

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 18, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 52 students of Grades 9 to 11 standing from the Sprague Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Norman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

We also have 60 students of Grades 4 and 5 standing from Robertson School under the direction of Mrs. Schroeder. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

We also have 18 students from the Neepawa Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Hollier. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Private Bills.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Private Bills met on Thursday, May 18, 1978, for organization and appointed Mr. Gourlay as Chairman. Your Committee agreed that the quorum for all future meetings of the Committee would consist of six members.

Your Committee recommends that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills by the House be extended to the 15th day of June, 1978, and that the time for the introduction of Private Bills in the House be extended to the 22nd day of June, 1978.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, arising from the report of the Standing Committee on Public Bills just presented, I would like to beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills by the House be extended to the 15th day of June, 1978, and that the time for the introduction of Private Bills in the House be extended to the 22nd day of June, 1978.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

Before we get to the Question Period I think I should make a statement to the House. Due to technical difficulties we are having some trouble with the printing of our Hansards. We hope that those problems will be solved very shortly and Hansards for this week will be on your desk as soon as possible.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE (May 17, 1978)

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday a Matter of Privilege was raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet at which time the Minister of Agriculture was not in his seat. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture

has any information to impart to me on this subject matter.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I certainly am going to deal with it but wonder if I could wait until the Member for Lac du Bonnet is in his seat so that I could explain directly to him some of the things that he had said yesterday when I was not in my seat. I would like to give him the courtesy of hearing it first-hand in the House, and will ask you to give me an opportunity to deal with it when the member is in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, I'll hold this matter in abeyance to a future date.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Could the Honourable Minister advise the House whether it is the intention of Manitoba Housing to proceed with construction of Phase II of the Midlands Public Housing Development this year 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Midlands Housing Development is under discussion by the department and has been under discussion by MHRC for several years that that program has been going on and it hasn't been dropped. We have had presentations from groups within the area as to what they would like to see there and we're in discussion with them and there will be housing on that property, but the decision of how many units, etc. is being discussed with the people down there and my department.

MR. EVANS: Is the honourable member advising us that there will be no construction taking place this summer in that particular project.

MR. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure what that answer is, whether it is no there will be no construction. . . —(Interjection) — Two noes make a positive.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member said his question was: Is the honourable member advising him there will be no construction this year? No, I am not advising him there will be no construction this year.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address another question to the Minister then. In the event that construction may not proceed or does not proceed this year, would the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation be prepared to allow senior citizens living in that area the access to the vacant land so that they may have various garden plots to raise vegetables for themselves?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would have to have that considered. I would not like to see senior citizens go out and plant gardens and then have somebody tear them all up. I would have to check to see when construction would be starting, if it is starting, and let the honourable member know. By all means, I would like to see the senior citizens enjoy it if they can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister confirm that the government of Manitoba originally asked the Federal Finance Minister, Chretien, to allow the Government of Manitoba to use its one point share of the three point sales tax reduction for about \$20 million worth of direct job creation instead of the complete tax reduction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Transcona's question, that was one of the options that we initially discussed with the Minister of Finance.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary. Since the Conservative government has taken the position with the Federal Government that direct job creation would help stimulate the economy, at least as much as tax cuts, will the Minister lift the freeze on home care staff hirings, nursing home construction

and on senior citizens' construction and allow also the acceleration of city public works which the province cost-shares in?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's second question, there have been a number of moves made by the Provincial Government in direct job stimulation most of which have been announced. It's the opinion of the government that the programs are working satisfactorily and also that the program with regard to the sales tax reduction it would appear at this point in time to be working satisfactorily as well. If there are any other policies to be announced, they will be announced in due course.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. In the light of the fact that the Minister was originally pushing for a \$20 million direct job creation and the programs that he has announced for direct job creation don't amount to more than \$4 million, would the Minister reconsider his position so that he would stimulate the economy by another \$15 million or so, through direct job creation by accelerating public works which are necessary to the people of Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Transcona can suggest where we can achieve another \$20 million or \$30 million of cash to put into this sort of program, I'll be quite prepared to listen to him.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I wonder if he would be good enough to reconfirm the answer that he gave me a few weeks ago. The Federal Government has indexed the OAS and GAS and made larger payments to senior citizens. Now, as the Provincial Government passed that on — I think that was the answer that I first received — it wasn't just considered as a revenue; it was passed on to the people. Now, the reason for this question, may I say to the Honourable Minister, is that I have had a call saying that this person claimed that the supplement for the elderly in this case has been reduced; is that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that we will be dealing with the Minister's Estimates later on today.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I say to you that this might be in about three months, when we get to that, and in the meantime this is quite urgent for these people by now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member's question, I can reconfirm that yes, the indexed amount has been passed on. If he knows of a situation where through bookkeeping or clerical or administrative error that an error has been made, I certainly will look into it. But the increase has been passed on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to just briefly clarify an answer which I made yesterday with regard to the lifeguards, the question that was asked of me by the Member for Rupertsland — this had to do with lifeguards at public beaches. We will be having lifeguards to a certain extent at Birds Hill Park for this coming weekend; however, because of the cold weather conditions up in northern Manitoba, lakes such as Paint Lake will not be having lifeguards on duty; also in the Whiteshell area the ice has only gone out a week or two ago and as a result the waters are fairly cold, and within the next couple of weeks, as water conditions warm up, lifeguards will be placed at those different locations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I wonder, in speaking to the Rotarians last night and saying she would not tolerate harmful strikes, could she define "harmful strikes?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I would not tolerate strikes. I was emphasizing the importance of the minimum of government interference in collective bargaining, but I said that the government would also recognize their responsibility if strikes were to affect the health and security of the people of Manitoba, and I would hope that the previous

government would have felt that responsibility if they feel as strongly as we do about the security of the people of Manitoba.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, my second question is in respect to when the legislation will be brought down; will it include professionals as well as ordinary working people, in respect to strikes?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what legislation the Member for Kildonan is referring to.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to legislation because there is no other way a government can enforce what it wants to have done, and I'm sure that the Minister was sincere when she said she would do something if it was necessary, so I'm asking her what she's going to do and whether it will include professionals, whether it will also include lockouts, not only strikes?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, it would include anybody who would be jeopardizing the health or security or the economy of any great deal of our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Would he be good enough to table the legislation from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario to which he claims the Cattle Producers' Association Act is similar?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify that matter if I may. It is indeed the privilege of the member opposite to get legislation on his own behalf.

I did not indicate that the legislation in other provinces was the same. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that there were associations of the same type in the enabling legislation we were setting up for the Manitoba Cattle Producers.

It is, I believe, recorded that it is a fact, an association similar to what is proposed in Manitoba.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: I'm wondering if I could ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, since he is co-operating to this extent, if he would be prepared to table a sample, if not all, but a sample of the letters which he has in favour of a Cattle Producers' Association in Manitoba and a sample of the letter that he has of those who were opposed to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the members opposite are anxious to have one of those copies. I will be dealing with that on the point of privilege if the members can wait until the Member for Lac du Bonnet appears in his seat this afternoon, or at the first convenience. I will be dealing with that and they will be dealt with at that time.

MR. CHEIACK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. In view of the fact that all of us will be prepared to hear, in due course, the exchange between the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the Minister of Agriculture, I would ask him whether it wouldn't be more helpful for all of us to understand the discussion that will take place if we indeed have before us a sample copy of the letters to which he referred to. I understood his not wanting to file 4,000 letters, and how many more I don't know, but a sample of the letter would be helpful to all of us if he is prepared to table it.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I explained, I will be dealing with that at the time of speaking on the point of privilege. I'm just offering the courtesy to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, which I was not afforded yesterday, to raise this point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I just clarify that I'm not asking for an explanation or a discussion. I'm just asking if the Minister is prepared to file a sample of the letter, so then upon receipt of it we will be able to better understand the difference of opinion between the two members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest that repetitive questions may not be in the best interests of the House. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I wonder if the

could advise the House whether or not as a result of the recent trip by his legal advisors to Switzerland and possibly to Austria in connection with the Reiser matters, whether or not there has been any significant change in the procedure that had been commenced insofar as the charges against Reiser, Kasser and others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the special prosecutors retained by the government have not been to Switzerland; they did go to Austria at the beginning of this week to review the status of the matter in Austria, and are still in Austria and I expect them to return next week and report to us at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the special prosecutors did not visit Switzerland, can he advise us as to whether or not there have been any developments pertaining to the charges against Reiser and Company in Switzerland that would cause there be no need for their attendance in Switzerland?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Selkirk didn't refer to the time period during which he was discussing. There were attendances in Switzerland earlier in the year with respect to the matter of an appeal against the decision of the Canton of Thurgaw. Since then an appeal has been filed against that decision through the Department of External Affairs and discussions are under way between the Department of External Affairs and the federal authority with respect to the previous decision made there, but there has been no resolve of that matter, either of the appeal or of the discussions going on through the Department of External Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will direct my question to the Minister of Health. Concerning the problem in Snow Lake in the lack of doctors, I commend the Minister for attempting to start a rotation system from Churchill and Winnipeg. Would the Minister not agree that a rotation system from Flin Flon to Snow Lake would be much more convenient, being as the distance is that much shorter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree that if there are some physicians available for that kind of emergency service from Flin Flon, yes, it would appear to be more convenient to use them. That emergency program has been worked out by the Northern Medical Services, under Dr. Hildes, and I presume he has been unsuccessful so far in attracting physicians from that community, but I will investigate that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister took as notice some time ago to provide information on a question I posed to him in regard to a meeting at Elkhorn with Mr. Church in attendance. I would like to now know if the Minister could advise if a resolution was passed at this meeting unanimously opposing a checkoff without a referendum?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, there had been verbal discussion and the consensus of the meeting, I believe, was that they were opposed to a checkoff. However, if the Member for Ste. Rose reads the intent of the bill, that there will not be a checkoff on beef cattle in the Province of Manitoba until after a producer elected board is elected by the producers themselves and they themselves will have the opportunity to implement the checkoff.

MR. ADAM: Yes, a supplementary. My question is whether or not a resolution was passed at this meeting with Mr. Church in attendance, representing the Minister. Was a resolution passed at this meeting requesting that there be no checkoff in the Province of Manitoba without first holding a referendum? Now, the Minister had a representative there; surely he can give us an honest answer.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, there again are accusations by the member opposite that I am not

reporting to the House. I have said that, as indicated from that meeting, I do not have, to my knowledge, in the department at this time a documented form with that kind of a resolution on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the Minister of Agriculture be prepared to table the evidence that he has, which in his opinion demonstrates a similarity between producer-funded organizations such as he envisages coming into being under Bill 25 and those in existence in the provinces British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, to which he had made reference last Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member opposite can avail himself to that information in other provinces. As I have said in all the information that I have provided that it is support for a cattle association in the province and that is what I have stated and will continue to state.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a point of order. I have no knowledge of what the Honourable Minister based his statement when he said that the producer-funded organizations in the provinces I had named are similar to what he envisages will come into being now. So, therefore, I cannot avail myself to that information. Therefore, once again, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I ask the Honourable Minister whether he would provide this House, by tabling the evidence that he has about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Burrows, as I have already suggested today, that repetitive questions in this Chamber do not lead to good question periods. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the increasing concern in connection with the cattle growers bill, would the honourable member consider a referendum of cattle growers in the Province of Manitoba to ascertain their true desires and wills pertaining to this legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend opposite is well aware, that in presenting legislation to the House and to the people of Manitoba the procedure is to get the people of the province to speak on that legislation in committee, that they will have an opportunity to do so, and I feel that, as I have stated many times, there is support in the province of the majority of producers for an organization and the legislation is now before them and will be going to committee for their discussion.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, with due respect, the honourable member has not answered my question. Is he prepared to, at any time, submit this matter to a referendum of producers in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance in his capacity as Acting First Minister. I would ask the Honourable Minister whether or not he and members of his Cabinet in government have yet had an opportunity to decide whether they will convene a special meeting with civic representatives from the City of Winnipeg, in order to ascertain whether they will give effect to the resolve of the Council last evening, with respect to the acceleration of Public Works' projects scheduled for the next five years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it may be, and I understand from news reports that a decision respecting this subject matter was made by City Council last evening. That decision and the specific projects to which it refers have not yet been received in my office and as soon as it is, I will take the matter up with Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary, then, to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister of Urban Affairs be willing to give us his undertaking as Minister Responsible for Urban Affairs, to convene a meeting of the joint delegation with civic and Cabinet representatives as soon as possible, I would suggest — and this is gratuitous — that such a meeting be called as soon as possible, perhaps in the time phase of one or two weeks, in order that immediate attention be given to this particular resolution of Winnipeg City Council. This is an urgent matter involving employment in a much-needed area of our economy, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the member that he asks this question and allows the Minister a chance to answer?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if such a meeting is required by the City, then such a meeting will be held.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Further to the answer which the Honourable Minister of Tourism gave to the House today regarding the beach patrols, I would like to ask him if he could supply the House with the actual figures for each location, as to how many beach patrol people will be on duty, and when they will be starting actual duty? I note he mentioned Birds Hill will be one of the first brought on stream, but I'm wondering, for the other locations how many people will be involved and when they will be starting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that staff is right now meeting with Red Cross officials; they have forwarded a list of lifeguards to us; we will be establishing those particular guidelines and also the locations within a very short while and I would be happy to table them in the House or provide the honourable member opposite with that once it's been totally formulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My second question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Given that the company which goes by the name, J.A. Jarmoc Project Management Limited, is presumably still operating illegally after having entered into agreement with the Provincial Government regarding a condominium unit, that is, operating illegally with using the name "Limited" in their company name, has the Minister completed his investigation on this matter, and will he be taking any action in this regard as per the Companies Act which does provide a penalty of a maximum \$500 fine for this practice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, this question from the Member for Rupertsland is a follow-up to one that was placed some time ago and in this connection I told the member at that time that the Corporations Branch was pursuing the matter in the normal way, and that when they had a report to be made it would be communicated to him. This investigation has taken place, I assure him, in a manner that is usual in all such cases, and when the results are obtained he will be informed.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that it has been some several weeks since the Minister had told me that the only delay would possibly be the Royal Mail, could he give us some indication when he expects this report to be put before the House, or will we have to wait as long as we're waiting for the Jarmoc report?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the member any precise information as to when the investigation will be completed. I will say again that when it is completed he will be advised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an answer to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, when he questioned me about the units in Selkirk. To date, at the present time we are building 12 new family public health units in Selkirk that will be finished this fall. That will give us a total of 192 units, of which 35 are trainee housing units. We will be opening 63 senior citizens' units within the next couple of months, which will bring us to elderly persons, 139.

We have 221 applications for public housing, and we have on application, 76 for senior citizens.

Now, our statistics show us approximately 40 percent of those applications are eligible people. We are presently going over the applications in Selkirk, taking a look at them from their qualifications, and because of the empty houses we feel that our figures aren't quite the same as the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs — but they're close — because I guess we took our figures at a different time. They feel there's approximately 52 vacancies in Selkirk in the Bestlands and townhouses and Mercury Street, to give some examples, and we are presently looking at the possibility if, to the people that qualify for assistance in housing of possibly utilizing some of the empty units that are presently in the Town of Selkirk. We feel that we can probably have the situation in Selkirk in very good shape after we make this survey.

Now, in Portage la Prairie, Mr. Speaker, we have 121 units, including 36 which are under construction at the present time in Portage la Prairie, of family public housing. Elderly persons' housing, we have 65 units which will be under construction this year. We have pending 24 applications for family public housing and we have 70 applications for senior citizens' housing. Elderly and infirm persons, we have 113 licensed units; 52 eligible for rent supplement and only 10 actually being subsidized. We have low-dividend units, 88 units in Chelsea Terrace; 22 eligible for rent supplement; none actually being subsidized as of March.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that maybe if he presented that to the House in printed form, it would take a lot of time off the question period?.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was only asked this question; I just have very little more. In Portage la Prairie, we have serviced in 1975, 118 lots at below market prices and to date only 34 have been taken up; we still have the balance waiting to be taken up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable member for his information. I wonder if he would concur that insofar as the 52 vacancies which he made reference to in Selkirk as against some 145 applications, that insofar as those 52 vacancies are concerned re Bestlands, that families of \$12,000 per annum and under would not qualify for rental or purchase of the Bestlands units?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I didn't suggest that they would qualify for purchase; I said we may be able to use those units for people and give them a rental subsidy within those units.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he consider bringing in legislation for the businessmen of the Province of Manitoba similar to the Cattle Producers' Act in terms of its objects and intent and method of operation?

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have not given that any consideration and if there is anything that comes forward as far as legislation that I am involved with, I will be tabling it in the House, but I haven't given that matter any consideration.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Attorney-General. Would he advise the House whether there is a recognized entity, recognized by his department and by the courts, known as the University of Manitoba Police Force?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are commissionaires at the University of Manitoba who issue traffic summonses and enforce regulations of the University on their property.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. If quoted

correctly by members of the press, the Honourable Minister indicated that there would be no reduction, or the government does not intend to reduce its involvement in the regulation of health and safety conditions in the workplace. My question to the Minister then is: Does her government intend to increase its involvement in the regulation of health and safety conditions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: It is under review now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then willing to explain the detail of her department's proposed revamping of operations pertaining to the regulation of health and safety conditions in Manitoba's workplaces and could she further explain what impact or effect that would have on The Workplace Health and Safety Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that those questions might better be raised during examination of her Estimates.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on April 28th and May 15th, the Member for Brandon East asked some questions about the Milk Control Board, whether there are restrictions to consumers obtaining financial information so that they could present a well-prepared case to the Milk Control Board and he asked further that if there were restrictions would the Minister bring in legislations to amend the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that in the statutes administered by the Consumer Department, there are no impediments or restrictions which would in any way affect this provision or otherwise of financial information but I think, of course, the question really asks for an examination in a broader sense of the whole method by which the Milk Control Board deals with the problem of establishing producer and maximum fluid milk prices in Manitoba. I would point out to the member that the board has carried on its duties on behalf of consumers and processors in a sort of non-adversarial way without disclosing data on the individual firms involved. Mr. Speaker, the member would appreciate that when there are a number of producers involved that the supplying of confidential data publicly would not be in the interests of the industry, generally. So, in essence, the question I suppose, Mr. Speaker, comes down to whether or not the member feels that the board is serving the public well and it's my opinion of course that this is the case in this respect. To change the system in any manner would result in the releasing of data of several different competing firms to the public.

So, Mr. Speaker, again while this board is not under the authority or responsibility of the Department of Consumer Affairs, I did offer to bring back this information to the Member for Brandon East and as far as any amendments to the regulations or statutes, we are not proposing to introduce any at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, I thank the Minister for his reply, his statement. I appreciate that it is not in the best interests of the industry to disclose data on individual companies. By way of clarification, I'd like to ask the Minister then if he feels that nothing can be done to assist the consumer groups, as opposed to the industry groups, to assist the consumer groups in obtaining that kind of data that would enable them to present a case against what they may deem to be an unwarranted increase in the price of milk, particularly when one large producer, one large processor, is not asking for a price increase. Is there no hope therefore for the consumer groups to obtain that data now in order to present the kind of case that they believe they should present in order to hold back what they deem to be an unwarranted rise, or particular unwarranted rise, in the price of milk at this time?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to repeat, there are no impediments within the statutes of the Department of Consumer Affairs that would prevent any activity by consumer groups. The matter which the member brings up really is under The Milk and Dairy Products Control Act and that is the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism. Can he confirm that there

have been staff cutbacks in the Museum of Man and Nature and that opening hours have been cut back from 9 p.m. daily to 4:30 p.m. daily, in effect cutting off access to most working Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Museum of Man and Nature operates with their own board of elected board of directors and has a general manager and I'm sure it is trying to do the best as far as it can do with regard to providing access to the public of Manitoba. They have been having several displays for the people in the province and I just signed a proclamation with regard to Museum Days where they encourage people to come and see how the different museum artifacts are made so I'm sure that they are providing access to the public to the best of their ability and will continue to do so.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary. Can the Minister confirm that one of the positions eliminated in the Museum of Man and Nature has been that of multicultural studies?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for the day-to-day operations. What we do is we provide one grant for that particular operation and there are competent people on the board of directors as well as management level that are looking after the interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. PARASIUK: In the light of the fact that the Minister provides the money to the museum and in light of the fact that we have a multicultural nature to our province, does the Minister agree with the elimination of the position of multicultural studies from the Museum of Man and Nature? Do you agree with that elimination or not?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will just repeat that the staff is running that particular facility the way they see fit with the Province of Manitoba. With regard to multiculturalism, we just announced a \$100,000 grant to the French Cultural Centre, we announced grants to the Ukrainian Society and we're providing cultural grants of substantial amounts as the year progresses.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. I believe our Question Period has elapsed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the indulgence of the House, has the matter of the Order for Return been resolved? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, as you'll note on the Order Paper, there is a Notice of Motion that I will be introducing an amended Order for Return. Consequently I request of the House the permission to withdraw the first Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, before I announce the business of the House for today, may I just make an announcement regarding the Public Utilities Committee.

It is my intention to call Public Utilities for Tuesday next, and in all probability the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation will be the first corporation that will be dealt with.

As honourable members know, the Chairman of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is currently in London and of course his appearance before that committee will be contingent upon his arrival back in Canada. We are hoping that he will be back. In the event that he does not make it, then the Manitoba Telephone System will be appearing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for Executive Council..\$\$

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, May 18, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. Will the committee come to order before we lose our membership?

The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force will be the first spokesman.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a number of questions were raised at the last sitting concerning the methodology of the Task Force and its review teams. I indicated at the time that I would table the names of the departmental liaison officials which were chosen by the Task Force to present information on behalf of their departments and I would like to, if I may, hand that list out. I don't think it's necessary to read the list but I would ask that it be included in the Hansard as read if that would be sufficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. To members of the committee, the Clerk will distribute copies of the list mentioned by the Minister and see that it is included into Hansard.

DEPARTMENT LIAISON:

Agriculture: Dr. Helgi Austman, Assistant Deputy Minister.

Attorney-General: Mr. John A. D. Graham, Assistant Deputy Minister.

Co-operative Development: Lenore Good, Director of Research and Planning.

Consumers' Bureau: Mr. Gordon Snider, Director of Administration; Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

Continuing Education and Manpower: Dr. W. C. Lorimer, Deputy Minister.

Corrections: Doug Clark, Acting Director, Adult Corrections.

Education: Mr. Robert W. Dalton, Deputy Minister.

Environmental Management: Mr. W. J. Podolsky, Acting Head, Administrative Services; Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

Finance: Mr. Mal G. Anderson, Comptroller, Comptroller's Division.

Fitness and Amateur Sport: Mr. Fil Fileccia, Executive Director, Operation Support Services Branch; Department of Health and Social Development.

Health: Mr. Fil Fileccia.

Highways: Mr. C. Jackson, Construction Engineer, Operations Branch.

Industry and Commerce: Ian Blicq, Assistant Deputy Minister, Enterprise Development Group.

Labour: Jim P. Wood, Research Analyst, Labour Research Division.

Lotteries Commission: Fil Fileccia.

Manitoba Health Services Commission: Mr. Rudy Bristow, Director of Facilities, MHSC.

Mines, Resources and Environmental Management: W. J. Podolsky.

Municipal Affairs: Mr. J. D. McNairnay, Q.C., Deputy Minister.

Emergency Measures Organization: Mr. J. D. McNairnay, Q.C.

Northern Affairs: Mr. Lionel Kuran, Director, Airport Operations and Maintenance.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs: Mr. Del W. Gallagher, Deputy Minister.

Public Utilities: Mr. Gordon Snider.

Public Works: Steve Sohor, Director, Administrative Division.

Renewable Resources and Transportation Services: Mr. Al Hodgson, Co-ordinator, Resource Programs.

Rent Stabilization: Mr. Gordon Snider.

Securities Commission: Mr. Gordon Snider.

Social Development: Peter Schmidt, Executive Director, Financial and Central Services Branch.

Telecommunications Branch: Mr. Gordon Snider.

Tourism: Del Gallagher.

Urban Affairs: Mr. McNairnay.

Tax Credit Office: Mal Anderson.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AUDITORS:

Jim Apostle, Dick Chenier, Shel Diamond, Norm Frohlich, Bob Gorchyski, Marlynn Little, Eric Preston, Val Zinger.

TASK FORCE REPRESENTATIVE:

Administration: Mr. Frank Ball, Chief Financial Officer, Workers Compensation Board.

Agriculture: Mr. Ross Cameron, Programs Officer, Program Analysis Branch, Management and Operations Division — Janet Honey, Resource Analyst, Planning Secretariat of Agriculture.

Crown Corporations: Michael Decter, Acting Planning Secretary to Cabinet.

Education and Cultural Development: Mr. Jim E. Nykoluk, Director, Manpower Assessment Branch, Department of Continuing Education and Manpower.

Economic Development: Mr. W. M. Ward, Director, Program Development and Review, Environmental Management Division, Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

Health Care: Mr. Richard Criddle, Vice-president, Administration, St. Boniface General Hospital.

Local Government: Mr. Brian B. McCallum, Outside Plant Engineer, Manitoba Telephone System.

Social Development: Mr. Ralph Kuropatwa, Executive Director, Program Analysis and Review Branch, Department of Health and Social Development.

Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services: Ron Kabaluk, Chief Program Research Section — David Tomasson, Chief Program Management Section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister again.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. You know, Mr. Chairman, the liaison person on the Management Committee Auditors who were involved total in number approximately 40.

On the question that was asked, Mr. Chairman, at the last sitting concerning the number of civil servants who were contacted by the Task Force and its review teams, we attempted to do the following things and I would like to, if I may, Mr. Chairman, put this as a matter of record because this information was not furnished and I think it's relevant to the discussions.

We contacted by circular, sent by the Task Force to all civil servants and most employees of Crown corporations in which we solicited submissions from them to the Task Force itself. That numbered some 30,000 circulars, Mr. Chairman, that were sent to the government employees.

As I've indicated before, newspaper advertisements were also placed throughout the province and, as has been indicated, we received over 500 submissions which represent, in an approximate guess, between 600 to 800 individuals who replied.

In addition, a number of the review teams as part of their methodology circulated their own circulars and questionnaires and received approximately between 100 to 200 replies to their requests.

In the past two days since the last sitting, my staff has been attempting to compile statistics regarding the number of meetings which the review teams held and the number of civil servants with whom they met. The committee will understand that these numbers are far - from complete as comprehensive records have not been kept in all cases. We have, however, been able to identify the name of 350 individual civil servants with whom the review teams met and that number excludes those who met with the Task Force itself. The review teams and their members conducted over 290 meetings. The Social Development review team alone, Mr. Chairman, met for over 180 hours for a total of nearly 800 man hours.

The Task Force itself met at least twice weekly and in the last month of our work met nearly daily. We do not have anything like complete records of the civil servants with whom we met; that is the Task Force itself as opposed to the review teams. But, by way of example, in three excursions outside of Winnipeg we have met with at least 55 civil servants and a roughly equivalent number of members of the general public. Our staff, of course, met with civil servants throughout the course of our work.

In all, Mr. Chairman, we estimate that the number of civil servants who had direct contact with the review teams or its members, the Task Force staff or the Task Force itself certainly exceeds 500 and probably exceeds 1,000. In addition, we had contact with several hundred members of the general public, public service organizations, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, many of these meetings took place with the understanding that strict confidence

could be observed and I am not prepared to discuss the particulars of the meetings or the submissions except as I indicated the other night. I believe that there was full opportunity for any member of the Civil Service or the public to make his or her views known to the Task Force and hundreds did just that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to suggest that our study was exhaustive. We attended only to conduct a management review of as many departments and agencies as possible during our short mandate.

Our report does not pretend to be a scientific analysis or a comprehensive program review. It does claim to be the best effort of several hundred civil servants and private citizens with expertise in the management of large organizations to bring government under control. We made our recommendations as best we could on the information we had and if the members of the committee have other information or have other recommendations, they are certainly free to offer them and I would welcome their contribution to the public debate in this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the committee, as we left off the other evening I had three names on the list, prior to accepting the motion for the committee to rise, and they were the Member for St. Johns, the Member for Wolseley, and the Member for Selkirk. The Member for Selkirk is absent right now but he was in the room, and we will go in that order unless the members names that I have read off are not interested in speaking at this time. The Member for St. Johns is first.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in speaking but I will withhold in favour of those who have been waiting, just to ask the Minister is this the only undertaking the Minister gave? I had the impression there was more than one but we don't have Hansard yet.

MR. SPIVAK: No, I think the only undertaking I gave was to, in term . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: To produce what has been . . . Well, I accept that, Mr. Chairman. Then one other question dealing with this subject and then I will move off. On Page 12 the Task Force Report states that where detailed discussions were not held with senior individuals in program areas close program audits were conducted. Could the Minister describe to us what kind of audits were conducted?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that paragraph has to be read together with the other paragraphs on the page, which indicated that we had access to the reports, studies, evaluations and undertakings by the government in the last decade, and including the program audits of all the government's activities that were under their scrutiny.

So, Mr. Chairman, in some cases it was necessary and in some cases it was desirable to refer to and we did refer to those particular audits plus the various studies that have been undertaken — some internal, some which have been external in the sense of external consultants, some which were within the public domain, some that were not.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, my interpretation of this statement is that the Task Force or its review teams conducted close program audits, not that they read someone else's or reviewed someone else's audits, but that they themselves conducted it. Now, if that verb "conducted" is wrong, and it means reviewed, I'd like an explanation. On the other hand, if the Minister says they were conducted, there's nothing I can say that they weren't conducted, but I wanted it clear; were they or weren't they?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think that there were some. I indicated before, and I now indicate to you, that there was a very close program audit of the financial arrangements in terms of accounting procedures and controls within the Department of Northern Affairs with particular reference to the operation of the trust accounts of the Department of Northern Affairs and its operation, and that was a program audit which was conducted; conducted with the benefit of consultants who were experienced, and as a result there were procedures recommended which were in fact adopted and altered the procedures that would have been followed in the past.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's Northern Affairs and that's an audit of financial affairs; program audit means an audit, for example, involving the hospitals; or for example, involving special projects in the Department of Education. And I don't know where senior individuals were not involved in direct discussions. I'm looking at this paragraph that says close program audits were conducted. It means to me by the Task Force or the review teams, and I would like to know whether the Minister

wants us to accept the statement that where there were not senior individuals there was a close program audit conducted. If that's the wrong terminology, I would rather it were corrected, than to leave us . . .

MR. SPIVAK: No, I don't think the terminology is wrong, Mr. Chairman, I think that we can continue on. There were in fact audits with respect to administration which were program audits. You see, the Member for St. Johns is talking in terms of a specific program, in terms of the government operation; we were talking about the organization and efficiency which include the programs of government dealing with administration, and there were in fact several specific studies that were undertaken, one with respect to the whole data service, not only MDS but the whole computer programming of government. And that was a program of government that in fact required and did receive a close program audit by the Task Force.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just picked out of Volume II , I just opened the book and I happened to open it at Page 66, which is as good a way to look for a spot check as any — and I see under Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders, "no additional juvenile spaces other than psychiatric should be brought onstream in Manitoba." Mr. Chairman, just that statement alone has to be based on the review of the program; not of finances, not of administration, but of the delivery of a service.

Now, can we say, or assume that where there were not discussions held with senior individuals in program areas, a close program audit was conducted? — program in the sense of delivery of a service by the government to the public.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, to begin with I'm satisfied that in almost all cases there may be some senior officials involved in discussions with the review team of the Task Force, and I think I can say that pretty clearly. There may be an example where one person did not meet with the Task Force or wasn't interviewed but I think in most cases senior people were involved, and in addition the program auditors had the reports and the Task Force had access to the reports of the government in the last period of time. I don't think there's any contradiction and I think both statements stand for itself. The statement that was made on Page 66 I think the honourable Member for St. Johns referred to is a Task Force statement and based on its observations and its determination, and recommendations flow from that; it's based on the information that was available to us and on the information that was perceived from discussions and from review. And to that extent, Mr. Chairman, that is, I think, a procedure that any commission goes through in arriving at whatever conclusions it has to arrive at. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, again and for the Member for St. Johns we'll clear this up. I don't expect him to disagree. They were no secret than any other commissions that have been held that are held as a result — (Interjection)— are held in secret. So, there are many commissions that are held in secret, Mr. Chairman, and that's not such an unusual thing. The Lambert Commission is a commission that is investigating government management and is conducting itself as a review. The other commissions that have been held, some have had public hearings some have not. This was an attempt in a short period of time to try and see whether there were recommendations that could be brought forward which would assist the government in attempting to meet the budgetary problems it had; and secondly, in being able to try and resolve what appeared to be certain management difficulties and the need for change. And to that extent, as I indicated in my opening statement today, it was not the most scientific that could be accomplished, it was not the most exhaustive, but in four months it did produce a report, and I'm really interested in hearing the kinds of recommendations from the members opposite to understand what they agree with, what they disagree with, and curiously enough what they would have done had they remained in power.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I just make this point, that this Task Force received wide political publicity and was a report made to the public, not to the government; not for the government's assistance but rather as a political document in my opinion. And, Mr. Chairman, I am looking forward to going through the Task Force Report and recommendations but I bear mind that there are assumptions made of which we are not aware based on information that we are not aware, and we will find it difficult to discuss these recommendations without a sufficient knowledge of the background, of the validity of the assumptions made. That's just a comment, not a question.

MR. SPIVAK: I'd like to make a comment. I think that there is no way that we could have possibly

satisfied the Member for St. Johns. If we had made this document as a private document to the government and not made it public, we would have been accused of dealing in utmost secrecy and in effect we would have been accused of the lack of open government. The fact is that we have produced a report which has been presented to the government and which the public have full knowledge. The Honourable Member for St. Johns can state that it's a political document. To the extent that every document produced by government is political, it can be classified as political, but this was an attempt, Mr. Chairman — I say this, and I do not believe that I would any way be able to satisfy the Honourable Member for St. Johns — an attempt on the part of a number of people who we're committed to try and to provide to the government the benefit of their experience and expertise in assisting the government in carrying out its function. They did it on the basis of providing as best they could, the benefits of their experience and involvement. They did it with a great deal of enthusiasm and they did it, I think, in an unbiased way. There are a number of conclusions that the review team and the members came forward with which were consistent even though their backgrounds were different and I cite that their backgrounds were different and I think that the document can be argued on its merits by anyone and that's a logical debate that can occur in a free society and I don't question that, and the Member for St. Johns will say it's political but I have to tell you that no matter what kind of a document we produced four months after a defeat in an election, he would have suggested that it was a political document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley, then Selkirk.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: The other night I had a speech prepared to congratulate the Chairman, Co-chairman, on the fine Task Force Report but I wanted to be one of the Conservative MLAs who on Page 139 does not agree with this group of individuals, and I wondered if the Minister might care to tell me who these experts in Tourism are because it would seem to me that at a time when you have a .90 cent and .85 cent dollar, that to reduce the travel of the Tourism Budget by 20 percent and actually, in fact, \$25.9 million down 9.9 percent, I think is most questionable. I think if we look at the fact that an announcement that Ottawa and Quebec have an agreement for \$76 million for tourism development and upon checking and asking the staff what Manitoba gets from the Federal Government, I find that Manitoba hasn't even signed the Tourism Agreement with the Federal Government so they don't get a cent. So it seemed to me that if Manitoba would get busy and sign an agreement with the Federal Government, the Canadian Government Travel Office might give something to the Province of Manitoba if they can give \$76 million to Quebec and I can't for the life of me see how these Task Force individuals running these suggestions, and I hope my suggestions will be taken exactly what they are. I'm trying to share the fact that periodicals and articles indicate that the Japanese market is going to go ahead by leaps and bounds and the Task Force has suggested that the Japanese market be eliminated.

I can think that most stays in Canada are for 15 days or longer from the Japanese market. They spend a week in Banff and then they're looking to come to our fine farm development program. We have the farm vacation situation that the Japanese love to come here and take pictures of farm animals and what have you. And, it just seems to me that we're missing the boat and we have the best trophy fishing possibly in North America, yet people jump on at Lockport and our aircraft take them to northern Ontario. So, it seems to me that destination development might be part of the answer and that means more money, not less money because if local Winnipeg fishermen are getting on at St. Andrews and going to northern Ontario fishing, when we have the finest sports fishing in North America I just shake my head in wonderment.

So, I would just like to offer the suggestion that a 20 percent reduction in the tourism thing at a time when we should be putting in more money because we have an .85 cent, .90 cent dollar and possibly the reason is the Task Force Report may have been written prior to the devaluation of the dollar, so I hope the co-chairman will take my thoughts back to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think that the Member for Wolseley has simply highlighted the fact that again the Task Force Report is really recommendations and it doesn't follow that everyone has to agree with the recommendations, and he obviously disagrees with one. The decisions were made as I've indicated based on the financial position we found ourselves in as a government and the need to look for those areas in which restraint could be exercised. And in that area there could be many differing opinions and I would say that if he has an opinion as he has the time will probably be in the Estimates of the Department of Tourism which will simply shift this debate over to that period.

But in any case, I think logically that's where it should go but I accept what he says and I accept the fact that there will be difference of opinion but again, these are only recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Selkirk, then Winnipeg Centre.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister was going to obtain for me information in connection with one William McCance.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, I'm sorry, to that extent that information. . . when the Member for St. Johns asked for an undertaking I assumed it was related to the subject matter in which I was dealing. Now that's true and I will have that information. I'm sorry I did not have that there before, it wasn't intended not to have it. He's a good fellow I'd like to assure the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Well, I'm sorry I wasn't at the meeting the other night, Mr. Chairman, but first of all I'm just trying to keep things clear in my mind, what kind of a ball game I'm in in this particular committee meeting. First of all as I understand it the Minister responsible for reporting to the Legislature for the Task Force is not the Minister responsible for the Task Force, he is one of the co-chairmen as I understand it in terms of reference.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister in making his presentation this afternoon used four or five times the term, "the Task Force attempted." I was really glad to hear the Minister use that specific term because he hasn't presented this. . . in any way succeeded. When he refers to audits, program audits, I find it passing strange that in checking with my colleagues none of the former Ministers were asked, none were asked in program evaluation. Let me put what I'm trying to say this way, Mr. Chairman. Everybody understands, you know, financial accounting. You get a dollar spent for this, did you get value received for it and all the rest of this. Evidence is rather hard in that regard, but it comes down to evaluating programs. I know I wasn't approached to say, you know, what were you trying to accomplish, whether you agree with what we are trying to accomplish or not.\$

For example, one of the responsibilities that I had was involving corrections. So, take a program, say probation. I would assume if they want to evaluate the program that they would at least go to the people who were responsible and say what we're you trying to accomplish by sending this amount of money in that particular view, what was your goal? And then they would evaluate it to see, number one, whether they agreed with the goal, because that is their right to disagree with the goal. But they didn't do that, they didn't find out what the former administration was trying to do as far as their programs were concerned, for this specific example that I am using. Then to go to the people who were charged with the delivery of that particular service and solicit their opinions, their advice, whether the Minister or the government was out of their mind in the first place when they were trying to accomplish a particular goal for the particular program, or whether a different type of program could have been used to accomplish the same results at less cost. So when this document which is held forth to the public of Manitoba as a four-month effort by a group of people — the Teachers' Society, I think, put it most succinctly, and hit it on the head — it's a farce. Those are my terms, not theirs.

But nevertheless, they didn't even ask the people who were involved in it. No. 1, they didn't check to see what the goals were; what people were trying to accomplish by the establishment of the programs in the first place? So whether they agree with those goals or not, and doubtless being of different political persuasion, they would disagree with some of the goals, but nevertheless there should have been an attempt. If this was an honest assessment of what was taking place in the delivery of programs, especially in the area of social services, and I include in those social services, education itself. So we're talking about the expenditure of about three-quarters of the whole provincial budget; in health care, in education services — what were the goals?

So, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to try and defend this document as if it was an analysis that was even worth consideration of this august body, I think he's doing us a disservice. If you were going to evaluate something, you know, to apply what I have just said to myself in the situation of evaluation — we are asked to evaluate a Task Force Report. So for us to evaluate it then we would have to look at that which was used to evaluate. We have asked several times for the documentation, the opinions that went into this main recommendation, but that is not forthcoming, and that's the Minister's right, he didn't have to table this document; this is true. But nevertheless to bring it out and suggest that we should offer an opinion on it, then I think it puts him in the position where they have to at least in some way

put before this Committee that evidence or that expression of opinion which led to those particular conclusions.

Now, the Task Force Report itself, when it was tabled in the Legislature, it purports to be — I'm sorry I haven't got my copy in front of me — but on the front page, it includes, as a member of the Task Force, the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association. And the thing is dated March, after the man had resigned. . .

MR. SPIVAK: It's not signed.

MR. BOYCE: Excuse me, can I borrow a copy of it?

MR. CHERNIACK: If it's not signed, well how would we know.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sorry, but the actual one is. As a matter of record, so that you'll know, just as a matter of record, the original copies were filed with the Lieutenant-Governor as was required under a Commission of Inquiry and they were signed by Mr. Riley, Mr. Holland and myself. Unfortunately, the signatures are not shown here but that's the actual.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear the Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, what I'm saying is that the original, as required by a Commission of Inquiry, the originals are filed with the Lieutenant-Governor and they were filed, signed by Mr. Holland, Mr. McCance and by myself.

MR. BOYCE: Well, that might well be, but nevertheless I'm dealing with the document, I'm not dealing with the order-in-council to establish things here. I'm dealing with this thing as . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, just so that the honourable member will know, this is not unusual with respect to commissions of inquiry, or how they are tabled, either in Manitoba or in the House of Commons in Ottawa, and that I can indicate to him. This is the same procedure, the printing is the same way as well.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, is this standard procedure for the Minister to interject whenever he gets the desire to. If he disagrees with my opinion, he has the right to express these disagreements when he has the floor. Nevertheless, we had a document presented to us by a Task Force that was comprised of one Honourable Sidney Spivak, Q.C., William Jackson and Gordon Holland. There was another man involved in this particular thing; I think he was a co-chairman — at least, this is the information that was made public — Mr. Conrad S. Riley. So for us to evaluate this, we should be able to ask these people questions, to see the reports that were made to these sub-groups, to see whether there's any way of substantiating some of these recommendations. If this isn't forthcoming, Mr. Chairman, then I think we're wasting our time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, the question's been raised, and it's been raised by other former Ministers, why did not the Task Force consult other former Ministers? And I'd like to throw that question back to them and ask them, why didn't they file a submission? They are members of the public like everyone else and they were entitled to file submissions; they have particular expertise, or believe they have particular expertise; surely they could have filed a submission. I want to repeat again, because I think this is important, and important for some of the former Ministers to know as well, that there was a very frank discussion, open discussion, with the officials of the department with respect to the operation of the department, so that the review teams could have the benefit of their experience and to be able to weigh the alternatives that should be weighed when change is going to be considered. And in effect, that's really what happens. There was a perfect right on the part of the former Ministers to offer themselves by way of a contribution.

The thing that sort of irritates me at this point, and I have to say that, is that in all the discussions taken place so far in the House and the public debate, the attempt has been to try and talk in terms of the process and the method and sort of the conclusions in which there is disagreement, but I haven't really heard from the members opposite really what recommendations they disagree with, and why they disagree with them, and I think that would be an important part of it, Mr. Chairman, because I think that this is part of the debate that should occur. But it would seem to me that there has been an attempt to be as open as possible in the explanation of the methodology, recognize the need for confidentiality and privacy — and that's what we've tried to do. I think the numbers that have been indicated today, which I didn't have at my fingertips the other night, I think indicate the real attempt to try and cover in a proper way and obtain information from those who have been involved in public service and those who have been affected, and those who believe change

should occur.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Ministei means what he says, when he says that the former Ministers could have made representation because, knowing the member for a number of years, I believe he believes that. But that's not the attitude of the government. In this change of administration, for example, there were almost like, get lost we've got the ball now and we're not even interested in your opinion. I know, in the present circumstances, I don't fault the Minister, who has what I had as a former responsibility, because the man is overworked. But nevertheless for him to suggest that we should have been the ones to pay for it, that's absolutely ludicrous, that's absolutely ludicrous.

And as far as the recommendations, we haven't even got there yet. I'm still on the first page of this thing. We haven't got into it. Before you evaluate a book or an opinion you want to know whether it's worth the time that you are going to spend on evaluating that book. Years ago, when they first started to print books, you had to have an imprimatur on this. You had to go to a Bishop and get a stamp on it, you know, and you would look for the imprimatur, you know, the credibility that you could give to this particular document. So, as years go by, people devise their own techniques in evaluating whether they should even read a book or not, or a document. In textbooks the technique is to go to the back of the book and look at the bibliography to see what cross-references a particular individual has used in presenting his opinion:

So, before we get down to the very specific recommendations I am trying to understand whether it's worth — in the name of the people that I represent — whether it is even worth me spending the time of day in discussing it because to this point in time I have had absolutely no evidence whatsoever that it is worth the time to discuss it. Because we have a document that people who are delivering the programs — for example, the Manitoba Teachers' Society which is involved in delivering an important part of the social programs in the province — have expressed their opinion of how much credence should be given to this particular document.

So, I am sorry to try the patience of the Chair and the committee, but nevertheless for the Minister to suggest that we should have come forward at this point in time or for him even to suggest now that we are responsible for coming forth with recommendations to bail him out, because that's what he needs, I suggest that that, too, is ludicrous.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I assume if I have to be bailed out; we have a bailiff in the Conservative Party so there is no problem. But let me say to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, he mentioned Manitoba Teachers' Society. They have subsequently, since the publication of the report, met with the Cabinet and have given a written presentation of criticism. I think that they have shown some agreement in certain areas and disagreement in others. Clarification that was required in understanding particularly the effect of Volume I and the way in which we would propose the structural changes that occur in that respect. I would hope that they have been satisfied to a certain extent. That would be a question you would have to ask them. But I would assume that the proper kinds of dialogue that occur are exactly just that. Those interest groups who are affected by the Task Force recommendations would come forward with their comments and I think that the dialogue is very important.

I have to tell the honourable member that, with all due respect to him and I have respect him and his colleagues, I doubt that there is anything that was going to be able to be produced in this short period of time that would have been really satisfactory to the members opposite. I think that I would give as a basic premise but nevertheless, having said that, I am here and I would be interested to hear the comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Member for Winnipeg Centre carries on. What we are really here for is to pass a particular Minister's Salary under an item. He was the Minister responsible for the Task Force Report. Now, there are two ways of handling such a discussion: A general discussion on the Task Force Report where the Minister is either complimented or criticized for the way he and his Task Force handled a report, or the other way is you go page-by-page and item-by-item and all through it. I am of the impression, and I do hope that we can have a general discussion on the report as a whole and on the Minister's method of handling it. Therefore, at the conclusion of that we will either pass his salary or not. And this is my particular hope as a method of handling this particular item within these Estimates.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre, again, and then Selkirk.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to your point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a point of order; it's only a suggestion, as Chairman.

MR. BOYCE: Well, then, to your suggested point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. BOYCE: I have a difficulty right off the bat, because if we are to proceed to pass the report

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're not passing a report; we are passing a Minister's Salary. And that Minister was responsible for this report and, therefore, I guess, that's the only real subject material that we have to discuss in discussing his salary.

MR. BOYCE: In passing the Minister's salary, Mr. Chairman, to state my difficulty, on the first paragraph of the first page of this particular report, "It is important to understand," now this is the Task Force both Report itself, "It is important to understand the economic and governmental context in which the Task Force undertook its work. The premises shared by the newly elected government and the Task Force provided a background to our analysis, deliberations and recommendations."

Where are these premises? Where are these premises? What are these premises?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, they are contained within the report. The essential information that was available to members of the Executive Council when they took office, the information that was available to the Task Force, was simply that we faced a deficit position of \$225 million at that time, that, in turn, in terms of a projection we faced the probability of a \$400 million deficit.

That information was available to us from the sources that we had and the deductions that were made with respect to a comparison of a previous year's estimate rise, which was the lowest in the last four years, and applying that to the projected year. On the basis of that, and on the basis of the requirement for \$650 million, which would have to have been met either by the raise in taxation plus borrowing, or borrowing in itself, simply warranted the need for the exercise of restraint; the need to review; the need to try and, if possible, highlight areas in which there was duplication or a need for change. Mr. Chairman, on that basis, the Task Force applied itself.

The Order-in-Council essentially indicates the specifics that the Task Force was to undertake and that was passed by the Cabinet and it was on that basis, the premises are there and I don't expect the honourable member to agree. As I have often said and I have said it in the House, I think that the financial position which they would like to quarrel with, because I think, on the record, it is an indictment of the previous administration.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess it's our difference in backgrounds, because the legal profession is, you know, trained to argue that black is white and vice versa. Nevertheless when somebody says to me "premises", I would like a little bit more definitive statement than the Minister has just presented. Does he think that I will agree? He hasn't said anything with which to agree or disagree. But, perhaps then he can go down to another paragraph in this particular report — and I'm still talking to the Minister's Salary because he's the Minister responsible for being involved with it — down the page it says, "A result of the rapid growth in programs in the preceding years and the weakness of management control, staff has been hired in excess of program requirements. The curtailment and elimination of lowpriority programs has also resulted in a surplus staff."

MR. CHERNIACK: That's their premise.

MR. BOYCE: Well this is the kind of premise that I'm lookfor so I assume now the Minister is willing to take us through this effort for which he is responsible.

MR. SPIVAK: Well let me ask the honourable member, are you suggesting that there was no weakness of management control at the time we took over government?

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course I wouldn't agree to that.

MR. SPIVAK: How serious was that weakness?

MR. BOYCE: Very serious. If you want to get down to the nitty-gritty, if you want to get down

to an area in which I had some responsibility, I'll go through with you dollar by dollar and I'll admit every mistake that I made. I can tell you one right off the top of my head — but nevertheless for somebody to say weakness of management control. . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I refer the honourable member to page 59 which shows the structure of the Executive Council, Management Committee and the Planning Secretariat, and I ask the honourable member whether he was prepared to indicate whether the structure as it is prepared on page 59 was in fact the structure they were operating under.

MR. BOYCE: Well without prejudice, Mr. Chairman, I believe that was the structure, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you believe, Mr. Chairman, I might ask the honourable member, that the Hess Committee, the Economic Resource and Development Sub-committee, the Manpower Employment Sub-committee were in fact meeting, and carrying out their functions over the last few years in terms of central management?

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, as a member of a Health Education and Social Planning Policy Sub-committee of Cabinet and as a member of Manpower Employment and Immigration Sub-Committee of Cabinet, the former, yes quite extensively, and the latter as much as is possible. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I thought that we were here to examine the Minister's efforts, what they're going to do, not what I did, but nevertheless the Minister now is suggesting, I suppose, by taking me through this particular path, that they have come up with a management instrument which will be more successful than that. By and large this is what the Conservatives were doing in Ontario by the way, Mr. Chairman.\$

MR. SPIVAK: No they were not. Mr. Chairman, just for the matter of record. . .

MR. BOYCE: They have super Ministers.

MR. SPIVAK: They have super Ministers — if he knows the structure or if he understands the structure then he couldn't make that statement.

MR. BOYCE: I beg your pardon.

MR. SPIVAK: If you knew the structure in Ontario, you couldn't make that statement. The proposal is not what Ontario is operating under or what it was proposed to operate under.

MR. BOYCE: Well anything is similar only to some degree, Mr. Chairman. I would accept what the Minister says is correct. It's not exactly parallel — they have super Ministers and I hear that they want to try and put in Manitoba too, clusters of / Ministers running particular component, but that isn't the point. What weakness existed and how is what you suggest or recommend going to alleviate that weakness?

MR. SPIVAK: Is that question addressed to me?

MR. BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh well that's fine. No no there's no problem, I'll answer it. But I'd like to go back if I could to one of the statements the honourable member made before with respect to the question of objectives; I think that he made a very important point. I think that one of the first things that the review teams did, and certainly one of the first things the Task Force did — and in our discussions with them — was an approach clearly to try and determine as they dealt with each departmental activity what their objectives were, and having defined that, to determine how they carried on their objectives. I think that's very important. And, of course, what was found was that the objectives in many cases were defined; in a substantial number of cases they were not clearly defined. In those cases in which they were defined, the manner in which policy had been carried out, was fragmented, there was really an inability to evaluate other than through the procedures of the Management Committee and the Program Auditors Review which was the estimate process. It was very difficult to do the kind of evaluation with respect to programs so as to be able to determine whether in fact those objectives were being met, and in many cases it took several years before there could be a final determination; this of course meant that a program could continue and did continue for a long time before changes could be made.

What's proposed in the Central Management structure is the management information system

which is essential and important in a modern-day government which would not only provide the accounting information and deal with the costs up-to-date at any given time with respect to the programs. As an example, if the Treasury Committee would meet on a monthly basis or a quarterly basis we'd have that information, but in addition to that, they would have program evaluation which would be available through the management information system that would be able to indicate the way in which they have achieved the targeted group whom they are trying to reach by whatever program is being evaluated.

Now this becomes very essential, Mr. Chairman. If in fact for a particular program 5,000 people are to be reached in a given year and the cost is \$2 million and in effect, after a month, you spend \$1 million and you've only reached a 1,000 people and that information is before you, you're then in a position to make some adjustments with respect to the original assumptions that were made or the way in which the program has been conducted, or the potential loss of money in excess of what should have been spent to reach the targeted group.

If on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, you have devoted \$2 million to a program that's supposed to reach five, and after a quarter of a period you have only spent \$200,000 and you've reached 2,000 or 3,000 people, then obviously you over-budgeted and the adjustments could be made immediately to be able to apply those revenues that were going to be applied in one way to another way. And, that was lacking, I think, it's been lacking probably in most governments. Its business, because the bottom line is profit, has to be able to operate that way, and what really is lacking and what was necessary is a change in which there would be a proper management information system which would provide not just the financial information which is essential for the operation of government to be able to know and to be able to make the adjustments that are required if revenues alter or change; or if there's needs for shifting from one place to the other, at the same time to be able to amend and alter those programs that have been agreed to, it being assumed that at the time the agreement is made that the target group of people who are to be served are known, that what the program is supposed to accomplish is known; and to the extent that it's able to be quantified and computerize that that information is available. Now that was lacking, and what we've proposed here is an attempt to try and provide that central management within the structure of government. And we believe that this is necessary, an adjustment.

I'm satisfied, and I've said this before, that the members opposite who were in government really did not know the financial position of the government at the time of the election, nor did they know what the position was during the election. There may have been some, but not all of them, for the simple reason that that information wasn't as easily available as it should have been nor was it applied as it has to be applied against the total cost of government. So that there's a way in which you can evaluate from a financial point of view the financial position of government and, at the same time, be able to evaluate the programs of government.

So the proposal we're making in this report, we think is important and in the long run will provide much better information for decision making on the part of government. And we believe as well that there was really a failure to achieve proper management by objectives in the last period of time and I have to say that to the member opposite. We found this over and over again. This, I think, was one of the common threads. They were not clear, in many cases, the policies were not known and they were assumed to be known or assumed on the part of the civil servants who really were simply prepared to execute what the government policy was and did it in best faith on the assumption that that was the policy. Again, in a proper management information system, recognizing there are changes in ministries and recognizing as well that emphasis change within government, that there would be a greater ability for control in that sense.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes a statement that is totally erroneous, that the former government didn't know. I was one of the junior members of Cabinet and I knew.

MR. SPIVAK: You knew what?

MR. BOYCE: The financial position of the province.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, is the financial position that we stated correct or not?

MR. BOYCE: Incorrect.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, it's incorrect?

MR. BOYCE: That's right.

MR. SPIVAK: What was it then?

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I make a . . .

MR. SPIVAK: No, no, because I think it's very valid, you know, because if you say that the financial position as you knew it . . .

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, will you shut that man up for a minute please?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, if you knew what the financial position was . . .

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, will you shut that man up please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. All right. The Member for Winnipeg Centre, you've got the mike now.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you very much. In all due respect to my friend, I appreciate personally the position that he's in but nevertheless — (Interjection)— the former Minister had access when they wanted to have access to anything they wanted to have access to. And the further statement is completely false, is the amount of time spent on Estimates, in going through. As a junior Minister, one of the things I did was sit hour after hour in Cabinet; the best way for me to learn what was going on in the other departments was to sit there and to go through budget reviews of the other departments and I know the hours that were spent in assessing those.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister that it is difficult to manage any government because to put people in a position to manage a billion dollars, there's not very many human beings on the face of the earth that have the personal experience of managing a billion dollars. Everybody adjusts to over-budget, under-budget and all the rest of it.

But let's put it in simple terms. The Minister of Health has said what the priorities or premise of this government is: cost first. What I want to know is how they evaluated programs. Evidence is such that the government has backed off one particular program because they were worried about the immediate dollar in 1977. For an example, one of the cheapest ways of dealing with people who, for some reason or other, have to be removed from society under sanction of law, is to deal with them outside of a correctional institution if it is at all possible. One of the programs that we had been moving towards was in Brandon where the people would not be kept in an institution per se but would be kept in a facility which, according to law, would be a correctional institution but according to program we'd be dealing with them as their fundamental problem which is relative to overindulgence in alcohol. But nevertheless, the government in immediate cost dollars, in their way of evaluating programs it says, "We don't put out the dollars." So it is this kind of premise which permeates this particular report . . . let me back up a bit.

Take for example the correctional institution in Brandon itself. I don't know what the cost is, I think it's \$8 million. That particular building is going to last 100 years as the last one did so they want to put out the \$8 million and charge that all against the appropriations for 1978-79 and 1979-80 as if we were spending that money all at once which isn't true. If people did their own financing in that particular way, everybody in the province would be broke.

But, Mr. Chairman, I still haven't got an answer from the Minister as to how they have evaluated programs as far as cost efficiency is concerned. I'll use another example. In a particular community in the province when everybody is working, there is no social unrest, there is no social disorder. But because of circumstances, a cutback of a particular program, all of the people who were involved in a particular project went on unemployment insurance so all they have to do is to go down and sit in the local pub, get half swacked, start hammering at each other and they end up in the hoosegow. I think it costs about \$18,000 a year in 1979 dollars to keep a man in Headingley Jail. When you're evaluating programs, was this the way that the government looked at the programs, that far down the road? Just exactly how much they were saving in the final analysis or is it, as the Minister suggested in his long presentation, that all they're going to do is look at how much it costs in the first place. How many people they're serving?

You know, if one one probation officer keeps one person out of jail a year, he's earned his salary. That's the kind of analysis and I'm being very parochial, I know, but I have to speak from my own personal experience because I don't know what a billion dollars is either. But all of the billion dollars is made up of each particular person evaluating each particular program in the manner that I'm talking about because if that is not so, then I'm most concerned, Mr. Chairman, and what we're moving towards is a government of technocrats, that we're going to put technocracy into place and they're going to run it. You know, that isn't what the people of the Province of Manitoba elected

the government for.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on this point, I'd like to say that there is no disagreement with respect to what the honourable member is saying. I think that the input that we're talking about comes from those who have to make the decisions, whoever are charged with the responsibility at any given time within government. I acknowledge that; I'm not quarrelling that that input, that decision making, that understanding has to occur. All that has been suggested is — and I don't think that you can use the word technocrats — all I'm suggesting is that there is a necessity to have valid information upon which those judgments are going to be made and that valid information has to come from a much more refined system than governments have been operating under in the past. That's what really is suggested.

The problem in dealing with the immediate situation with respect to the present budget (a) has to do with the question of whether the financial position was as serious as we suggested. The honourable members say it wasn't; we say it was and we've made a number of steps consistent with that which you may or may not disagree with because you haven't accepted the original proposition but that has nothing to do with it. We've done it on that basis, recognizing we had to deal with the information system that was available and the departmental operations as they then existed with whatever recommendations we could provide for restraint. You can disagree or agree on it. We made choices which you can agree or disagree with on and we can argue that — I'm not quarrelling that.

But leaving all of this aside and assuming that we're in a position to ultimately implement what was recommended if those recommendations are accepted, the time can come when those who are in government would have the kind of technical information in an information system which is updated to provide it so that in effect when they do make the decisions, they can make them in the same way as you have, but that it's much more detailed.

If you free those and you said a certain Minister is responsible for administration as opposed to line departmental functions, and you set up a Treasury Committee which, in effect, can act as a committee dealing with this on a monthly basis and can evaluate that, then I think you're in a better position to make the decisions that have to be made because all government will be doing is making decisions in any case. They affect everyone. Those decisions have to be made with understanding and compassion and the realization that the facts themselves don't necessarily mean anything, you're dealing with human beings and you're dealing with the ultimate effects of government with respect to them.

So that I think you can achieve what you have talked about as an objective if something along the lines of what we talked about is adopted, which is a modernization of government. But the problem we had for this year — and I'm now speaking as a Minister as . . . because I've sat on Cabinet and on Management Committee and not as a person on the Task Force — the problem we had this year was to meet the immediate need of applying the restraint as we believed it to be necessary — which you may not have believed to have been necessary and you can argue that — in a way which would be able to deal properly with the information we had with the objectives that had been stated, with our understanding of how the programs had operated. That debate will continue and you will be able to judge whether those results were good or not in months to come.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, just in rising, in all the Minister said he used one expression which shows his inability to cope with such problems. He said "valid information". That's an erroneous use of terms. It's reliable information on which you base valid judgments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour of 4:30 having arrived, it's Private Members' Hour. But I'm led to believe that Private Members' Hour may be very short and if so we'll be back in committee if we can assemble a quorum.1\$

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 37, Health and Social Development. We are on Item (e)(1) Salaries, \$209,300. (e)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's not passed though.

Mr. Speaker, before we start may I ask the Minister, I believe he'd agreed to provide us with the list of permanent, term, contract — well not necessarily the contract — part-time people with

vacancies as to a certain date and if at all possible broken down by divisions, I wonder if we can have that .

May I say at this time also that we would expect, we will make the same request when we deal with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. So I hope that we'll be able to get that. In fact, if at all possible, I wouldn't mind receiving the information before we start dealing with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I think we could save time if we do that.

And just to remind again the Minister, I think that I'd suggest that we get a copy of the Registry of Children's Residential Facilities that I would find quite interesting. There's no rush for that. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing now with Personnel Management Services. First of all I wonder if it's the same. I'll take it, unless the Minister contradicts me, that here again was an area that last year the Minister felt that we should cut down on the staff. I think he had said that seven or eight should do the work and I see that he's requesting, I think, it's 14, yes. So I guess that this is an area again that the Minister said that once he was saddled with the responsibility he has learned and realized that these people are doing some work.

But I see that one of the questions that I have is that last year — and I still don't understand that fully — I felt that we had had \$255,000 approved and here it states \$248,000. But my question is why this approximately \$40,000 to \$50,000 reduction this year, if there is a staff of only one, a reduction of a staff of only one, where are they going to save that kind of money? I don't know. I'd like to know.

Now this is the area, this is the personnel in the department that does the recruitment, recruiting, the evaluation, reclassification, reassign and the training of the personnel. One thing that concerns me is the Task Force felt that there should be a rollback here and this should be done outside of the department or directly with the director of the special division. I think that the Minister might realize now and might agree with me that this might be very difficult to do.

Now in the Annual Report of the department on Page 4, I think, or 5, it's stated that there was as of December 3, 1976, 4,500 staff man years; and in December 3, 1977, the staff man years were cut down to 3,694 and that was a reduction of 806. Now I've always claimed that we were watching the restraint also and we weren't filling all the vacancies; and I think this is an indication. Of course, December is a month or so after the new government took effect but I think that even then they didn't fire 806 people in the month between then. So I think that some of the credit, if anything, if this is credit should go to the former administration. And then the vacant position is also . . . I was probably given the information that I wanted. Now I'll have to study this. But in the first paper that we received, the vacant positions as of March 31st were 206. That was March 31st. I believe that around October or so the vacancies must have been higher than that.

I haven't had a chance to look at this. Does this include the contract people, the information that I was just given today, is this contract people also? I haven't looked at it at all, as you can understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. SHERMAN: I wasn't sure whether the honourable member wanted an answer to that specific question separately. What has happened is, we have shown the vacancies. The vacancies of course do not apply to the contract positions because there's no vacancies where contract positions are concerned.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I mean the information you gave me today, this added information, that deals with contracts. I haven't had the chance to look at it.

MR. SHERMAN: No, it deals with vacancies in permanent positions, as I understand it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the request that I made about a month and a half ago, what I think is a reasonable request, in fact it was the same request that the Conservative Party or the opposition of last year made to me. I can quote you the page in Hansard, in fact it was the now Premier, and what I wanted was the following information: The permanent, term, contract, part-time and vacancies. Now, that was approved in 1977-78, what it was around November 1, 1977, and then on April 1, 1978, or what was requested at this time, and broken down. In fact, when we gave the information last year, we broke it for the division for the then Leader of the Opposition, and I would hope that we can have that. I think most of that information was given in other departments, and I don't think that we can compare apples with oranges; I don't think that this is going to help at all.

I'm very interested in getting the whole picture of the staff, the staff may even be contract people

and so on, because I agree, at times there were some people on contract that shouldn't have been there; I agree. And I want to see what was done on that. Of course, I also say that it could be a big mistake if this government, and this is as good a place to say it as any — if this government is going to decide that they're not going to have any contract people at all, I think that this is going to be a big mistake. I think that it is good to check it once in a while, to make sure that it's only contract people. For instance, the Mincome people were specialists, they were brought in to do a certain work with the understanding that when that work was finished, they were gone. And I think that if you have certain priorities in that department, as well as any department, but even more so in this department — let's say that it might be in what, in fighting VD, or anything like that — you might get a certain specialist and so on that you wouldn't want to keep when this work is done, that you wouldn't necessarily have to guarantee a job and try to realign or red-circle. I think that that's what the problem is, but I certainly would hope that the government is not going to go to the other extreme and decide that they're not going to hire any contract people at all, because I think this will be a detriment to the people of Manitoba.

I'll have to take this home during the dinner hour to see if the information that I wanted is all there.

Mr. Chairman, I figure that I've been on trial here as a member of a former government. I've been on trial with the now government being the accuser, the judge and jury. I've been told that there would be many horror stories; I've been told that we had too many staff man years; we have way too many civil servants, and I've been told that I, with the rest of my colleagues, could not run a peanut stand, and have been responsible for certainly mismanagement, and that there was an awful lot of fat that should be cut from this department.

Now, looking at the figures, even the figures of my honourable friend, that I was looking at yesterday — and I know that that could be wrong — but even looking at that, I think that the staff of the department are the staff man years that I requested last year, although these positions were not all filled and what we're requesting this year is approximately the same thing. I have heard the Minister also say that he had agreed with all the programs in this department, except I think that he mentioned one, which actually I must take the responsibility, if the responsibility has to be taken, but only collectively, not as the Minister responsible, because Corrections was another department in those days, and I think that he was talking about the Alcoholism Foundation and so on, that that was one department that he didn't hear.

So I really would like to hear, sincerely, if the Minister has found that there has been so much mismanagement in that department, there has been way too many civil servants, and if many of these programs then were mismanaged. And if there is that much — I'm not talking about now, I understand that the Minister has stated many times that the main thing that he would like to do more, in fact, we were talking about the hearing testing centres and he said that he agrees with me that that should be a high priority but that the priority of his government was to start with the cost and then see what the need would be. So therefore, this is not what I want to argue at this time, but I would invite the Minister at this time to show me what if there was that much mismanagement, if there was that much excess baggage, and then if there is so much fat, if he feels there is that much fat to cut.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me try to get a couple of matters straight on which there appears to be some misunderstanding in one respect, and certainly a very valid mistake pointed out in another. The honourable member referred to Page 5 of the Annual Report and the numerals shown there for the difference in the department's payroll in December 1977 as against December 1976. I compliment him on his sharp-eyed criticism; there's obviously a mistake in those numbers, Mr. Chairman; I'll have to get the correct numbers for him. But it's not logical that there should be a difference of what is more than 800 personnel. He's absolutely right; it's obviously a typographical error in the Annual Report and I'll have to get him the correct figure on that.

With respect to the details of the approved staff complement and the member's request with respect to vacancies in contract people, I thought that in the three pages that I sent over to him on Tuesday that his question was being answered. The first two pages show the approved staff complement in terms of staff man years for three succeeding years, including the present one. They show the vacant positions cumulatively and then on Page 3 we show program by program, the staff employed under contract as at March 31, 1976, 1977 and 1978 — on Page 3 of the three pages that I sent over to him on Tuesday.

MR. DESJARDINS: I never noticed the third page. I am sorry. Oh, it's on this one here; is this

the same thing?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. I think the information that the honourable member wanted is there. He can check. But my understanding, and my official's understanding of his question on Tuesday, would in our view seem to be answered by the information contained in those three pages and specifically on Page 3 where staff employed under contract is concerned.

Now, the information that we passed over to him this afternoon shows vacancies on a program by program basis, and of course those relate to staff other than contract staff, obviously. If that isn't the desired information then I'll have to exchange notes with the honourable member again, but I hoped and felt that that answered his questions in that area. I'll leave that with him for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

In terms of the total establishment of the branch, this particular branch, and the member's reference to the fact that there were 14 staff man years shown for 1978-79 and that represents no change from the figures shown for 1977-78. That's correct in the superficial printed sense but there are three vacancies in that complement and there's no intention, Mr. Chairman, to fill them.

That would explain in part the discrepancy, or the apparent discrepancy as it strikes the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, in the line having to do with Salaries under the breakdown of this particular vote.

The honourable member referred to a recommendation in the Task Force Report relative to this particular branch and the desirability of where this kind of work should be done, in-House or outside. I would have to give him the same answer on this that I gave him the other evening with respect to the Task Force recommendations. We simply haven't had time as a government, Sir, and I have not had time as the steward of this department to assess those many Task Force recommendations with any degree of competence or with any degree of intensity. We haven't had the time as yet. My mind is open on virtually every one of the recommendations in the Task Force Report and I would welcome opinion from persons like the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who have had experience in this department, as to the validity of some of those recommendations. So that is in the area of subjects that still has to be considered by the government. I presume I'll have some responsibility for bringing in an opinion, and by the time I've worked through my Estimates and done a few more months' work with officials of my department, I would hope that my opinions would be crystalizing with respect to a lot of those recommendations. But they're not entirely crystalized yet.

The honourable member referred to horror stories and mismanagement. I think I would have to say that those terms are his, or if they're not his they're at least somebody else's. I have not applied or used the term "horror stories" or "mismanagement" to the Department of Health and Social Development to my knowledge. In fact I would say for the record that I inherited an extremely well run and well staffed department. I have had, as I suggested in my opening remarks, a tremendous backup and support from that department in trying to acquaint myself with the many responsibilities that it shoulders.

I don't feel myself in a position to answer definitively the member's question about fat, excess personnel. I would doubt that there is a significant amount of it to be found. We are attempting to rationalize costs and spending in the way that seems to us is usually the most practical and sensible way to do it, by zeroing in on levels of administration that might be redundant or that might involve duplication; that might involve some unnecessary expenditure while attempting to preserve programming and services — that's an ongoing exercise — and we may find some positions, indeed we have found a few, and I've referred to three in this branch, that are vacant which are not targeted for refilling. We may find a few positions that are not necessary and therefore can be phased out.

Indeed, there are strenuous efforts being made by the directors of my different directorates and branches, to achieve if possible — particularly in the Community Operations Division — a 10 percent vacancy rate which was a target not unfamiliar to the previous Minister and the previous government. I believe they were striving for the same kind of a vacancy rate. Now if it becomes demonstrable that that kind of a rate can be achieved without significant effect on quality of service or programming, then presumably over the course of the next year or two those positions would be phased out on a permanent basis and the establishment would thus be reduced by that percentage. That does not represent in my view necessarily a discovery of a great layer of fat. It is a decision that has been concurred in and assisted by the directors of the different directorates and branches in the department themselves who obviously feel that there are some management innovations,

applications that can be invoked in a period of restraint that are justifiable. In a more affluent time perhaps the work would be spread around more. But we're not in an affluent time at the moment and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I'm sure, would be doing precisely the same thing were our positions reversed because I think he was striving for that kind of a rationalization of size of staff himself.

So all I can say in response to him is, that the department appears to me, if it helps him in his position, to have been effectively led and effectively run — I don't think I ever criticized his leadership or his management of the department. I hope and trust that a Progressive-Conservative government, through some Minister of other — perhaps not me — but through some Minister or other can do it better. That doesn't say he didn't do it well.

As far as the general staff question is concerned I would just add, Mr. Chairman, that most of the staff that we're looking at in a department like this, as the honourable member well knows, are in institutions and we're not reducing institutional staff significantly at all.

So I can't stand here and say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, "Look you overloaded, overpacked your department. There are great savings that can be made in terms of reduction of personnel, reduction of staff man years," because that was not the case. I think it was an efficiently administered department. I respect the efforts that the honourable member made as steward of that department. I just prefer that I have the job rather than he has the job, that's all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to say to the Minister that — and I don't know if there was a mistake, I didn't get the third page, or of course it was the only copy and I passed it around and somebody might have taken it — but anyway he is absolutely right. With the added information that I have today I have practically everything. I say practically because there is something else I would like to have.

I would like to have the vacancies. You give us the vacancies now and they're broken down as of March 31st, 1977 and then March 31st, 1978. Normally this is all I would need but because of the change of government and because of the change of ministers, I would like to have it as of October, because I think that the vacancies should have been higher, as far as I was concerned; because I know that I only filled the positions that I felt that I had to do. It was recommended to me by staff that it had to be done. We were on the Restraint Program also and we were cutting down on the vacancies. So if I can have this information I'd be ready.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I certainly welcome the personal remarks of the Honourable Minister. I wasn't looking for praise but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it is true that this Minister and myself have not had too many exchanges or too many throwing insults at each other, but the Minister stated last year that collectively he had to accept that he was part of a team, and I also am certainly as good a team player, and I consider that I was part of a team, and it might be true that this particular Minister didn't make these accusations, but others did, especially the First Minister, and this is what I resented very much. Because I can endorse everything that the Minister is saying and I think it should be like that, that he should want to do the job better than I did, and I hope that the next Minister, regardless of what party he belongs to, I hope that every new Minister will do that much better than the other. And I think that this is the only way that it can be done, and I think everybody will profit. There are certain things that a Minister wants to do and he can't do; it will take him a while to sow the seed, to get the thing going, and there are certain things I hope that I've done that will benefit the present Minister, that I hope that he will do the same thing to whoever replaces him, including maybe a member from this side.

But it has been said repeatedly by the Minister of Finance, there has been this scare, and I exclude the present Minister, but he himself had pointed out to me that he was part of the team and we were responsible for whatever our party did, in this case, the government and the opposition in my case. And this is why I ask this question, because there is no doubt that the Minister of Finance and the Premier of this province had promised to give us — I think it was one day — a horror story; the First Minister said that none of us could run a peanut stand. The Premier has said that the programs would not be cut at all, but they would be more effective, they would be run better, because we didn't know what we were doing.

Now, I'm kind of pleased — I came in today, Mr. Chairman, ready for a fight or ready to co-operate, and I'm kind of pleased that the Minister is being non-partisan, and again, I'm going to do everything I can to co-operate with him, and there are certain areas that we will not agree on, there is no doubt. Because we have a different philosophy, or ideology — I think mine is more

of the, certainly not extreme left, but more the middle of the road, and I consider that at least in these days, the present Minister is quite a bit to the right. But he says that might change, and I hope that it does, and I think that, as he said, he's going to try to do a better job than I did and I'm going to try to do a better job than he did in opposition. Because I consider the role of the member of the opposition practically as important. If we can convince, by any means, even if we can bring pressure to change certain areas, for instance, I will put as much pressure as possible so that Minister doesn't get roped in and bring in an assignment in the Medicare because that's the end of it, and the people of Manitoba will suffer. And I don't think the people of Manitoba would stand for it.

So, having said that, that makes it easier. As I said, I was ready to come here to fight if need be because my record, when you try to do your best you're jealous of your reputation and you don't want just some people to come in and make statements that they can't prove. And as I say, I was ready for a battle, but I'm much more pleased to be able to co-operate with the rest of these Estimates. Oh, there's no doubt that there'll be some battle along the road, but I think I've got it set now that the Minister is saying, "All right, fine. I took a department that I felt was all right; I think I can do a better job. That's fine, and I'm not cutting down programs, but we're more or less freezing, or doing . . ." — I'll argue with him on that; I think in certain areas they are cutting programs, and there's not that many staff. Now he's going to try; some of the vacancies, he's going to see if he can do without. Well then he's continuing what I did, especially the last two years. And I think that the paper that we have in front of us would prove that because of the new programs.

But, one thing where I will hit hard, as hard as I can, is if I think that in the name of restraint, the excuse of restraint — you see that's all we have now, restraint — we can't say it was in a mess, not in this department, anyway, after what the Minister said. He wasn't left with a mess but it was a question of restraint and the times that we are going through, at least in this department. Maybe collectively he feels differently, and that's up to each former Minister to establish to see where he went wrong. But in areas when we deal, I can tell my honourable friend, when we deal with prevention, because I know that he's all for prevention, but he didn't invent that. In fact, we agreed that we were agreed, last year and the year before in this question of prevention, and in this area, then, I hope that there's going to be more than just lip service because then I am going to push in that area also. And also, when we deal in certain programs, that I feel that you're going to lose money in such as home care. I think if anything, home care is a good program, home care should be increased, and I'm not going to make any accusation — this is what we're here for, to find out where the Minister, where the government is going with home care. But if there is any cut in home care, then I'm going to criticize that, because that is going to be a costly proposition. You'll have doctors that will keep patients in hospitals longer because that's one of the — well, I'll stop right there, Mr. Chairman, because we agreed that we would wait till the item, and there is a special item for home care and I don't want to be carried away.

So, as far as I personally am concerned, I think that I can let this thing go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (e)—pass. (f)(1) — The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Honourable Minister, I must admit that I am not altogether familiar with the various particulars of this department and so I am going to ask what may appear to him to be a very naive question. I do so honestly and innocently. Could the Minister be so kind as to detail what sort of programs are ongoing within the department today currently, respecting the development and training of staff resources? This is under Item (e)(2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will try to approach this subject with the honourable member as we go through the Estimates of this department item by item, because that really is where the training costs are handled. They are built in to each appropriation, into each program within the appropriation requested for each of those programs. The particular branch that we're dealing with, Personnel Management Services, provides personnel services to the department in recruitment, selection and evaluation of staff, evaluation and classification of positions and the development and training of staff resources, but the specific staff training component is broken down program by program and service by service and is built in to each of those individual appropriations. I don't know whether that answers the honourable member's question or not. For example, in the mental health field those

appropriations when we get into it, include sums for staff training, so that it's a little difficult to answer his question on this subject in more detail under this particular item in the Estimates.

As far as specific training of staff resources being a responsibility of this particular branch, the form and content of the work that the branch does in this area takes the shape of staff orientation sessions, and this appropriation contains \$14,000 for staff orientation sessions. And that really is the sum and substance of this subject and this kind of operation at this point in the breakdown of the department's operations and functions.

MR. CORRIN: I'm not sure whether I'm going to contribute further to the confusion or not, but I am curious, though, how the money is allocated; like, what sums are spent for what sort of program? What value do we get for the money that we are in fact spending? I notice that there has been a diminution in the amount of money allocated under this particular item. I also notice that there is a proportion of this money that's recoverable from the Federal Government, and I am curious, first of all, where the moneys are recoverable from the Federal Government? What sort of arrangement or agreement has been made as between this government and the Federal Government? What sort of subsidy or whatever is provided to recover moneys? And what in fact is the money actually spent on? How is it apportioned as between the various matters that the Honourable Minister referred to?

MR. SHERMAN: Let me give the honourable member this information, Mr. Chairman, and see if it gets at the point in question. First of all, the recovery from Canada, the funding from Canada, is under the Canada Assistance Plan. The total item that we're looking at here, (e)(1), Other Expenditures, refers to the general operating costs of this particular office that would include the routine operating costs of any office, such as stationery and travel and minor office equipment requirements. The Expenditures for Personnel Management Services remain at the 1977-78 level, \$25,400; Staff Training and Development costs are reduced by \$10,000, from \$24,700 to \$14,700; that is the \$10,000 represented in the figures that the honourable member has in front of him, the \$40,100 as compared to \$50,100.00.

Alternative methods of delivering training and development sessions, plus the development of many training packages, such as performance evaluations, business practises and problem-solving techniques, allowed for that reduction to be made. So, through the selection of alternate methods of that kind of service and the development of new packages, it was possible to reduce that allocation by that amount, \$10,000.00. That doesn't say that the service is minimized in any way; in fact, we feel it is not; we feel it's improved through the development of these new packages and techniques. They still enable us through this branch to deliver the evaluation classification and development services for which the branch was established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I thank the Honourable Minister for that response, and perhaps he could be specific and tell us how the \$24,000 reduction in staff training and development cost was actually effected? What were the areas of reduction and cutback?

MR. SHERMAN: The reduction, I think the honourable member was referring to, I think he meant to say \$10,000, not \$24,000 — it's reduced from \$24,700 to \$14,700, made possible through reduced requirements for audio-visual facilities and services, through reduced travel requirements; through reduced seminars and through improved training packages; refinements and sophistications in the methods through which performance evaluations and business practices and problem-solving techniques are presented.

This branch and these services do not relate, Mr. Chairman, for example to professional training of persons working under the Department of Health and Social Development, in professional Health and Social Service delivery fields, such as nurses and persons working in the mental health field, the mental retardation field, professional workers, professional deliverers of that type of service.

I suppose the other factor that contributes to the justification for this reduction is that there has been a reduced turn-over of staff and there has, as a consequence, been fewer new employees to work with, and that of course has minimized the requirement for as much input into training packages and training techniques and training sessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I was wondering, in view of the fact that in the breakdown there is reference given

to reduced requirements for audio-visual services and reduced travel requirements, if the Honourable Minister could give us a further breakdown in comparison of the actual reduction as between the fiscal year, 1977-78 and the one before us this afternoon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, whatever it is, Mr. Chairman, it's within the parameters of \$10,000.00. That is the significant contributor to the \$10,000 reduction. I would have to ask the honourable member for time to get that specific information. But it's contained within the \$10,000 reduction, would be a part of it. Precisely how many dollars and cents could be ascribed to those particular functions, audio-visual and travel, would be information I'd have to get for him.

MR. CORRIN: I was just wondering, if that was an undertaking I gladly thank the Honourable Minister for his co-operation. If it was not, I would ask the Minister for his undertaking, in that respect.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, it's an undertaking, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'm sorry I was out of the room for awhile. We're still on 2.(e), is that correct? 2.(e)? —(Interjection)— Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can ask your questions on (e)(2) on Other Expenditures.

MR. PARASIUK: On Other Expenditures, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I passed it and I neglected to acknowledge the Honourable Member for Wellington. So I have been repeating it under just the Clause (e). But (e)(2) is still to be covered.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay. Now on this item, I wasn't here previously and I'm wondering whether the Minister has had a chance to comment on the Task Force recommendation that personnel functions be centralized. Is that what you were talking to before when you said you haven't had a chance to . . . ? Okay. -

In this section I would think that this is the section that would deal with Career Planning within the Department of Health and Social Development. And in the light of cutbacks in the Civil Service Commission, namely, the disestablishment, I guess, of the Career Planning office, can the Minister indicate whether the department has developed any programs for Career Planning to enable physically handicapped, native groups, women's groups to in fact get to attain a higher proportion of the work force in this department? That's the whole affirmative action thrust that was begun by the past administration and which this new administration have said that it agrees with in their comments to various interest groups on this matter and yet people are concerned because the Career Planning office has been eliminated in the Civil Service Commission. The implication somehow was that this would be developed within other branches of the Civil Service Commission and that also departments would be carrying forward programs in this area.

So I think that in the light of these concerns raised by particular interest groups who were promised by the Conservative Party in the last election that they would not cut back in this area, could the Minister define, what are the innovative programs in this particular area that this section will be carrying out on behalf of the Department of Health and Social Development?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're sort of back into the same area in terms of question and answer, on a different topic but the same area that I just was in with the Honourable Meer for Wellington, in that we don't, in the department, have specific approaches or programs of this nature that I can define for the Honourable Member for Transcona under this particular branch.

There are things that the department can do generally in that respect, in concert with all departments of government. But the specific kind of challenge and responsibility that the honourable member is asking about really comes under the aegis of Personnel Administration of Management Committee of Cabinet and as far as affirmative action is concerned that really is primarily the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Labour. Of course, all members of the Executive Council consult in concert and hopefully will work in concert in trying to pursue the objectives and the targets of the affirmative action philosophy, but I cannot assure the honourable member that there is a

specific function in that direction for the Department of Health and Social Development under this branch, Personnel Management Services.

MR. PARASIUKE: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the development of programs in this particular policy direction in that it's a policy direction that seems to be agreed to by all political parties in Manitoba. It's the type of thing that is quite easy to give lip service to but if nothing substantive and positive is undertaken, we'll find ourselves 25 years from now with the same situation as we have now or a worse situation where we find that these particular groups who have, I think, been institutionally discriminated against will possibly form a lower proportion of the work force of the Department of Health and Social Development than they presently constitute. I raise this with particular reference to the Department of Health and Social Development in that the Department of Health and Social Development is the largest employer of the Province of Manitoba. It also is a department that does have a specific Personnel Management Service — some of the other departments don't have this — but this is one that does have a specific function.

Furthermore, I think the Minister was somewhat mistaken when he said that this is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour. It's the same person but I think it's the basic responsibility of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

At the same time we've had a few developments since October 24 that have added to my cause for concern with respect to affirmative action. There was a Cabinet sub-committee on Equal Opportunities, which I think has been disbanded. I know that the secretary to that Cabinet sub-committee was fired. So that means then that the push within the bureaucracy for this type of program has been eliminated. The structural entity that was supposed to act as the focus for this type of activity for all of the government has been eliminated. I never knew that Management Committee per se had this as its function. In fact, Management Committee staff and Ministers were represented on the Equal Opportunities Committee because people in the past administration wanted affirmative action to be given a very definite or focussed approach within the government.

I believe that that has been, as I said, eliminated at the centre. I don't think it will be happening. The Career Planning office has been disestablished. I don't see any new thrusts developing in the Civil Service Commission. The Career Planning office director has been let go. We have not had a replacement for the head of the Women's Bureau within the Department of Labour, who was doing some educative work in this particular area.

So the whole thrust of affirmative action is in limbo. In fact, it's in recession. We're going backwards rather than forwards. I notice also that we've had a reduction in the actual expenditures in this entire appropriation. Even with respect to Other Expenditures, we've had a reduction, we've had an absolute reduction and if you take into account inflation, we've probably had a reduction of some magnitude. So it strikes me that lip service has been given publicly. But in practice, when you look into the nitty-gritty of every department's activities, we find that with respect to the largest department nothing per se is happening in the whole area of affirmative action.

Now, perhaps the Minister is just saying that he is not aware of anything happening right now. But if he's not aware that may be an indication that nothing, as such, is happening; and if nothing is happening would the Minister undertake to try and re-shuffle his priorities to ensure that this area isn't just given lip service but rather that something concrete is done. Because frankly, you're not going to do anything large and dramatic in this area. It's going to have to be done on a steady basis, year by year and it's a difficult process; it's partly changing attitude; it's partly changing some institutional restrictions that exist — sometimes inadvertently — and it's a difficult area for any type of progress. But if the Minister doesn't give a strong commitment to it personally, then I think there will be a tendency on the part of staff to follow the path of least resistance.

The whole concept of affirmative action is not one of following the path of least resistance. It is rather following the path of difficult resistance. So that's why I think it needs a strong ministerial commitment and, of course, a bit of budgetary support.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all the honourable member is quite right in suggesting that the responsibility rests with the — the primary responsibility in this area — rests with the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. I believe in my answer I said, rests with my colleague, the Minister of Labour. But it does rest with my colleague, the Minister of Labour in her capacity as Minister responsible for the Civil Service. That is correct.

Secondly, as far as the reduction in expenditures is concerned, Sir, I hope the Honourable Member for Transcona will forgive me if I don't go through that again because I went through it with the Honourable Member for Wellington.

Thirdly, there are certainly some things that the present Minister is keeping in mind that can hopefully be done in the field of Health and Social Development to promote the concept of affirmative action. I've referred to at least one of them in statements outside the House, not specifically I agree, defined in public terms as a measure that's designed to promote affirmative action, but it would have that effect. I said that we were going to explore the possibility and I emphasize the word "explore" of a Native Child Welfare Agency in the core area of Winnipeg.

Now my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface may be horrified at that proposal and I daresay we may get into an argument about that later on when we get into that section of the Estimates.

But if we did find it practical and viable to move in that kind of an area, although I'm not trying to pretend to the Honourable Member for Transcona that I would undertake it essentially as a manifestation or articulation of the concept of affirmative action. It would have some spinoff benefit in effect of that kind, and there will be other things of that nature that I certainly will keep in mind that I intend to develop over the course of the summer and fall for recommendation to my Cabinet colleagues for implementation as early as possible, that hopefully will have the same kind of spinoff effect.

But in terms of directly addressing ourselves to the concept of affirmative action the way we are structuring or addressing our responsibilities in the Executive Council at the present, Mr. Chairman, is — I think I would have to reiterate for the honourable member — a method that calls for the initiative to come from Management Committee, and then for the various members of Executive Council in concert to work together to try to pursue that goal and that objective. I will, however, give the honourable member the undertaking that I recognize that my Department is the largest in terms of personnel; is the most sophisticated probably in terms of the components of the community generally that it touches right across the whole stratum of social and economic categories; and I would agree with him that I have a responsibility to keep the philosophy of affirmative action in mind and I will do that.

MR. PARASIUKE: Well, I would like to thank the Minister for his comments in this respect. I can appreciate that he hasn't been Minister of this very very large Department for that long and I think that it will take a bit of time for his particular personality to sort of work its way through the entire Department.

In this respect I appreciate his commitment that he will take very seriously the effort of affirmative action because I think it is very important, especially in this Department. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of passing on a couple of suggestions to him, in that his Department is the type that does touch so many facets of activity, that it does provide a wide variety of opportunities for affirmative action. I think that the New Careers Program which has been talked about when the Minister of Education's Estimates were discussed, in fact had many of its initial placements in the Department of Health and Social Development. I can recall going up north on a field trip and checking into one of the community health centres — it was and it still is in existence in northern Manitoba — and asking them about new careerists and how they were working out. It turned out that probably the best child welfare worker that that community had ever had, had in fact been a New Career graduate. This was a native person who had a number of children or so, who was older, responsible, had some experience in Bob Wilson or the Member for Wolseley's school of life or university of life, and had had a number of other experiences, had received two years of very good training and had turned out to be the best child welfare worker that they had ever had.

Now this person didn't have the M.A. in Social Work, or the M.Sc. in Social Work, that maybe other people might put up as an entry or qualifications into that particular field, but that person had a desire to live in northern Manitoba, to remain in northern Manitoba, that person had an empathy with northern Manitobans, that person wanted to do a lot in the way of extra effort to ensure that people with whom she had a very close association could in fact try and better their condition. So that is why a program like New Careers really can be very very effective for the Department of Health and Social Development and frankly I am somewhat disappointed that the Program of New Careers seems to be reduced and I am somewhat disappointed that it seems that there may be some difficulty in insuring that New Careers graduates actually do get long-term positions within the government bureaucracy as had been promised to them when they had originally undertaken their commitment to do two years of very intensive work in particular areas.

So I do hope that the Minister when he is considering affirmative action possibilities within his

Department will not turn a deaf ear or a blind eye to the very good, I think, examples of success under the New Careers Program, and that he keeps an open mind in this respect because that program, I think, over the longrun in terms of the quality of graduates who are committed to staying in northern Manitoba is especially good. If you look at the inner core I think you have another situation where I think New Careers graduates would really help improve the delivery of service of the Department, and also help improve communications between the department and its client groups.

So I will pass on this Item now, but I will indicate to the Minister that I assume that he will still be in that position next year and I serve notice that this is probably an area that I will be asking for some progress reports on and for some possible specific examples of what successes have been achieved over the course of this year after the Minister has had a bit of an opportunity to get his teeth into the Department more fully.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be a little more specific about the new careerists. I was going to wait until Community Operations, I thought this was the place that we were to discuss it, but now that we have started it it appears that this is the area.

The way it used to be anyway that the government, I think it was the HESP used to train certain people and then the different departments committed themselves to hiring certain people once they graduated. I know that last year we started this program and we had, I don't know if they were all hired but it was certainly the intention, I think they were, there were five new careerists that we started. I know because I was facing pretty well the same situation as my honourable friend is this year — we were trying to cut down on staff and it was difficult, but that was one area that we felt that we had made this commitment and we had agreed to hire five people.

Now my question is: Are those five new careerists, these new positions that we had last year, were they filled, are they going to be filled, or is that an area where there was a cut?

Now I can't help but make a comment about the Children's Aid Society, my honourable friend, the Minister, discussed it. I think that if he goes along in what I understood in his statement outside the House of setting up a new Children's Aid Society run by the native people of Manitoba, I think that could be dangerous. I think that could be dangerous. I can assure the Minister that if this is done the minute that this is announced, if it is ever done officially, that the French speaking people of Manitoba will want to do the same thing. I can assure him of that because that was something they wanted to do in the past, and I think that you might have other groups, Ukrainians and other groups that will want to do that. Now there is at the present a Jewish Children's Aid Society. I think this is a little different. I think that they started an awful long time ago and the main thing is that they are putting in an awful lot of money of their own, so we are not duplicating anything now.

But what the Minister is trying to achieve and I couldn't agree more with him and I think because we are dealing with very many native people or the Children's Aid Society are dealing with them, that the Minister could encourage the Children's Aid Society to employ native people, that I would go along with, and I think that you would achieve that without bringing all kinds of headaches on you. If you start, if you allowed to set up a native Children's Aid Society, God help you, because you are going to have all kinds of requests. Then you are dividing — are they going to in the long run become second-class citizens or what? Don't you think that you might even have trouble, it will complicate things in the adoption? So I am not going to be shocked by it. I would advise the Minister to be very careful. He did say that he is just looking at it, but I would encourage him to develop what he really wants and what the important thing is, it's not the Board who is going to call the shots necessarily. It is the people working with them that is important. I couldn't agree more with the Minister on that. I would hope that this could be done.

To the Minister, the question that I wanted was these five special programs, we hired five new careerists last year, where are they? Are they there or has that been cut? Or will it be increased?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I will get the honourable member that information, Mr. Chairman, and I can probably even do it today. As far as new careerists who were trained and completed their training and were hired by the Department, in the Department, or through the Department, their status has not changed. —(Interjection)— They are being maintained, that's right, but specifically where they

are I would have to get him that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I believe the Minister said twice today that with regard to affirmative action, it is in the hands of Management Committee, and although he agrees with the concept basically it is the Management Committee that deals with these things. —(Interjection)— No, under your present government.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, what I read into that is that that's the end of the affirmative action program. I read into the comments made by the Minister that is the end of affirmative action programs, because the Minister responsible for Civil Service, although he was the focal point whereby he was prodding other departments, prodding other ministries, to take action on the affirmative action program didn't go beyond that, so that was his responsibility through his staff working with departmental staff, and he working with Ministers, would try to get the people more in tune to the affirmative action program and the need for it.

Now apparently the feeling is that well, Management Committee will deal with it. Management Committee really doesn't get involved in the kind of people. It is a question of, have you got the staff man years and are you hiring in accordance with whatever the qualifications are, is it within the dollar limits established, etc.

In dealing in affirmative action we are dealing with a group of people who cannot under normal circumstances get into the job market, they can't. They have physical disabilities, they have various other disabilities, which does not make them the most ideal cost-effective employee, and if you are thinking in terms simply of cost-effectiveness, if you are going to pay \$3.50 or \$4.00 an hour and hope to get \$5.00 an hour out of that person, the likelihood is you are not going to do it. That is a fact, that is one of the facts of life you have to realize.

But I think there is a greater need. It isn't just cost first and then need second. Here is a case where need is first because if you leave it to the private sector, who have been called upon from time to time to do something in this area, has done some, the very large firms can sometimes work in a few people with handicaps. But by and large they are in the profit business, they are out to make money on their employees, that is what they are there for, and they cannot really do too much in that direction. I think government has to take the lead. It is up to government to, not only think in terms of cost, and say, "All right, we are going to get somebody who has two feet, two hands, and can move fast." And it may even mean that you have to take one and one-half employees where one would otherwise do, but it would give someone just an opportunity to lead a life of dignity, living on their own, doing something useful. So it is not just a matter of cost-effectiveness and that is why you bring in Management. It scares them, because I can see everything being looked at purely from the dollars and cents point of view. If we get somebody who is healthy and well, then let's get that one, because they will do more than the person with a handicap, and I don't doubt they might.

I know that the experience that we have had and during the eight years that we were in office, we did hire and made a point to, we went out of our way. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2 I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.t\$

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I ask the advice of the House whether you want to proceed immediately or wait until the other Committee comes in?

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Hour we are dealing with the adjourned debates on second reading of Public Bills.

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

MR. GREEN: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 8 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE CHARTER

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I have perused this bill in conformity with what is being requested and we find that there is no problem there, but I understand that one of our members, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, wishes to have a few words on it, and therefore I am prepared to let it go at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few comments in connection with Bill 8.

During the past number of years we have seen, from session to session, introduction of bills dealing with the amendment of charters — whether they be Brandon or Portage, or other centres. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not intend to stand in the way of this bill but I do intend to pose some questions in committee.

I do believe that it is time that we considered putting together a bill which will relate to small urban centres. The Municipal Act deals with municipalities in general, particularly those outside the City of Winnipeg with the exception of those that operate on the basis of charter such as Portage, Brandon, etc. The difficulty is that we are, I believe, faced with a situation by which there are some inconsistencies in The Municipal Act with provisions in various bills. I would like to mention one to the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. I would want to have this confirmed, but it is my understanding that insofar as the sale of land for industrial purposes, within a municipality, that that land sale has to receive approval and there must be some substantiation, in fact, that the sale of that land is based upon something in the nature of market value. There is some mechanism in order to ensure that land cannot be given away as a form of inducement to industry.

Now, whether or not that principle is correct or not . . . Certainly, if that is a principle established in The Municipal Act, then it is a principle that should also be expressed within the charters of Brandon and Portage la Prairie. Otherwise we have a situation in which some urban centres working within the confines of The Municipal Act are dealing with their affairs in a manner inconsistent with the manner in which other centres, which are working under municipal charters, are operating.

I mentioned that as one example, Mr. Speaker, in an area in which I believe there is inconsistency. I believe there could be many.

I glanced at the Portage la Prairie Charter yesterday and the two relevant charters are dated 1907 and 1912. Glancing through the various sections it was obvious that many of those sections are out-dated and are archaic. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, because I have not had the opportunity to do necessary research, whether or not those sections have since been changed; whether or not, Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Municipal Act from time to time have, in all cases, referred to the various sections in the Portage Charter and the Brandon Charter in order to eliminate conflict. I do know that there is that one area of conflict which I referred to earlier.

Certainly before this bill is approved in committee, I wish to totally satisfy myself, Mr. Speaker, that the request that the member is making insofar as an amendment to the Portage la Prairie Charter would be one that would be similar or identical with the provisions in The Municipal Act and same would relate to other larger towns and small cities in the Province of Manitoba. Otherwise, we would deal with the situations in which we would have two types of municipal residents: Those that are operating on the basis of charter and those that are operating on the basis of the provisions of The Municipal Act.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this can be dealt with by the introduction in the future . . . And I only wish that I had done so when I had an opportunity as Minister of Municipal Affairs. We had discussed the prospect of the development of a small urban Act, in which all centres, such as Thompson, Brandon, Portage, Dauphin, Selkirk and others would operate on a basis which would be similar so that we would eliminate the inconsistencies from one centre to another. I believe the centres which I have mentioned — and there may be others — could operate on a similar type of basis. I do not believe that there is need for gross inconsistency from one such centre to another centre.

As well, they are very, very old charters and I do believe there is a need for a great deal of research. How do I know that the Portage Charter of 1907 and 1912 is any longer relevant to the situation in Portage la Prairie today? I could read from various provisions in that charter which clearly

and demonstratively indicate that it is no longer relevant to the modern day.

We need research, Mr. Speaker, as to the existing charters for municipalities. I believe that research should be directed towards obtaining some consistent approach to our small urbans, and I would like to see a small urban Act eventually presented to the Legislature.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12, An Act respecting The City of Brandon. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

PRIVATE BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 10 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE ROYAL TRUST COMPANY AND ROYAL TRUST CORPORATION OF CANADA

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill was stood in my name for a certain period of time primarily because we were waiting for further information. I believe the Honourable Member for St. James was going to get that and he, too, was waiting. I understand now that it is here and the Honourable Member for St. Johns is prepared to go ahead on the bill.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have been looking at this bill and, having had various discussions, I am now prepared to deal with it, with less than enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, because I am not at all impressed with the need, nor am I sure about the purpose of The Royal Trust Company, which is now attempting to divorce its operations as a trustee from The Royal Trust Company by having established another company called The Corporation, and will therefore transfer to The Corporation all its trust business.

I have looked at all the explanatory notes which were made available in connection with this and they say that the bill is necessitated by the reorganization of the business of The Royal Trust. True, once they had decided to reorganize it became necessary. It says that the bill does not deal with policy matters but is a highly technical adjunct to effect transfer of one area of Royal Trust business.

Well, they want to do it for their purposes; I'm not clear on them and I would hope that when we meet in committee we will find out more about why they are doing this. It does not impress me when they say that — and they do say that — as a result of increasing pressure from western based clients and directors it was decided to give The Royal Trust Company a western decision-making base.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the directors of The Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation are the same and the Royal Trust Corporation is wholly owned by The Royal Trust Company. I understand they have a head office in Alberta and that the officers of The Corporation are in Calgary. Their reasons, I believe, are not of great moment except that they are now saying that all the business that they have of a trustee nature which is of a Quebec type will stay in the Trust Company which will operate the Quebec matters and all the rest will be handled by The Corporation, which indicates that there is some motivation that has to do with the problems that are related to Quebec and the rest of Canada. And I am not at all sure that I am . . . Well, I am sure; I am not too sympathetic with their efforts to assist people who may be prejudiced on the basis of where they want the head office of the company they deal with located.

What they intend to do is to pass a trusteeship from the Company to The Corporation and probably the main concern I had was that what this Act will do is that if you, Mr. Speaker, knowing of The Royal Trust Company and believing that it had both financial security and a reputation for many years of good administration, have chosen The Royal Trust Company to be the company which will

act as the executor of your estate or trustee of certain assets — What this Act will do is, regardless of the desire — yours or that of any other person that has named The Royal Trust Company — it will automatically, by this legislation, become The Royal Trust Corporation that will be assumed to be the corporation named in the trust deed.

Well, my concern was that people who had faith in the company should not be disturbed in any way by learning that instead of the company they are dealing with The Royal Trust Corporation. And that is the main reason for delay. I have now received an assurance — a verbal assurance — from the local solicitor for The Royal Trust Company that they will agree to an amendment in committee and undertook to prepare an amendment that will make The Royal Trust Company a continuous guarantor for any of the actions of The Royal Trust Corporation in relation to any transactions that come to the corporation as a result of this bill automatically transferring from the Company to the Corporation. And I mention that, Mr. Speaker, because indications are that in this bill there are certain matters that are being transferred. The trustee business is being transferred but the property owned by The Royal Trust Company for its own benefit and not in trust is not being transferred to The Corporation. So I see it that the Corporation cannot be as strong as the Company and that's why I insisted that the Company ought to be guaranteeing all the deeds of The Corporation.

The other point is that the indication is this is intended to be a uniform bill in the other eight provinces of Canada, having excluded Quebec — the code province.

I am informed that the bill has passed through some of the provincial legislative reviews but not all, and I would expect that when we get into committee we should receive satisfactory evidence of the fact that the majority of provinces have already reviewed it and approved of it. I don't think there is any reason in the world why Manitoba should be amongst the first. I believe three have already dealt with it and I would want the committee to be assured that it is aware of any changes or proposed changes in principle that may take place in any other of the provinces in relation to this uniform bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, knowing as we do the way businesses operate and the fact that they wish to proceed in this way, it seems to me that it is acceptable to let the bill go to committee. But in committee I hope we will have the kind of review which will satisfy us as to the purposes, the motives and the main point is the protection that we have the responsibility to give to those people who do not know that by an Act of the Legislature they are now going to be dealing with a corporation other than the one they had thought they had selected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had understood that there probably wouldn't be anybody further speaking on it. That's why I was hesitant to rise. I would like to thank the opposition for agreeing to at least support the bill to this stage, to committee, so that we can have certain questions answered in committee and I will make it my effort to see that whatever information is available, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the present status of similar bills in other Legislatures . . . At the time that we deal with it in Committee, I'll try and have as much information there, and I believe I'm correct in that the public can voice opinion at that time in Committee as well. So I would presume that the solicitor who is representing The Royal Trust will be there to explain first-hand to the members of the Committee the different items in the bill.

I would just be very brief, Mr. Speaker, in that — just for the information of the House, I didn't mention it in my explanatory presentation earlier in the debate that when this corporation was set up for the other provinces it was well in advance of the change in government in Quebec and it was my understanding that was not the reason why it was set up, that the charters were well under way and in fact I believe were in effect prior to the change of the government in Quebec, so that I would not want it to be left with the Legislature that this is one of the objectives of the bill, because it is not, and I would thank the opposition for allowing it to go to Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 16 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE ST. JOHN'S RAVENSCOURT SCHOOL

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity over the past few days

to look over the bill and I find it to be as the Honourable Member for St. James has outlined to us. I also would like to thank the honourable member for the additional information that he made available to me. The bill indeed deals with nomenclature and the internal operations of the school's board, and because of that, Mr. Speaker, we see no reason to delay its moving along to Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the opposition for looking at the bill and allowing it to go to Committee, and hope that they will support it in final reading. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader. That concludes the affairs of Private Members' Hour.

MR. JORGENSON: Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that a motion? Do we require a motion for that?

A MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson. \$

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just before we went into the House for Private Members' Hour, the Minister had agreed that information is reliable, it's the conclusions which have to be valid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk and then the Member for St. Johns.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just make a comment or two in connection with personnel and then I want to pose some questions to the Minister as to why certain appointments were made in respect to the Department Liaison Committee and that dealing with the Task Force representatives.

First, I would just like to make a general statement in connection with Task Force personnel. I regret very much that the Task Force itself, the appointment of the Task Force — I suppose here I must look to the Executive Council and the First Minister — saw fit to appoint to its group one who is a senior civil servant in the Province of Manitoba —(Interjection)— senior civil servant of long standing, because this document, in my view, Mr. Chairman, is a political manifesto, it's a Conservative manifesto, it will become the point of controversy now for the next number of years, there's no question about that. Its rationale, its presentation is Conservative directed and I think it's unfortunate and I think it's very regrettable that the First Minister and the Executive Council saw fit, I believe unfairly, to include as a member of the Task Force one who should not be exposed to that form of political controversy.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose some specific questions. (1) Insofar as Legal Aid is concerned, whether or not Mr. John Graham of the Department of the Attorney-General acted as a department liaison. I want to say to the Minister that I appreciate — having been Attorney-General for four years — the expertise of Mr. Graham. He's one of the ablest public servants that we have in government. He is a man, and when I say able, however, that is very familiar with the administrative setup in the Department of the Attorney-General and I would like the Minister, in answer to me, to indicate whether Mr. Graham was also the liaison for Legal Aid or whether there was some other liaison re Legal Aid.

(2) I would ask the same question of the Minister pertaining to the Human Rights Commission and I single out those two due to the fact that there are recommendations in the Task Force Report which are far-reaching in respect to both Human Rights and to Legal Aid.

I want to also ask the Minister — pertaining to local government. I would think that the Task Force representative dealing with local government would be one that would be well known as one that has particular background and knowledge in the field of local government and I wonder if the

Minister — and maybe I'm overlooking some point or other — why dealing with Local Government there would not be one that would have a great deal of experience and involvement in the field of local government rather than one, Mr. Brian D. McCallum who, I must admit, I never met during all the years that I was Municipal Affairs Minister. In the Department of Municipal Affairs there are certainly some very very able people that I do believe would have provided tremendous input to the Minister in that particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Let me try and deal with the questions in order, if I may. To begin with, the government selected Mr. Gordon Holland, who is the gentleman you are referring to, to the Task Force on the basis that he was a person who had served in government in senior positions, had in fact been the secretary of the Management Committee, I believe the chairman as well as the executive director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and now chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System. On the basis that he has had a wide-ranging experience within government, and had served more than one administration and was capable of providing a very important input into the decision-making process with respect to the Task Force itself. Now, as has been commented before, Mr. Holland signed the report. Now the honourable members can look upon this as a political document

MR. PAWLEY: Well, it is.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and they can say it is a political document. Mr. Holland did not have to sign that report. He did sign it and I must say that he helped as well as the co-chairman and as well — not in terms of the founder of it — as well as Mr. Jackson to the extent of his contribution to the time in help shaping the report. I must say this with respect to Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson did have a very important contribution with respect to the report. He left at a period of time before the report was in its drafted form but nevertheless, there are a number of ideas that I think he will acknowledge that he agrees with and there were certainly a number of things on which there was a consensus. This report represents our consensus, including that of Mr. Holland, and I think it's a reflection, not so much on the government but on the opposition that that question should be raised with respect to himself.

With respect to the question of the liaison, departmental liaison function and the function of the secretary who was a Task Force representative to the actual review committee, there is a distinction. The objective of the liaison person was to arrive at someone who would be in a position to provide the review teams with the documentation and would be able to provide the information, and in turn be able to furnish what was required with respect to the departmental questions, it being understood that not everyone within a department would basically have an understanding of the full departmental structure. In some cases the departmental liaison were, in fact, the , in Deputy Ministers other cases it was not. Now a Deputy Minister's knowledge is possibly greater than someone who is at a lesser level but, nevertheless, the object of the departmental liaison was to furnish the review committee and to be part of the process of examination and to be in a position to assist.

The people who were selected as the secretaries of the review teams and were, in fact, the Task Force representatives, were really people who were to handle the arrangements, were to be able to deal with the various minutes that had to be undertaken and to deal with the arrangements that had to be arrived at with respect to locations, meetings, and the distribution of documentation and submissions that were presented.

So their functions were separate and I think that one has to understand that we selected people who we thought had administrative capacity in the case of those who would be the secretaries, particular administrative capacity and we tried to select people from the departments — and you've already spoken very highly of Mr. Graham — who in effect would have the capacity to provide the information, being understood, of course, that the review committees would be in fact dealing with peoples involved in the various departmental activities as they made their analysis and would be meeting with deputies and ministers and other officials in the process of obtaining their information. And that's really basically what happened.

MR. PAWLEY: First I just would like to make a comment and again zero in on the third question that the Minister didn't deal with.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sorry, if I didn't deal with it, it's because I forgot. — (Interjection) — Well with

respect to local government, one will know that the departmental liaison was the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and I don't think you're challenging his ability.

MR. PAWLEY: What was the role of the Task Force representative?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, the Task Force representative was the secretary of the Task Force who I indicated was the arrangement person who handled the arrangements with respect to the review team and acted as its secretary.

MR. PAWLEY: I have a comment I would like to make to the Minister in connection with the earlier reference I made to the involvement of Mr. Holland. He said words to the effect, "You say it's a political document. "Only a few moments before the Minister had made a statement to the effect that this document was an indictment of the former government. Now he has made that statement. . .

MR. SPIVAK: That's my conclusion.

MR. PAWLEY: That is the conclusion and I would consider that you have arrived at that conclusion as a result of the various forms of reasoning as outlined in the report, Volumes I and II, the recommendations that you have arrived at a long with your co-task members. You've arrived at that conclusion as co-chairman of the committee and certainly I'm sure that you had that conclusion long before this report was commenced and continue to have it, but the fact is that it does indicate very clearly that it's a political document. I believe that the Minister should recognize that. It's a Conservative manifesto. I don't blame the Minister for participating in the preparation of a Conservative manifesto but the fact is if the Minister and those that were involved in the Task Force wanted to be fair, for instance, they would have, in the very early portion of the report when they attempt to draw conclusion that there's been a tremendous growth in government expenditure in comparison to the gross provincial product, they might have made some references and graphs showing the situation of other provinces. They might have also have outlined some of the points on the other side of the coin, that increased government expenditure is not necessarily a bad thing and increase in private expenditures not always necessarily a good thing. But in reading this report, the Conservative philosophy is weaved over and over again into the report. We are shown only one side of an argument. We're shown only one side of the coin. There's no attempt to provide any balanced rationale. All growth in government expenditure is bad, there is no comparison graph-wise to what has happened in other provinces. If the Minister had wished he would have found that insofar as growth of civil servants for instance, that the growth in civil service in Manitoba is the second or third lowest in Canada, second or third lowest. He would have discovered that the numbers of civil servants in Alberta is much greater per thousand than it is in the Province of Manitoba. He would have found that there's been a rapid growth in government in all provinces and in Canada. This is not necessarily bad and I feel that there should have been some clear acknowledgement from the Task Force that there is positive features to this rather than to provide us with the typical September, October type of election rationale that was advanced by his leader and colleagues.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I'm going to satisfy the Honourable Member for Selkirk, but let's talk about a couple of things. He's in a presumption because the Honourable Member for St. Johns said it, that this was written two years earlier than was known to be the case. — (Interjection) — Well, the truth, Mr. Chairman, is that the financial position of the government wasn't known two years in advance. — (Interjection) — Well, you know, again I point out and I put on the record that today the opposition while challenging the figures have not produced what those figures were. They were the government as of the date of the election. If these figures are incorrect, they can put those figures on the table. They have indicated that several months later additional funds were available, the restraint program worked and there was an adjustment that was made, but they have not in any case, Mr. Chairman, produced any figures whatsoever, and they're not in a position to do that because they are only in a position to produce the figures that were given to the government by the very same department officials who were their departmental officials, and that becomes a very important thing because the information supplied and the premises under which we operated were that the financial position was as such, and it was a question of whether the money was to be obtained either by increased taxation or by borrowing. There were value judgments that were made with respect to the state of taxation in Manitoba and to its financial ability to borrow, and to the long-term commitments and the honourable members will indicate and understand correctly that the word indictment is not used in this report. I've used it and I say that, the Task Force members did not, I say it's an indictment. And I say that as a Minister who is very much

aware of what the financial position was.

I am not prepared to sit back and let the inferences be suggested as they have been that somehow or other this information is incorrect. If you say this information is incorrect — the Honourable Member for St. Johns says it — put it on the table what the information was. — (Interjection) — You put that information on, you put the information on the table, you talk and talk and talk, put it on the table — (Interjection) — You've been here for several months and you haven't put it on the table. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Chairman, all we've indicated is that there were changes in the federal funding and the restraint program worked and you cannot take — (Interjection) — Oh sure, that's a beautiful smoke-screen and you can talk all you want and you can act it out, but the fact is you can't produce any information which would indicate that the information is incorrect, that was furnished with this Task Force. Nor, Mr. Chairman, are you prepared to put on the table what you would have done had you been elected. The obvious question that has to be asked of all of you is if the information is correct or if the information isn't correct, then what is the information, what would you have done? Continue the way you had been, had a 13 percent rise in the Estimates for this coming year? Where would you have received the money? Just tell us how you would have got the tens and tens of millions of dollars. When you tell us that, Mr. Chairman, then I'll be able to listen to you.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just present to the Honourable Minister some information which he must surely be aware of. That first it's his government that decided to add to the deficit situation that which was part of capital deficit to this point. That was a political decision, it was a decision to do that in order to up the deficit, in order to try to make the previous government look bad, so that's number one. — (Interjection) — Up the deficit so you could arrive at a figure of \$225 million in total deficit, that was a political decision, that's a figure which is used throughout the Task Force.

Secondly, when the Task Force report was tabled, there was knowledge within the avenues of the Provincial Government that the deficit that had been given was \$40 million to \$50 million higher than what it in fact was, so we're dealing with a capital deficit figure which is included here which had never been included in previous years which, I suggest, was added for political reasons. Duff Roblin himself had changed that system of accounting in 1961. You have seen fit to revert to that system; I suggest it was for the single purpose of trying to make the deficit situation in the Province of Manitoba look much worse than in fact it was — \$40 million to \$50 million that was indicated as part of the deficit when in fact it was not part of the deficit.

Thirdly, if the situation was as bad as the honourable member had suggested, then there is absolutely no reason, no reason whatsoever — and I believe that this exposes the untruth of the position that has been taken by the present government, otherwise there would have been no reason to cut taxes to the extent of \$25 million-plus in certain areas. We should have continued for this year if the situation was as grim and as serious as was suggested, but it was this government that decided that the situation wasn't so grim, wasn't so serious, that major tax cuts could not be made at this time as hurriedly as possible, in a rush, in order to improve the position of really what results in being a small percentage of Manitobans.

So, there's \$100 million in capital included in the calculations here; \$40 million to \$50 million which was added in that should not have been included and was known at the time the Task Force Report was tabled in the Legislature plus \$25 million-plus that was given away in tax cuts.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Task Force was tabled March 31st —(Interjection)— it was dated March 31st . The Order-in-Council was November 16, 1977. The report of the Task Force presents the financial position of government as of that date.

MR. GREEN: As of which date?

MR. SPIVAK: November 16, 1977.

MR. GREEN: November 16th? Oh, well, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, Mr. Chairman, now this member wasn't . . . Let's understand something correctly. A report in which an Order-in-Council was based on which certain premises were made, on which certain deductions had to be made on the basis of that, it was evolved as a result of the financial position of that date. Now, Mr. Chairman, and the members opposite say: No, now we must take

that statement and produce three or four months later when we receive more federal money and when the restraint program, not put in by the previous government but put in by this government, was exercised. Now the honourable member laughs at the restraint program.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. GREEN: It's the funniest thing I've ever heard.

MR. SPIVAK: He really . . . it's not funny. He laughed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you permit an interjection?

MR. SPIVAK: No, I'll finish and then you'll be able to talk. The restraint program you laugh at — and you should laugh at it because a year earlier you put in a restraint program and nothing happened because you never understood what restraint was and you never understood the necessity. I'm dumbfounded by him. He simply says we shouldn't have put the \$100 million of current capital, which we're going to have to borrow, included in this. We should have left it off. Somehow or other it was going to disappear. Somehow or other we're not going to have to even worry about it. Somehow or other we're not even going to have to either collect money to pay for it or borrow . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Nobody said that.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . there's going to be no liability. Well, Mr. Chairman, all we simply said was we have a current capital in which we're going to have to borrow money or raise taxes. We pointed that out, that was the basis of the position on which the restraint program was undertaken, that was the basis of our own position. The honourable members keep arguing five months later, when the program was put into place, which they would like to take credit for. Well, I'm going to tell you, they can't take credit for that. They had nothing to do with that, fortunately, and had they been in government nothing would have happened. Now that's No. 1.

Now, No. 2, with respect to the whole question of the position of whether we should have applied what's happening in other governments and made comparison of tables showing our situation was not any worse. Mr. Chairman, governments in this country are bankrupt. Governments are continually doing the same thing over and over again. They are either taxing the consumers and taxing the taxpayers or they are borrowing in the future on the assumption that we're going to have the ability to be able to pay. We have made a judgment, Mr. Chairman, and the judgment has been reflected in the statements that have been made and reflected with respect to the premise that there was a need for the exercise of restraint; there was a need to bring government into control; there was a need for some rationalization in government services and there was a need to examine the central management of government to be able to determine whether there was a method in which the kind of observations and scrutiny that has to occur in a much greater way than in the past would be undertaken, both in terms of current and capital accounts. Mr. Chairman, that's what the proposal is. I don't expect the honourable members to agree with it but I simply say to you, if the information as of the date that we took over as a government is incorrect and the \$225 million is not correct, put it on the table what it was. You were there.

MR. PAWLEY: It's false.

MR. SPIVAK: It's false? It's easy to say it's false. Put it on. You were government. You were a member of the Executive Council. Put it on the table.

MR. CHERNIACK: You did.

MR. PAWLEY: You've already put it on the table.

MR. CHERNIACK: He doesn't know it; he still doesn't know it.

MR. SPIVAK: You've put it . . . What?

MR. PAWLEY: He's indicated how false it was.

MR. CHERNIACK: Did you know?

MR. SPIVAK: As of November, \$225 million was false? . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Where were you on March 31st?

MR. SPIVAK: . . . \$225 million was false, as of November?

MR. CHERNIACK: Sure, it's a projection that was forwarded.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, the projection in November was false.

MR. GREEN: No, the projection was right, the figure was false.

MR. GREEN: No, the projection was right .

MR. SPIVAK: That's right.

MR. GREEN: The figure was false.

MR. SPIVAK: The figure was false . . . Well, that's interesting. Therefore we go on the basis that all we had in November was the projection. We applied a restraint program . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Where were you in March?

MR. SPIVAK: . . . which had its effect — I have to say this to honourable members, if the restraint program hadn't been exercised at all, then any moneys that would have come from the Federal Government would have been eaten up and that figure would have been higher than 225.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's rubbish.

MR. SPIVAK: You say that's rubbish — well I say to you that that isn't rubbish because I'm aware of at least \$40 million to \$50 million of current capital expenditures, that were in fact not proceeded with.

MR. GREEN: Okay, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk, St. Johns, Burrows, St. Vital and Inkster. That's the way they're listed. The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, at this stage I intend at a later time to debate the statements made further on. A couple of us are following this in some sense of sequence and I'm not going to be distracted by going out of sequence. I intend to follow the report in an organized way. But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how much the Minister knows about what went on. It seems to me that by March 31st, all Ministers should have known, and at least a couple of Ministers did know, that these figures were incorrect, that the \$225 million was exaggerated by \$50 million — is it? — by a very substantial amount of money.

MR. SPIVAK: Why?

MR. CHERNIACK: And, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately for the Minister, he's going to have to wait until we're through and until I'm through. The fact is that it was known at least to the Minister of Finance and to the First Minister — and maybe kept secret from the Task Force — that the projection was false. Now it's all very well for him to talk about November 6th as if they went into limbo, and maybe they did, Mr. Chairman. Maybe the Task Force went into limbo and the Minister stopped meeting with his colleagues and stopped learning up-to-date information from them and was going on a projection which was calculated some time back in November. I intend to find out the extent to which the Provincial Auditor certified through the projection because when we read the Task Force Report, it would appear that the Provincial Auditor was involved in it too. The sentence says, "Immediately after taking office, the new government instructed the Department of Finance in co-operation with the Provincial Auditor," — Page 24, Mr. Chairman — "in co-operation with the Provincial Auditor to prepare an interim report on the financial position of the province for the six months ended SeptSeptember 30, 1977 as well as projections for the year ending March 31, 1978." I was under the impression that the Provincial Auditor denied that he co-operated in the preparation of a projection for the year ending March 31, 1978.

The provincial auditor said, "I've nothing to do with it, that's the Department of Finance." And, that indeed it was only the Department of Finance that's responsible for the projections, so we'll come into that, that's page 24, I'm not there yet. But I am saying that if the Minister knew what

was going on in the government of which he was part he would know that by the time this document was signed, March 31st, it was already known that the figures of \$225 million and \$129 million were wrong, Mr. Chairman. Now, apparently he's saying well we knew that but we could still say that all the corrections were ours, all the improvements were ours. Well that's nonsense because we know that there was revenue of some \$24 million that had nothing whatsoever to do with the new government.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister knows that the Attorney-General informed us just the other night that, I think it's close to \$200,000 — I forget how much exactly but it was a substantial amount of money was spent out of last year's fiscal year for this year's program. I wonder if he knows that. Then when he talks deficit, as indeed he will, he should know that the Attorney-General's Department — oh yes it was in this room, Mr. Chairman, so you were here and I wasn't so you'll correct me, I hope, if I'm in error — that he admitted that there was a program for Assiniboine Park for this coming fiscal year that they scouted around and they found the money in bits and pieces out of last years fiscal year and prepaid it or advanced it to this year. Now if they could do that with something under \$200,000 how much more could they do, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — Well, no that's another aspect and the Minister is saying, well produce it, prove it. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, I was not in government for about 3 years, I did not take with me any up-to-date records such as the Minister would have. If he says, "Prove it," let's remember, they are the government, they are making the assertions, they are responsible for the assertions they make. It is not for anyone to disprove their statements right or wrong.

Now let's talk about that deficit. He says, "Well, the money had to be borrowed didn't it? "Do you mean that that capital money should not have been put in because it was capital, not current, it had to be borrowed, who would be responsible? Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister who is part of the Task Force, who knew so much about what was going on, also knew that in the Estimates for this current fiscal year there was a concealed \$30 million of planned expenditure. He says, "No". — (Interjection) — Oh, he says he knows, I thought he said no, I thought he was going to tell me he didn't know.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we didn't know, if he says prove it the fact is we didn't know. We had no way of knowing until we got to — I think it was the first department, Agriculture in this room — where we discovered that the Department of Agriculture was planning to spend some \$3 million more than the Estimates showed they were going to do. And that was from a government who was talking about zero budgeting, a government that was talking about combined spending, a government that was talking about giving the full picture, that government proceeded to — Oh, I don't say deliberately conceal, maybe it was in ignorance that they did not give the information of the . . . Now the Minister of Finance has just walked in and has made his great contribution. He will have every opportunity in this committee to make his contribution. But the fact is there was some \$30 million — it was like pulling teeth to get the information which we still don't have — I'm sure the Minister of Finance doesn't want to interrupt anyone because of the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we find a little dribble of \$200,000 that was admittedly spent in advance out of last year's budget and will form part of last year's deficit. We know that now, we know that there's some \$30 million that when the Minister of Finance made a public statement, "Our combined spending for this coming year will be "X" dollars broken down amongst departments of which Agriculture will be "Y" dollars," he concealed the fact that there was another \$3 million to be spent, combined spending. When he talks about comparison that's one thing, I'm not debating comparison, I'm talking about his statement, combined spending for next year will be so many dollars, and I think he knew that there was another \$30 million going to be spend. The fact is he gave us evidence to that affect. So that having known that this Minister says well of course we had to show capital in our \$225 million. The fact is they didn't have to, Mr. Chairman, they could have been a lot more honest about it as they learnt and we know, we know that the Minister of Finance, we know that the First Minister knew very well by March 31st that this projection was wrong and we knew that the Provincial Auditor was not participant in the projection. That's my understanding even though the Task Force report indicates that he was party to the projection.

So that, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants to be indignant about it he should be indignant with his own information and what was given to him. He should know that there was bits of information that he didn't know, that's pretty substantial. He should also know that a government faced with a problem deals with the problem and deals with it properly. Again I say, I don't know, I was not party to Cabinet discussions but I am very sure that as it would become apparent that there's a reduction in revenue there would be changes made.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it's as if saying to a person who is gaining weight, ten pounds a year, that

if you gained 40 pounds in the last 4 years he's bound to gain 10 pounds next year even though he may be in serious difficulty. That person would no doubt make an effort to stop gaining 10 pounds and even to reduce, but the Minister for his political purposes and to justify the campaign that they conducted which is so far unproven and we've been through, how many departments — 8 departments, unable to find waste, unable to find mismanagement is now relying on unrevealed, and concealed information on the basis of which he is trying to build a report.

Now, Mr. Chairman' that is what we must go into. The recommendations is something we should debate with the Ministers responsible because I know this Minister if we come to one recommendation g and say, you know, that's blatant nonsense. He'll say, well it's only a recommendation, the government isn't bound to accept it. So, why debate with this Minister recommendations which the government may not accept. What I want want to do is to find out what is the basis of the facts as they are stated and what are the assumptions because when he says they dealt with premises he admitted that the premise is the one which is stated I think on the very first page, "As a result of rapid growth in programs in preceding years, and the weakness of management control, staff had been hired in excess of program requirements, the curtailment and elimination of low-priority programs had also resulted in surplus staff." He states that as fact, he has not given us the information on which it was based. At this stage, I'm wondering what access he had to Cabinet minutes, what access he had to minutes of the Cabinet committees? It could be interesting to know that because he seems to know so much about what went on that one would assume that he has even more information that I thought he had. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the analogy of the weight is a very important one because basically what the Member for St. Johns is saying is that in effect if someone weighed 180 pounds. . . — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns says he wasn't finished, he paused there and I recognized the Minister, it's my error, it's not the Minister's. I thought you were through and I did recognize the Minister, it's not his fault. .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman you've indicated previously a list of speakers which included the Member for St. Johns and others. Are you saying now that you are going to recognize the Minister after you recognize the Member for St. Johns?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The practice that we have worked in this committee since day one since I've been here is that a Member questions the Minister responsible and the Minister answers and back and forth. —(Interjection) — On that same point to the Member for Inkster, - the Minister of Finance wanted to get into the act and I said to the Minister here, I asked him, "Can the Minister of Finance have your spot in replying to an answer?" And he said, "Well, I'll reply to it myself." So the Minister of Finance, like anyone else, goes on the list.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was here when you made that sort of a ruling but you were saying questions and answers. I wasn't asking a question; I was making a statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought you were through.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, no, firstly I wasn't through; secondly I was not asking a question which required a response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister thought that he should reply.

MR. CHERNIACK: I was not asking a question which required a response.

MR. SPIVAK: You asked whether I had . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: That was the last thing I said . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I assume that that's a question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't through and the fact is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it is 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair and returning at 8 o'clock this evening. The Member for St. Johns is first on the list.

A MEMBER: And then followed by . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: By the Member for Burrows, St. Vital, Inkster and the Minister of Finance if those persons are present.\$

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to Page 37, Health and Social Development. We are under Clause (e)(2), Other Expenditures—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was completing my remarks before we went into Private Members' Hour and I was pointing out that the comments as made by the Minister lead me to believe that the Affirmative Action Program as we knew it is pretty well defunct and that there is in fact no Affirmative Action Program taking place. The Minister indicated his concern and his interest in people with handicaps, but there is no structure within the Provincial Government to bring that about unless the Minister himself is prepared to advise his staff that people with disabilities, for example, should be given certain — not preference, perhaps, but they shouldn't be required to meet the same standards as people without disabilities. Now, if he's prepared to do that then he can indeed, within his own department, have an Affirmative Action Program. The reason why it was housed under the Civil Service Commission was because it was felt that traditionally the method of hiring, the system of hiring was such that because the qualifications were set out on paper, the people who didn't meet those qualifications just never got to be interviewed, and it was an attempt to overcome this sort of road-block within the system that the Affirmative Action Program was established and a Minister was put in charge of prodding — I have to use that word — prodding other Ministers and staff to take another look and look differently at the hiring practices that have developed over the many, many years. As far as I can see, that is now finished and there will be none of that by this government at this time. But if the Minister does in fact say that he himself has a concern for people with handicaps, that he himself does feel that they should be given consideration, that he I hope will undertake it on his own behalf, that within his own department — because they are the largest employer of government — and certainly within his department, covering all of Manitoba — rural, city, northern — that there are many areas where people with certain disadvantages, be it physical, medical, or educational, be given some means of entering into the mainstream of employment through the Provincial Government.

As I indicated earlier, you can't leave it to the private sector because the private sector looks at it simply on a cost-benefit basis, and if it means that it's going to cost them more money because they can't get the same productivity from someone who is physically handicapped, who is in a wheelchair, for example, then they are not inclined to hire people with that kind of handicap. So it has to be government; government has a responsibility. And that's why I reminded the Minister of the newspaper headline which said, "Cost first, Need second," and this is a case where it's got to be reversed, because if you use the cost needs first, as the only consideration or as the primary consideration, then you will never be hiring people whose only avenue into a useful, productive work activity is by virtue of a government, be it municipal, federal or provincial. You cannot use the same measurements of cost-benefit, cost effectiveness, of a dollar's work for a dollar's pay, in dealing with these people. At the same time, they are a large group in our society and they are going to grow as medical technology helps them and makes it possible for them to function partially. Then, we have an obligation to these people to see to it that they can be used in the work force, so they can lead productive and useful lives, albeit they cannot be as effective, perhaps, as somebody who is totally physically fit.

So I acknowledge with regret that the Affirmative Action Program is kaput, but I hope that the Minister, because he is the largest employer in the province, and because his department is so very aware of these people, because he has to deal with them through the myriad of programs that he has, will address himself to it, recognizing that these people, because of their handicap, have something going for them. They have an understanding and an empathy in dealing with other people in society who are disadvantaged, that perhaps another person might not have. So that they have a contribution to make, although it may not be measured in dollars and cents. I would urge the Minister to have his own Affirmative Action Program even though the Provincial Government seems to be backing away from one which encompasses all government departments.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just briefly in response to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

I want to say that the Affirmative Action Program is not kaput, I don't accept the member's interpretation of the situation. I respect his concern for it, but those persons who have been hired in the past under the Affirmative Action approach and policy are still in place; there were three paraplegics who last year, under the previous government, I think were hired in the Vital Statistics Branch; they're still there; they're still doing a very valuable function, and certainly, I hope they will be there for a long, long time. And it's my intention that they shall be.

I take the honourable member's words seriously; I think that really was essentially the message that the Honourable Member for Transcona was giving me and I assure him that I will keep this in mind in this particular department. This is a department where there is justification — well, there's justification everywhere, but there's perhaps more justification for an Affirmative Action approach.

As far as the reference to the newspaper headline about cost first, needs second, I didn't write the newspaper headline and I wouldn't have written it that way. I would just remind the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, that that was specifically related to the Capital Construction program. I don't know whether the honourable member — this was in my opening remarks, on the opening of my — (Interjection)— I don't know whether the honourable member read anything but the headline, but if he did he would have noted that that story was devoted to the Capital Construction program, and that's true. We have said, "What's it going to cost not only to build but to operate?" That's the question that has to be answered first.

That is not a philosophy or a principle that is necessarily being applied across the Health and Social Development field. It is applied to the \$135 million Capital Construction Program.

MR. CHAIAN: (2)—pass; (e)—pass. (f)(1) Salaries, \$415,300 —pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't think there is any reason to go into this one too long. But there are three questions that I would have as a matter of curiosity. Is there anything unusual about the registration added or reduced, registration of birth and death, and so on? I don't even want the numbers if it all looks about the same. There is nothing to be concerned with at this time.

There is one thing I would like to know. How much of the cost of this branch is paid for by the revenue, from this branch? Because we are charged, I think, charged for different certificates and so on.

Another question, the last question on this item is: This department in the past had started on an automated system for record storage and this was a computerized statistical information. It was felt that this was going to save money because they were getting snowed under out there and that was going to be fully computerized within five years or so. Now, is that still going on? Has that been frozen? Or where is it at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: The computerization program is still proceeding, still continuing towards total conversion and completion, Mr. Chairman. That's where those three paraplegics, to whom I referred, are employed.

As far as the question on revenues is concerned, this particular branch derives \$305,000 from revenues, \$305,000 is the amount that . . . —(Interjection)— That's projected for this current fiscal year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Projected?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. And on Registration Statistical Data there is no significant change, Mr. Chairman, for the past three years, 1975, 1976, 1977, births, marriages, deaths, adoption registrations, legal change of name. The numerical differences are pretty minimal. For example, marriages in 1975 were 8,900; 1976, 8,200; 1977, 8,098. Deaths, 8,400 in 1975; 8,3 in 1976; 8,039 in 1977. But the numerical differences I don't think are significant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (f)—pass. (g)(1) Salaries— pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Now this is an item that we'd like to get more information on. We see from last year there is a decrease of approximately \$84,000 on this. What I'm interested in knowing: Is there any change in policy? Has there been a freeze or reduction in accumulating more equipment?

are there any programs . . . I would like to go into the breakdown of the programs to compare what is being done and what is there going to be done in the future? For instance, the motorized wheelchairs that we had started a couple of years ago.

So before making any other remarks, I remember last year that the health critic at the time, the Member for Rhineland, felt that we weren't doing enough and I see that there is a cut. I think that he talked about more grab bars and raised toilet seats, and so on. So maybe we could have a little bit of an explanation and a breakdown of programs by the Minister before we comment any further.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is no change in policy or philosophy in the approach to this branch and the different programs that are operated under it.

Those programs are the Medical Home Care Equipment Program; the Wheelchair Programs; the Ostomy Program; Respiratory Support Systems, Inter-Uterine Device Program and then Warehousing and General Office appropriations are itemized separately, too.

The figure in front of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is lower than the requested appropriation or the approved appropriation for 1977-78, that's correct. But it does not, Sir, represent a reduction in government services in these programs. In fact, I think it can be legitimately argued that this year's requested appropriation of \$827,000 actually represents an expansion because in the previous year there was seed money, equipment purchases that were necessary that are not necessary again.

For example, particularly the wheelchair programs, both regular and motorized. The wheelchairs have plateaued. We have an inventory of approximately more than 500 wheelchairs now. Regular wheelchairs for 1977-78 cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$140,000.00. This year we are asking the Legislature to approve an expenditure of \$91.6 thousand. Motorized wheelchairs in 1977-78 accounted for \$53.3 thousand. This year in that program we're asking the Legislature to approve \$33.3 thousand. In both those cases it means that the need for new equipment, new wheelchairs has been eliminated. We've got the chairs we need. But the service will be maintained at an equivalent or expanded level, depending on the demand.

Overall, if you look at the programs over all, the seven programs that I itemized including Warehousing and General Office, the Legislature voted in 1977-78, \$668,500 and we're asking the Legislature this year to vote \$583,900.00. So the request is less because the seed money has gone to its purpose and the equipment is there.

In the case of the Ostomy Program, there are currently 1,024 people on that program. That is a program that I've been asked about a number of times, and I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has, and it's one that I think is performing an excellent service and is proceeding at a gradual level of expansion and improvement each year, as expansion can be accommodated. Certainly there is no intention to reduce any of these programs.

They are at least being maintained at the existing level and in the case of the Ostomy Program, there in fact is an increase of \$27,000.00. Last year the actual vote was \$131,700; this year we're asking the Legislature for \$158,000.00. So that represents the general approach of the department and the Ministry to the services and programs in this area.

MR. DESJARDINS: I can understand this. It's possible and it's hopeful that some day you're going to reach the equipment, you'll have the inventory that you want.

I have a little trouble believing that this is correct without any change in policy, with the motorized wheelchairs, because that program hasn't been going on that long. Is it tougher to get motorized wheelchairs? I know that many people would want them. Could the Minister give us the patient load also of these different programs? That is one that I'm concerned with.

Then the other one is the Oxygen Delivery System which was just started last year. I think that this was a program that could save an awful lot of money, the taxpayers' money. I was talking about the Oxygen Delivery System. Those are the two that I'm concerned with because that was just started last year. I'm very pleased to know that the Ostomy Program is going on and that there's an increase.

But the main one that I have is the motorized wheelchair and the Oxygen Delivery System which was just started last year. Can we have the patient load of these different programs, too? I think the Minister gave us those on the Ostomy Program, and not the others.

MR. SHERMAN: As far as the motorized wheelchairs are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that everybody who meets the guidelines and has applied for a motorized electric wheelchair and

has been panelled for such a wheelchair has got one. Applicants for electric wheelchairs are screened by a committee who prioritize them, as the honourable member knows, and 3,300 wheelchairs were in the field as at December 31, 1977. That would be the composite of standard and electric wheelchairs, I think.

Regular wheelchairs, 3,228; motorized wheelchairs, 73; so that's the total, 3,300 that's in the field as of December.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Regular wheelchairs, how many?

MR. SHERMAN: On Page 169 of the Annual Report, the breakdown table shows that for 1977, and we're talking here December 31, 1977, there were 3,228 regular wheelchairs, and 73 motorized wheelchairs in the field.

The comparable figures for a year previous were 2,975 and 47. And the comparable figure for the year before that was 2,660 and 17. So the honourable member can see that the distribution and dissemination of them is increasing.

As far as the Respiratory Support Systems go, there's a reduction of approximately \$52,500 that we're looking at. Seventeen units will be in use by the end of the current . . . No, as a matter of fact 17 units were in use at the end of the 1977-78 fiscal year. So that's the fiscal year just ended, 17 units. ' Systems to be used by patients who require large amounts of oxygen on a continuing basis. Savings can be from \$150.00 to \$350.00 per month per patient compared to the previous method of providing oxygen.

The 1978-79 Estimates, the Estimates we're addressing allow for the purchase of ten more units, so that's the 1978-79 funds are to deliver and maintain those units that are in existence now and purchase ten more units. The reduction comes about by the fact that there is a substantial saving per month per patient that can be achieved with these systems compared to the previous methods of providing oxygen.

MR. DESJARDINS: Last year I believe that the funds voted was for 25 machines, and my honourable friend says there were 17; they asked for 10 more. That will be a total of 27, so there is a reduction. Does that mean, is that all the request that the department has, and is he satisfied, I'm anxious to know if he's satisfied with the program because that was a new program. Is it working out as well as was anticipated and if so, why the cut? If they had increased the price of these machines, the estimate was for 25 last year; if there is only 17 and 10 more, that's 27.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, we bought the 25, Mr. Chairman, but we have only got 17 in use at the moment. There is eight that haven't, they are being paneled, or people are being paneled for them. I gather there was some difficulty at the suppliers end and so we still have eight to come, but they have been bought. —(Interjection)— And yes, the program is working out very well' I think, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I have other questions, but I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland now would like to request more grab bars as he did last year, and raised toilet seats. I don't think he is listening. I would imagine that the Minister feels that we have enough of those, that there is no need to vote any extra funds at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Was the Minister going to answer that question? I saw him getting up, I would yield to him if he was going to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express concern at the very large reduction on Other Expenditures in this Item. If you take into account inflation it is a 25 percent reduction on medical supplies and home-care equipment. It would strike me that we would get more value for our money by enabling people to leave institutions and go live in homes with their family. I have a couple of specific cases in my own constituency where people have gone through horrible cases of polio, have been living in institutions for a very long time, and frankly have really had their horizons opened up tremendously by the provision of medical supplies and home-care equipment in their homes. This has enabled them to go back to their homes and frankly the quality of their lives has improved by about 1000 percent and I would think that there were probably a number of other cases like that. In fact, the League for the Physically Handicapped has always been saying that they need more such equipment. I recall in past years there were arguments that there wasn't sufficient medical supplies and

equipment, and I think that people on both sides of the House are in agreement that this is the right way to move, that we in fact want to get people out of institutions and into their home and family environments. The best way in which that will happen is if we can provide this type of home supplies and home-care equipment.

I really haven't, I think, received a good enough explanation from the Minister as to why we are getting a 25 percent reduction in real terms, because that is what we are really talking about if you take into account inflation. Does that mean that the demand has decreased by 25 percent? I would have thought that the demand in this area would be increasing by the rate of about 25 percent per year, so I can't understand why we are getting a reduction in demand or is this one of the areas in the Department where the cutbacks actually are being made, and is this being done because these people traditionally have a very hard time in mobilizing their protests against cutbacks. Has there been a definite reduction in the order of 25 percent of demand for medical supplies or home-care equipment?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had answered that question. The salary appropriation is approximately the same as the honourable member recognizes. The Other Expenditures are down and I went through the list of programs and gave most of the comparable figures and pointed that the reason they are down is that some of them required seed money and most of them required equipment. We now have the equipment. We have more equipment in some cases, particularly in the wheelchair field than people are asking for. We have the equipment, anybody who applies and meets the humane and liberal criteria is supplied, and there are wheelchairs sitting there waiting for new applicants. So what really has happened here is that there has been an expansion in program because we haven't had to spend as much money on equipment. The Ostomy Program is up, the Respiratory Support System — we have got new money going in there and the wheelchair inventory is over 500 at the present time and if the honourable member knows somebody who needs a wheelchair or anything else that comes under this program, a respiratory support system, I wish he would send me a note on it because we have got the equipment.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, the reason why I raised this is that the League for the Physically Handicapped has in fact been arguing that they aren't getting sufficient support for their programs or their needs from this government, and that is why I raised these particular points.

The home-dialysis units, are they in this appropriation as well or are they covered in another area?

MR. SHERMAN: No, that comes under the MHSC, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PARASIUK: Fine, I will just check to see where that is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, just one clarification on one more program, it's the Medical Home-Care Equipment Program. What is the patient load this year compared to last year? What is the amount to be spent this year as compared to last year?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly give the honourable member these figures or he can find them on page 169 in the Annual Report. 1977 — the patient load Medical Supplies and Home-Care Equipment Program services provided was 6,661. The comparable figure for 1976 was 6,202. I can give it in terms of items of equipment —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon?

MR. MILLER: How much are you budgeting ?

MR. SHERMAN: Dollars for general medical equipment last year the House voted \$143,200 this year we are asking you, the House to vote \$143,200, the same thing.

MR. MILLER: So it is a freeze really on the amount. You are matching the amount, but you are not allowing for any inflationary factor at all, or any increased demand. Is it because you have sufficient supplies and there just isn't a demand for it, because I imagine some of these supplies under this particular category are not reusable necessarily. They are only used once and that is the end of it. So that are you simply replacing and hoping to maintain the load or in the light of the fact that you want to get people out of the hospitals and into home-care, aren't you going to have to expand this in order to keep abreast of the demand?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I guess the candid answer to the honourable member is that initially

at this stage it is an attempt to hold the line. We are asking an appropriation the same as last year's in this field, this is general medical equipment — bed-pans, that kind of thing that are necessary and are required, quite apart from the specialized equipment that we have already referred to. Now if we find that that is not enough it is possible we'll have to try to reallocate from within the overall appropriation to which I refer and which allows for expansion in certain areas, and I may have to ask my officials to do that. But at the present time we feel that it is viable.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I understand then that only in the general medical equipment is the one the Minister is saying that they are holding the line, the others they have sufficient equipment, it's not a question of restraints?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like to ask the Minister whether in fact the closure, I guess it's the possible closure — I am not up on my facts with respect to the Shrine Hospital, the future of that hospital — I am not sure whether it is continuing or not or whether in fact the future disposition of that hospital will put any strain on this particular appropriation?

MR. SHERMAN: I certainly don't anticipate that it will, Mr. Chairman. We are looking at a home-care program here. The Manitoba Hospital for Rehabilitation of Children or whatever the exact name is now, the former Shriners Hospital, provides a very specialized service. There still are about ten, the last time I was there there were ten or twelve in-patients there and I believe there is an out-patient service, but I may stand to be corrected on that. But is it a highly specialized service that really doesn't spill over into the same field as is being supplied or the same general area of need as is being met here in this home-care service.

The whole question of the future of the Children's Rehabilitation Hospital is under review by two committees at the present time, one medical and one management, not related to government — the management committee that has been set up with responsible people in the community to make some recommendations to the government and I am not sure what the final future fate of that hospital will be but it is still serving in-patients and also that prosthetic lab that is very highly regarded is still in operation there. It is certainly my intention to maintain that lab. If it doesn't exist on that site we will maintain it on another site.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: You said that there are two committees studying the future of that hospital and one of these is an internal committee of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the other is some type of external committee. Is the membership of that committee public, and if so would the Minister please let us know who is on it?

MR. SHERMAN: Sure, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to discuss that with the honourable member under the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The committees, neither one of them is an in-house committee. One of them is a medical committee made up of persons, including personnel like Dr. Merv Letz of the Children's Hospital, who have expertise in the field of rehabilitation of children, and the other one is a management committee that includes people who did have something to do with the management of the facility when it was operated by the Shrine, who are looking at the business side of the facility, where the medical committee is looking at the professional side of the hospital, and will be making recommendations to the government. Those committees were set up on my authority and I can certainly make that information available to the honourable member, but I think we should go into that under the Health Services Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.