, Mr. Speaker, in an atmosphere which was almost vulgar. That with glee and enjoyment, a notice is issued through Information Services, the government propaganda organ, that 287 people had been laid off.

well, Mr. Speaker, we dealt with it department by department and what happened in the Department of Mines was that there was a reduction of 47 positions — there had previously been a vacancy rate of 75 people — the vacancy rate was reduced to 30 people and these were on the Estimates so that the number of people employed was relatively the same. There was an argument about contract employees, many of whom, Mr. Speaker — and the honourable member can't argue that all of the contract employees were permanent people. Many of the contract employees were hired for specific terms, specific programs which when they were completed were no longer contract employees. — (Interjection) — Yes, and that's what happened.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, we have now the Minister running for cover and how do you know when a Minister runs for cover, Mr. Speaker? When he stops saying, "Rely on me," when he starts producing Civil Service information. And we had the worst example of it yesterday, a repeat of what the Minister of Health did. The Minister without Portfolio in attempting to say that people who are working politically said, "You know civil servants talk to me and they told me that you guys are great and the other guys had us on and we really weren't doing our job." And, you know, that's what the Minister of Health said. He said, "You know, I have talked to civil servants and they told me, boy, we are running a tight ship now compared to the previous administration." Is the Minister so naive and so immature as to accept that kind of crap, Mr. Speaker? Those are the kind of civil servants, Mr. Speaker, that you should kick out of your office. They are playing on your vanity, they are of no use to you and, Mr. Speaker, they are playing on a massive ego vanity when they talk to the Member for River Heights, to try to make him think that he is their friend, that they are going to work harder for him. Mr. Speaker, that's the oldest trick in the book. The smart Minister tells those people to go to hell; he does not give them the time of day. Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio elevates them to being his authorities in this House of the Legislative Assembly. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not a reflection on the civil servant, that's a reflection on the weakness of the Minister — a reflection on the weakness of the Minister. That's right. And that's when you

will find that a government is in trouble, when they find that their own credibility won't carry them two steps. So they start that kind of nonsense.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister said something about political civil servants. I said, "Where were they?" The Member for St. Matthews said, "Everywhere, everywhere." Well I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of political civil servants. "Everywhere." There was none reported in my department. I will tell you what happened in my department. There was, Mr. Speaker, a woman on staff as an assistant to the deputy minister, an administrative assistant. Her name was Evelyn Elliott. She was doing administrative work for the deputy minister, she was asked by the Member for Winnipeg Centre whether she would be his executive assistant knowing that she would no longer be a civil servant but would be on the O/C executive assistants payroll. She accepted, Mr. Speaker, about four months before the election, going off the Civil Service which she would have a steady job and would have to be fired by the Commission, and working as an executive assistant as a result of which our government when we retired — and I'll come to the point — eliminated all of those people including her who was an executive assistant at that time and could have been an administrative assistant.

You know what happened, Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration? They won't deny it. After the election was over, there were approximately four or five people who were executive assistants who after the election was over were created into civil servants before the change of government. I will name them. Dave Saunders, who was an executive assistant, was named as a civil servant after the election was over. —(Interjection) — Harry Enns was an E.A. Fine. There was one, Mr. Speaker in my department. The Member for Lakeside said no. But there was one in my department. There was the executive assistant to Mr. MacInnes in the Department of Health who after the election was over was created a civil servant by the previous administration so he would not lose his job when the government changed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do the honourable members deny it? And are they ashamed of it because I am not ashamed of it, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated in this House on numerous occasions that if I am looking for civil servants in certain areas or for policy advisors or where it involves the strong implementation of a government policy, I will hire competent people. I am much more likely to find those people amongst my friends than amongst my enemies. I see nothing wrong with that. I think that that is a wise policy to follow. But the honourable member is suggesting that all over the civil service there was this politicization. Well, Mr. Speaker, it just isn't true. We haven't found it anywhere. And where the Member for St. Matthews says, "everywhere," I challenge him to find it anywhere within the Department of Mines, for anyone to suggest that there were people on the payroll hired for political purposes. It just isn't true.

The deputy minister was hired on the basis that he was a man who could be expected to be in complete sympathy with the government policy. Do you object to that? No, of course, he doesn't object to it. Does he find anywhere else within the administration that people were hired other than on the basis of doing a job in the department. Your Minister hasn't said so and it just didn't happen, Mr. Speaker.

I want to compare what happened under the new administration. Mr. Speaker, when the previous administration was in its last days after the election, the lame duck part of it, there was one civil servant who had previously been a civil servant who then took on a contract job on the basis that she would be entitled to her old Civil Service position — there had been approximately six months in which the change to that Civil Service position was to be made. It wasn't made until the election was arrived at, Mr. Speaker, and after the election, in our last Cabinet meeting, we made that person a civil servant by Order in Council. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to find out that that Order in Council was never signed by the Lieutenant-Governor. And I will tell you who the civil servant was. It was the chairman of the Rent Control Board and all she was to get was her Civil Service position which she previously had which was discontinued because of her promotion, and then reinstated after a period in which it was understood that she would never lose her position. Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether there is a parliamentary precedent for the Lieutenant-Governor refusing to sign such an Order in Council. I don't know if he refused to sign it. I know that it wasn't signed. I know that the First Minister of this province who sends those Orders in Council did not know that it wasn't signed, but somebody somewhere saw to it that that O/C wasn't signed, Mr. Speaker.

Well I think that is an astounding reflection on somebody, I don't know who, but somebody. I know it happened. I was there when the Order in Council was passed and if honourable members are saying there was something with it, then I harken back to the day when they signed, Mr. Speaker, Orders in Council after the election, declaring Dave Saunders a civil servant; Mr. MacInnes in the Department of Health a civil servant and those Orders in Council, nobody refused to sign them and these people became civil servants.

Well the Honourable Member for St. Matthews has some comparisons. Perhaps he would like the supreme comparison, Mr. Speaker. We never hired a consultant at a fee of approximately \$300,000 — I believe I am being conservative — to tell us how to win elections. Well the Member

for St. Matthews looks astonished that a government would spend \$300,000 and the terms of activity was to tell the government how to win elections. Is that the purpose of paying out public money? Doesn't the honourable member know what I am referring to? Mr. Speaker, it has been read so many times in the House, I thought it would be known verbatim. Operation Productivity produced a report, Mr. Speaker, which said the following: That programs should be geared to the area of the riding and how best to win the riding. In the weak ridings you do certain things, in the marginal ridings you do certain other things, in the stronger ridings you do other things. If I am paraphrasing, Mr. Speaker, the report is available. —(Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting thing with the Alistair Stewart memorandum. It was completely repudiated by the First Minister. I suggest, Mr. Speaker and I will agree, and I said so at the time — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't speaking . . . myself but the First Minister spoke on it — that that was an uncalled for memorandum and, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member who has all my files, the honourable members have all my files and from time to time civil servants — the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Minister without Portfolio now is talking about such great things and all of a sudden he's in love with bureaucracy — if any such memo ever appeared on my desk, the response was quick and immediate. You are not employed to provide political advice. You are to refrain from doing so. You are to deal with the matter strictly on its professional merits according to your professionalism and I do not consider you to be a professional politician nor where you hired for that reason. Ask Bowen. He used to be in the Department of Mines, still works for you. Ask him what he was told when he came in and said that he wanted to give me political advice. Ask him whether he was able to do it. So don't say that this practice is something that we accepted and don't bring out the Alastair Stewart memorandum. Bring out, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Operation Productivity —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Matthews, who the First Minister very wisely did not add to the Executive Council and we can see the reason why, because he says that somehow that particular suggestion was not correct.

I can tell the honourable member that I am just as willing to take advice as any member of the existing Executive Council and any member of the previous Executive Council. What I would not do —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member does me too much credit. He thinks I know everything. —(Interjection)— He thought I knew everything. The honourable member is just as wrong about that assumption as he is wrong about most of the other assumptions that he has in his mind. He is just, Mr. Speaker, consistently wrong.

The fact is that I do not claim to know everything; I do not claim to have known everything, but I do claim, Mr. Speaker, that I did not rely on the Civil Service for political advice or for political employment and that when the honourable member says that that was rampant, I suggest to him that that is not true, that it was rampant under the previous administration, or that it could be found to be fair in a greater degree and more consciously under the previous administration than it could be found under our administration. As a matter of fact, I was somewhat disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that when the government changed hands in 1969, that there was not a greater change in the top policy civil servants, because I believe that there should be and nobody has heard me weep one tear for people who were hired on the basis of their affinity and sympathy with the Conservative Government being let go. Not those, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that those who are hired for normal activities, that you should have as many New Democrats as you have of any other political party, that you do not fire stenographers because of their politics, that you do not fire road builders because of their politics, that you do not fire people in northern Manitoba who are working on a water project, or what have you, because of their politics. But that is what the Conservative Government has decided to do. Indeed, they have said so.

They said, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is Mr. Murta and Mr. Clark, that this firing now which they are apologizing for in Manitoba, was based on the fact that on the payroll of the New Democratic Party government, there were all these civil servants who were working politically, not otherwise, those were the people who were fired in northern Manitoba. Because, the other people, there has been no firing. You fired a deputy minister, you hired a deputy minister. You fired a person in the Civil Service Commission, you hired a person in the Civil Service Commission. We fired executive assistants and you hired executive assistants. There has been no change.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting with the greatest of respect that the honourable member's remarks with regard to the politicizing of the civil servant is incorrect, that it is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to justify some firings which cannot really be justified and, Mr. Speaker, the entire statistic with regard to the number of civil servants have been so confused, to use the authority of the Member for River Heights, as to make it very difficult now to understand them. But certain figures, Mr. Speaker, are irrefutable. They are accepted by both sides: that in March of 1977, there were 14,090 on the payroll; that in March of 1978 there were 14,192 on the payroll; that on the payroll in March of 1972 there are 480 people whose equivalent was not on the payroll in March of 1977, and we don't know what the equivalent was, we don't know how many casual people there were. There was therefore a net decrease in employment of approximately 380 people between March of 1977 and

1978. But that's not good enough for my honourable friend. I suggest to you that that is temporary, and just as the Minister of Health has now said that he is going to hire more people and the Minister of Tourism, who originally talked about laying off lifeguards, that instead of laying them off, we're going to increase the number of lifeguards, that in a very short space of time, Mr. Speaker, those figures are going to be right back where they were, or so close as to indicate that this alleged monster Civil Service of New Democrats is nothing but a sham, is nothing but a farce, is nothing but an attempt by the Conservative administration to justify what is unjustifiable and cannot be rationalized. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things that they have cut, absolutely. Instead of having people on the government payroll, they are paying people on private payrolls. What if we add those to the Civil Service figure? Then, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— They are still costing money. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, these figures will be higher. Mr. Speaker, fifty percent dollars, all of the dollars are coming out of the economy of the Province of Manitoba, much of which has been given in tax rebates.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.
The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the honourable member will permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the honourable member's time has expired, only with leave of the House.
(Agreed)

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member will indicate whether it is his contention that Mr. Edgeworth contacted Statistics Canada within the last couple of days, or the last day, and informed them of the change and as a result, the change and new information has been furnished to the House. Is that his contention?

MR. GREEN: I'm not sure whether it was done within the last couple of days. I know that the change is something, by what my honourable friend said, must have been communicated by Mr. Edgeworth to Statistics Canada. I will concede that I believed that that took place as a result of the discussion in the House. If it didn't, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't change anything. Mr. Edgeworth must have contacted Statistics Canada about the change.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable member will indicate whether he is aware that there is a distinction between the casual employees used by the personnel administration branch of this government, which is the same personnel administration branch of the previous government, and the use of the word "casual" for Statistics Canada purposes, which only includes departmental, so that in effect the change that was brought forward indicated a change not just for March of 1978 but for all the reporting information that had been supplied in the past few years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, you know, I will concede again that the Minister yesterday, in an attempt to clear up a very great problem, had to look into this and try to find out where these discrepancies lay. The most that he has done, in my opinion, and I don't know what the communications were with Statistics Canada and the Government of Manitoba, but I think there must have been some, and there was with the newspapers too and there was with our research director. What I will repeat to the honourable member, who said that my research wasn't correct — and let's remember that that's what he said. My research was correct. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I said that it is my impression that all contract employees are included. That is still my impression. They are payroll employees.

MR. SPIVAK: They are not included; read the letter.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have read the letter and I have seen that there are all kinds of different changes that have taken place and I am not able to determine which are which at this time. What I am telling the honourable member is that I came into the House and I said that Statistics Canada has given us the following figures: March of 1977, 14,090; March of 1978, 14,192. Now, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't tell the whole story and I admit that. I said to my honourable friend that these are the figures I have, you check it, you research it. If you will look at my words, that is what I said.

The honourable member, now having been forewarned, now having had his attention directed to the problem, came into the House. He said, "Those figures are correct, not incorrect." He said 14,090 people in 1977; 14,192 people in 1978, but if you will look at September, you will see 15,336 people, and he did say, Mr. Speaker, contract employees have not been included. But he said, you will add this 1,300 to the contract employees — and that was his research — he said you add 14,192, you take 15,336, that's 1,200 employees plus 600 contract employees, that means 1,800 people have been let go, which is more than the government claimed. That is what he said. And he said, "I ask my honourable friend to correct his research." —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I was finished. I have been asked a question, by leave of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, who now is unhappy that the question was asked and that he gave leave. That is too bad for him. —(Interjection)— I know he doesn't like the answer. He would like to dictate the question and the answer. Mr. Speaker, that's the Conservative . . . They would like to dictate the kind of briefs that come to the Legislative Committee, and they would like . . . The next thing there will be is a law saying that answers have to be in accordance with the desires of the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wish the honourable members would give the member an opportunity to provide the answer to the question he was asked.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if my computer is wrong, then my authority is super-fraud over there, who gave me those figures. —(Interjection)— Is that unparliamentary? Now we have introduced a new word into parliament, which has been apparently accepted.

Mr. Speaker, he then said that if you will take the 1,200 from September of 1977 to March of 1978, you will see a reduction of 1,200 people, plus the contract reduction of approximately 600, I think he gave, which was 1,800.

We then, Mr. Speaker, showed him that this is impossible, that his research is haywire because on the basis of his research, between September of 1976 and March of 1977, there was a reduction of 1,300 people. So today we have a new story, Mr. Speaker. That was the second egg on the face. So today we have a new story which compares October 21 with May 5, which shows, Mr. Speaker, that between March of 1977 and October of 1977, the New Democratic Party — they have to now say that we reduced the Civil Service by 300 people between March and September. Because that's what the new figures say and the more new figures you will get, the more the matter will be confused and what is not confusing, Mr. Speaker, is that this suggested mass reduction in spending and in the Civil Service is nothing more than a farce and a hoax.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

CORRECTION — HANSARD

MR. SPEAKER: Before I proceed, I should like to make a correction that has occurred in Hansard. There was an error in the 2:30 Wednesday, July 5th issue on Page 4769 where the recording of the vote that occurred on Bill 39 includes the names Bostrom, Boyce and Cherniack in the Yeas column when it should be in the Nays column. I hope that that correction meets with the approval of those who . . .

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Would you call Bill 57 please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member, who will not be using any House time, would be good enough to call this bill this afternoon and call the other matters which he has to get through with as well. It won't use up any more House time and I will speak on it this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: The way my honourable friend was going on the previous bill, I thought he

Thursday, July 13, 1978

to continue and I was just providing him with that opportunity to have a non-stop performance all morning. But I'm quite prepared to accommodate my honourable friend and we will go to Third Readings of Amended Bills. If you will start with Bill No. 3, Mr. Speaker.

THIRD READINGS

BILLS NO. 3, 11, 20, 22, 31 and 36, as amended, were each read a third time and passed.

BILLS NO. 2, 9, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30, 44, 50 and 58 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend, the Member for Selkirk, would now be prepared to deal with the report stage of Bill No. 4. He has an amendment to that bill.

BILL NO. 4 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT — REPORT STAGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the proposed new subsection 238.1(6) of The Highway Traffic Act as set out in Section 1 of Bill 4 be amended by striking out the figures "12" in the third line thereof and substituting therefor the figure "7."

MOTION presented.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are just a few words that I would like to offer on behalf of the amendment. We had considerable discussion in Committee in respect to this proposal. No formal amendment was offered in Committee. As members will recall, it was last year first that we dealt with the amendments to The Highway Traffic Act dealing with the Alert machine. At that time the first amendment was a 24-hour period in which a licence would be suspended, to be reinstated.

During the Committee proceedings, we agreed at that time, on the basis of information that we had received, to reduce the 24 hours to 12 hours. The Attorney-General has brought in further amendments this year but has reaffirmed the 12-hour limit. Mr. Speaker, in view of further information which has come to our attention, and concerns which we have expressed which I do not feel have been answered by the Attorney-General, it's our view that seven hours would adequately serve in the situation at hand. The legislation is not intended to act in a punitive sense; it is only intended to assure that a driver who has been drinking and is a threat on the highways will be removed from those highways for a period of time sufficient in order to satisfy ourselves that he is no longer a hazard on the highways. Mr. Speaker, this would take place under this legislation mainly in the area of a reading of .05 to one. Mr. Speaker, if the reading should be in excess of one, then we would anticipate that the driver would be charged under the provisions of the Criminal Code for operating a motor vehicle either while impaired or in excess of .08, and so should he be. This discretion should not be used, Mr. Speaker, insofar as those that ought to be charged under the provisions of the Criminal Code. They should be charged and dealt with according to the law. But the discretion in this bill should not be used, therefore, for that group of motorists, but only for those motorists that fall in the warning or marginal category.

Mr. Speaker, it's our view that after seven hours, that any motorist who has been operating a vehicle and has a reading within that space, would very easily, after seven hours, have reached a point where they would be clearly at a level that would cause them not to be a hazard on the highway. In excess of seven hours, for twelve hours, would be to add a punitive sense to the legislation. It would mean that a motorist — and in particular, I'm thinking here of one who operates for a livelihood, such as a truck driver — would be penalized for no good reason, no sound reason whatsoever. On the other hand, if the truck driver was operating his vehicle and was stopped the evening before, was tested with the breathalyzer or the Alert machine, and the reading was .80, he received the seven-hour suspension, then there's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that by 8:00 o'clock the following morning, that truck driver would be sober enough and responsible enough that he could resume the operations of his vehicle at that time. A seven-hour suspension is sufficient. But if we leave the provision at 12 hours — and I would think that that would be the norm or common type of situation at one o'clock in the morning — if we, however, leave the 12-hour period in, then we are working a hardship and punishment which is not the intention of this particular legislation. The truck driver would only be able to resume his operation at 1:00 p.m. in the afternoon and

an entire morning would be lost for no reason except to punish, to punish and not to remove the motorist for a period of time which we support and concur is required to remove unsafe operators from the road. Again, may I repeat, if the motorist is operating in excess of one, then he should be dealt with under the provisions of the Criminal Code. This legislation then should then not be used in those situations, so we see no reason why seven hours is not adequate. We would have liked to have heard some further medical information. We had no expert witnesses before the committee and it is only based upon information that we understand is the case, that we would recommend this amendment to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this bill not only deals with those drivers whose reading is between 50 milligrams and 100 but also deals with those persons who are over that level and who are dealt with under Section 237 of the Criminal Code, dealing with impaired driving.

I would point out that when this bill was originally introduced last year in the Legislature, the previous government at that time had a suspension period of 24 hours. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is the period of suspension in the other three western provinces and in the Province of Ontario and I understand that after hearing some medical evidence that that was reduced to 12 hours.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the proposed amendment, that because you are dealing with persons whose licences are suspended for readings over the limit imposed in the Criminal Code, and because of the fact that according to Dr. Penner, I think a man who did give evidence last year before the committee that alcohol dissipates at the rate of approximately 10 to 12 milligrams per hour with an average of about 12 milligrams per hour, considering the fact that we're dealing with drivers whose readings are well above the legal limitation under the Criminal Code, the 6 or 7-hour period is not sufficient time for many of those persons to drop below the 50 milligram level. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there also is provision in the bill under Section 238(18) for a person at any time to obtain a certificate as to the level of alcohol in the blood, and present that in order to obtain the licence back.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern that is had with respect to certain individuals who, no doubt, their level of impairment would drop below the 50 milligram period within the proposed 7-hour period, but there must be a period of suspension that is adequate to deal with all cases. There is provision to obtain the certificate to obtain the licence back before that period of time is up, and I would suggest that in this kind of legislation, I am not that opposed particularly, myself, to having some form of deterrents in the legislation. When you consider the penalties imposed in other jurisdictions for driving while under the influence of alcohol, we are probably very lenient in this country, and certainly that's one of the reasons why the previous government and our government has chosen to deal with this piece of legislation to attempt to cut down on the number of accidents that occur on our highways and the damages and difficulties that ensue as a result of drinking drivers because, Mr. Speaker, it is a serious problem. I sympathize with the concern of the Member for Selkirk in his proposed amendment but I suggest that there is some provision for obtaining the licence back prior to the end of the 12-hour period; that we do have a level of suspension that is one-half that of all other jurisdictions in western Canada and Ontario under their proposed legislation. The legislation will need some practical dealing with and it may very well be that in future years, as a result of experience under the legislation, that further amendments may be required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let us be clear as to what this suspension is. This is not a suspension for a conviction. This is a suspension for an alleged, at this stage — not proven — reading. That when there is a conviction though, a suspension is not for 12 hours or 24 hours, the suspension is automatic for a lengthy period of time. It could be three months; it could be six months, but on conviction we have no argument. The person is penalized. We are now talking about penalizing an ostensibly legally innocent man. Now the Attorney-General and those being lawyers, we are talking about a legally innocent man, who may found innocent completely, and I say that under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the suspension should be as short as possible.

Now, the honourable members indicate — and this is not a political question — that we brought in a bill with 24 hours and that other provinces have 24. We also reduced it to 12 hours, and I don't know whether it's a New Democrat or a Conservative who believes in eight or 12. What we do know is that somebody told us that it had to be 24, that when we looked at it we didn't think that that made any sense and we reduced it to 12, and the honourable members probably agree that it was 12.

Let us also know that two years ago it was nothing. It was not at all. How was it dealt with, Mr. Speaker? If a man was brought in for driving while impaired, he was incarcerated. While he was incarcerated, there was no problem of him having his licence suspended. He couldn't go anywhere. When he was bailed out, the general situation is that he was driven home. If he tried to drive himself home and he was still, in accordance with the policeman's view, driving impaired, he would be arrested and incarcerated again. So there is no problem, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a drunk person. There is absolutely no problem. If he got into his car, the police could arrest him and incarcerate him.

We are talking about the remotest of circumstance. We are talking about a man who has had his licence suspended, let's say at midnight, comes back at 8 o'clock because he needs his car for his employment, and some doctor is going to tell you that he shouldn't get his licence back. Mr. Speaker, we know better; we know better. If he is still drunk when he comes back at 8 o'clock in the morning and tries to drive his car and a policeman sees him doing it, he can be incarcerated again. But, Mr. Speaker, I have been with honourable members at my favourite affair, the Hotel Keeper's Association's party I would venture to say that some of the honourable members at that stage may have a blood count or a breath count which is too high, and a lot of them, Mr. Speaker, would not drive home, but I have seen the honourable members the next morning and, Mr. Speaker, we all know, they are as sober as judges. As sober as judges, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— That's because judges are drunks.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a limit which, until two years ago, did not have to be imposed. I am suggesting to the Honourable Minister that this is not a political question. That if they want to say that they are the ones that reduced it from 12 to seven, that we had it at 12 and therefore we are frauds in talking about seven; let them say it, but reduce it to seven. Forget the question of who did it, why it's there. I am telling you that two years ago it wasn't there; the laws regarding drinking and driving were administered. We are now talking about an innocent person who has had his licence suspended, and we are suggesting that seven hours later he be given his licence. If he is still in an intoxicated position, Mr. Speaker, the same policeman who gave him his licence can go and watch him get into his car and if he feels that he is intoxicated, he can arrest him on the spot. —(Interjection)— Even a judge. He can arrest him. The Attorney-General will confirm what I am saying, that if that man gets into his car at 8 o'clock, he can be arrested; he can be asked to take a breathalyzer test; he can be incarcerated; he can be charged. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, what is the point? We are 57 people in this House, who have the common sense to know that that shouldn't be the case. That all we are trying to do is make sure that a man who is charged will not drive his car away immediately after the charge is registered against him and immediately he gets out on bail, and we should keep it to the lowest minimum.

If, Mr. Speaker, at any stage after we have done this — why shouldn't the onus be the other way — if after we have done this, a year from now, it turns out that a man . . . MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The hour being 12:30 . . . The honourable member.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, all I was going to say is that if the Attorney-General . . . Mr. Speaker, I will give him my vote in advance, a year from now or two years from now, he says that a man came back after seven hours, got into his car and was still drunk, I will vote the other way. I will go to eight hours. I will go to nine hours. But I don't wish to do it on the basis of something that I know from my every-day experience is not correct and which was not necessary for any time two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30 — the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House that the Minister of Finance would like to go into a Committee of the Whole House on the finance bills, and so they will be called as the first order of government business this afternoon. We will be calling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, it depends; we will see who is in the House here.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the hour is 12:30. I realize that we have a motion before us that has not been resolved. —(Interjection)— No, but it has to stand in the name of someone. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the vernment House Leader, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

Thursday, July 13, 1978

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 in the afternoon.