

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. Resolution 85, 6.(a) - The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I only have one question, by the way, pertaining to the road between Flin Flon and Cranberry Portage. It's roughly 40 miles, Mr. Minister, and it's a very, very crooked, dangerous road. It's narrow and it's very, very crooked. Formerly, we straightened the road out from Flin Flon to Baker's Narrows and shortened it by eight miles. From Baker's Narrows to Cranberry is roughly the same distance that's surveyed.

My question to the Minister is, would he consider working on this section of the Highway soon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): The design is not completely done on that stretch, but there are some portions of it that are designed, yes. But, as the member well knows, there is no appropriation for construction on that, or straightening on that this year.

MR. BARROW: This year.

MR. ORCHARD: No.

MR. BARROW: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister would now answer two or three of the questions which I posed to him prior to the committee's rising at 4:30. I believe that he said at that time that the first portion of the blue book which we have before us, the first half of it lists projects previously programmed, and that that is a list of the highway construction projects which were scheduled for the previous fiscal year, or rather for the fiscal year which will end in a week's time, or a little better than a week's time, just by way of comparison; and then commencing with Page 15, projects scheduled for 1980-1981, lists the projects which his department will proceed with during the forthcoming fiscal year.

I have a few more comments to make, Mr. Chairman. But I would like to ask the Minister, have the projects titled as projects previously programmed, commencing with Page 1 of the Highway Construction Program, and ending with Page 14, have those been completed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman, they haven't.

MR. HANUSCHAK: They have not been completed. Now could the Minister then answer the question which I posed to him prior to the Committee's rising at 4:30? Could he indicate the - I'll take one second - of the \$76,415,600, well, or whatever, \$60 million for regular program, could the Minister indicate the amount contained in his Estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year that is being

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

appropriated toward the completion of the projects commenced last year and the amount that is being appropriated for the projects to be commenced in the forthcoming fiscal year?

MR. ORCHARD: Now, before we get any further in the line of questioning, I want to explain to the Member for Burrows how we set up the road program. It involves a formula set out by the Provincial Auditor. Now we have roughly \$81 million between regular program, highway strength and a Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement, roughly . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is making reference to \$81 million, a figure which I do not see in the Estimates. I am not sure what it is that he talking about.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Burrows was listening I would indicate that it would be the total of (a), (b) and (c) under Appropriation 6. It is \$80,911,000.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am sorry, I am sorry. 8.(b) and (c).

MR. ORCHARD: (a), (b), (c) under Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Which totals up to \$76 million.

MR. ORCHARD: Which totals up to \$80,911,600 less a recoverable of \$4,496,000 from Northern Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am sorry. Yes.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, we choose \$80 million as a rounded figure to commit work road projects in the province for a fiscal year. The Provincial Auditor allows us to multiply the \$80 million by 1.6, which gives us a target commitment figure of \$128 million. Of that \$128 million a number of the projects are in the first 14 pages of the Blue Book Road Program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I have the distinct recollection of the Minister having told us prior to the Committee's rising that the first half of what is contained in this Blue Book, that is the first 15 pages, was merely a summary of what was done in the previous fiscal year.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it is a summary of the projects which have not been completed. Some of them are in progress and have not been completed. Now bearing in mind that we are given a multiple of 1.6 times our capital construction budget, and we rounded it off to \$80 million; we didn't use the \$80,911,000.00. We had a target figure of \$128 million of construction projects that we could commit to tender, or to commit to a road program. The first 14 pages represent by the Estimates on each individual project some \$44 million worth of work, some of which is . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, when the Minister says represent \$44 million worth of work, is that \$44 million worth of work to be done?

MR. ORCHARD: Some projects may be started, but the money has not flowed completely through. In other words, sometimes you don't finish a road and there is \$44 million worth of work to be done on those 14 pages.

MR. HANUSCHAK: \$44 million worth of work that is still to be done. Carry on.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Now, there is \$44 million worth of work to be done on those 14 pages. We have to deduct from the \$128 million that \$44 million; we also have to deduct from that a portion that we are going to put into a pre-advertising program next December or November, which is normal practice to get part of the program flowing in advance of the construction season so people can move equipment, etc., while the roads are frozen. That takes up an additional \$15 million. That leaves us with a total to commit to new program, which is found in the balance of the pages, of \$64,400,000 of potential projects.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister now answer the question which I put to him prior to 4:30 in more precise terms that he has? How much money will he require to complete the close to 200, well it's 218 projects, listed as projects previously programmed, and how much money is there contained in the Estimates for the projects scheduled for 1980-81?

MR. ORCHARD: In precise terms, \$44 million would be required to commit to complete the projects on the first 14 pages; in precise terms, \$64.6 million would be required to complete the projects in the last pages, the projects in 1980-81, in precise figures.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, then obviously, the figures that the Minister has given certainly don't add up to the figures shown in the Estimates, and I am well aware of what the Minister has just said. But the figures in the Estimates Book certainly don't reflect that.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what figures in the Estimates Book don't reflect that?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has just said that he still requires \$44 million to complete the projects commenced last year or the previous year or whatever, and then he said that he requires an additional \$64 million to undertake the projects scheduled for 1980-81. He has shown in the Estimates book only \$60,415,600, and I'm referring to that figure because (b) is Highway Strengthening, of which there is no mention in the Highways Construction Program which he has distributed to us, plus (c) Page 12 - one of your back-benchers, Mr. Minister, is attempting to help you, whether he is or not . . . I'm sure that the Honourable Minister needs all the help he can get. Plus Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement of \$4.5 million. So, those figures don't add up.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in my explanation, and that's why I was very careful to point out to the Member for Burrows, that we chose the target figure of \$80 million, not \$80,911,000.00. The \$80,911,600 is the combination of all road projects which are going to be undertaken this year, found in the final pages, in order to commit work, because it is impossible to schedule the program only \$80 million work in one fiscal year and ever possibly complete it. Therefore, the auditor has allowed the Highways Department, for years and years and years, to establish a 1.6 multiple times the capital commitment given to the Department of Highways for highway construction. Hence, the target figure in the program is not \$80 million, but is rather \$128 million.

Now, of the \$128 million, \$44 million is found in carryover. \$64 million is required to complete the new program and \$15 million is set aside for a new program which will be committed this fall, in December or late November, on what is called pre-advertising, to start the construction program, but that won't show. Mr. Chairman, the pre-advertising program does not show on this year's road program, it will show on next year's road program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I think that I must take the Minister through the Highway Construction program, line by line. I'm using both for the benefit of the honourable member who is so willing to run to the assistance of the Minister, and for his information, I want to indicate to him and to his Minister that, for example, in 1979-80, Highway Construction program, the first line reads, Trans-Canada Highway East, mileage 2.2 miles. Location, from west of Perimeter Highway to Plessis Road connection. Nature of work, acquisition

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

of right-of-way. And then, I look at the Tory Blue Book, which is the colour used this year, and there I find, at first line, reading exactly the same, Trans-Canada Highway East, mileage 2.2 miles. West of Perimeter Highway to Plessis Road construction, acquisition of right-of-way. So therefore, I ask the Minister, has any of that land been acquired? Or has none been acquired? Or only a portion of it, or what?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's what I was attempting to explain to the Member for Burrows. Anything that appears in the first 14 pages is program which has been committed last year. In some of it, there's one there from two years ago, which has not been completed because of some technical difficulty that was encountered after it was put on the program and expected to be completed, and if it was not completed and funded, then it appears again in projects previously programmed. There are no new dollars assigned to that project.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Ah, but Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister must have new dollars because his predecessor said on Monday, April 24, 1978 - and I am quoting from Page 1205 of Hansard - "My understanding is that dollars not spent in this allocation, indeed lapse, . . ."

MR. ORCHARD: Absolutely.

MR. HANUSCHAK: ". . .that there is no carryover hereon in, that we in fact will come to that zero-based budgeting concept that has been talked about".

MR. ORCHARD: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now, I ask the Minister then, with respect to the first line in his highway construction program, how much money does he need to complete the acquisition of right-of-way on Trans-Canada Highway East? Does he need a thousand dollars, two, three, ten thousand? Because two years ago, he asked for funds for the acquisition of 2.2 miles; but assuming that he and his predecessor have been doing things, either in looking after whatever else - because I know that his predecessor had other things to do, a half-a-day a week was taken up looking after Public Works. But I want to know whether the Minister wants funds to acquire 2.2 miles, or is it only a tenth of a mile, or two-tenths of a mile, or whatever, for this fiscal year?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows is hung up on two separate items. He is hung up on lapse of capital appropriation, in the ongoing commitment of a road program. Now, at the end of this fiscal year, should the Department of Highways not expend the \$68 million that were voted to it last year and only cash flow, \$66 million, then we lose \$2.3 million in capital appropriation. But we still have the project in the program carried forward eventual completion and commitment of dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because the same program shows up for two years in a row on a program, simply means that it is not completed, but those dollars are deducted from the target commitment that the department has to work on before they can commit any dollars whatsoever to new road program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I wish to thank the Minister for his answer. Would he then answer my question? How many dollars does he need to complete the first project listed on his blue book, Highway Construction Project Program, TCH East 2.2 miles?

MR. ORCHARD: On that first project, we have only acquired 11 percent of the land that we have budgeted for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now we're getting somewhere. Very well. So, the Minister has only acquired 11 percent of the land, so therefore he still needs 90 percent, roughly, 89 percent of what was appropriated previously. Very well. Let's move on. Trans-Canada Highway West. Mileage, 3.7 miles, from west of Headingly to east of PTH 26.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the funding which is required to complete all of the projects on the first 14 pages of the road program is \$44 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: What is the total value of the projects listed in the first 14 pages?

MR. ORCHARD: \$44 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So it would appear then that there were no moneys spent on these projects during the fiscal year about to come to an end.

MR. ORCHARD: The project, even though 10 percent of the property has been acquired and paid for, the project is put into the carryover at its original budgeted value. So that that figure of \$44 million represents these projects which are not completed, as if there has no work been done on them, despite the fact that some of them may be 10, but those are the parameters under which we have to operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a very important clarification. It would be interesting to know, since this \$44 million represents the global budget which was originally allocated for those projects, what is the actual figure that will be paid out against those projects?

MR. ORCHARD: Let me understand the question. You want to know, of the \$44 million which those projects represent, whether there's \$2 million of the dollars already flowed, or \$20 million of the dollars . . .

MR. USKIW: That's right. How much has been - no, you have indicated, sir, that the \$44 million represents the global funding for the total program of all of those items in those first 15 pages. Now, you've also indicated that progress payments have been paid against projects. So in essence, we end up with a surplus of capital here, since you won't need the \$44 million to complete the first 15 pages.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. The \$44 million is the part of the projects for which money has to be yet spent. In other words, on that first example where we have 11 percent of the land acquired, what shows up is 89 percent of what we budgeted. Okay. I was in error when I said that the total original project cost was part of the \$44. If you flowed 20 percent of the money only 80 percent shows up and it is part and parcel of the \$44 million.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is quite opposite then to what the Minister originally indicated. The Minister is now saying that the \$44 million represents the monies yet to be spent on those projects and we would have to assume that there may have been \$40 million already spent, as a figure of speech, that there were substantial sums expended on those projects and this is simply the balance.

MR. ORCHARD: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister on several occasions made a statement which kind of surprises me. He says that the Provincial Auditor allows him to commit, is it 1.6 times the Estimate? On what basis does the Auditor have the authority to allow anybody to spend money that isn't in the Estimates?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman. What the Auditor allows us to do is draw up a road program based on a program which is not completed, in other words, carryover program, plus a deduction for pre-advertising, plus regular program, and

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

he allows us to commit to program 1.6 times our capital budget, but he allows us only to spend what our capital budget is.

MR. CHERNIACK: By what authority would the Auditor be able to allow anything?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, in past years, as I tried to explain earlier on and obviously unsuccessfully, in road construction there are so many variables, namely the weather is the major one, that it is virtually impossible in one year where you have an \$80 million road budget, to spend exactly \$80 million on projects. In other words, if we only drew up a road program of \$80 million, and with the lapsing of capital, we would often leave \$20 million and \$30 million on the table, because it is impossible to complete within the fiscal year the projects that you may wish to complete to commit \$80 million worth of new capital construction, as is obvious, because we have got some \$44 million carried over from previous years. All that does is give us the ability to have enough work in process to assure that we spend our capital budget each and every year and not have a portion of it lapse.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister confuses me when he talks about capital budget. Does he have a capital fund available to him?

MR. ORCHARD: A capital appropriation of \$80 million.

MR. CHERNIACK: I am sorry, I am not aware of a capital appropriation, and that confuses me, Mr. Chairman. Where does he have a capital appropriation?

MR. ORCHARD: Then if the Honourable Member for St. Johns would like it, we have a budget figure of \$80 million, \$80,911,600 to go towards construction of roads in the province . . .

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, yes, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it really has nothing to do with what I would like, it is just that the Minister, who, of course, is new to this portfolio, I understand, should learn to use the terminology which is commonly accepted as being understandable, not just to him, but correct terminology.

I still do not understand on what basis he thinks the Auditor has authority to permit a program to be prepared. I really think the Minister means to commit a program. Is that not what the Minister means, that actually the Minister believes that he has the authority to commit work to be done beyond the Estimates, the appropriation passed in here? Isn't that what he means? Because anybody can prepare a program, a five-year, a ten-year, a tremendous program can be prepared, but you can't be committed surely beyond some authorized figure. Isn't that what the Minister means?

MR. ORCHARD: I believe that may be the correct terminology, if that would be satisfactory. We are allowed a target commitment in the road program which is 1.6 times, and I have to choose my words very carefully, if I am in error you please correct me, the budgeted amount in the appropriation of \$80 million.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, well then committing doesn't mean just listing a Blue Paper with what we propose to do, but rather committing means to invite bids and enter into contracts. Isn't that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: In some projects, yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: My point, Mr. Chairman, is that when you invite bids and you enter into contracts, you are apparently permitted to do that beyond the

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Estimates figure, and when the Minister says in "some" projects, I say a limit of projects. There has to be a limit, which he says is 1.6 times the Estimate permitted. Now when he said \$80 million, I thought I understood him to say that that was permitted in the appropriations of the year about to expire. Am I mistaken in that? Did I not hear him correctly?

MR. ORCHARD: You didn't hear me correctly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Was that for this coming year?

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: For the year about to expire it was \$68 million?

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the Minister says that they were permitted to commit, I am now using the words which I think are correct, but I want him to tell him, 1.6 times \$68 million for the year about to expire. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now the only other thing is that I don't believe the Auditor has authority to permit anything. The Auditor can only certify that whatever is being done has been done in accordance with the law. The Minister intimated that this has been done for a long time, and I don't quite think that is right. I think that what has been done in the past when we had capital and current, that there was a capital item available to be used by Highways in order to permit them to take advantage of exceptionally good seasons and in order to permit them to invite bids at an early time of the year so that they can get the contractors cracking. I really think that the Minister is confused, or maybe doesn't know the basis for this. The reason I mention it is, that I would assume his department would know, because again they are working ahead and projecting what they are going to do, and I would say to the Minister if he has \$80 million in the current Estimates he should be planning to spend all 80 million in this coming year. That is not just a figure that they draw out as being a good looking figure and therefore on that basis can he tell us how his department would arrive at the figure of 80 plus apparently 1.6? Where is their authority to do that?

MR. ORCHARD: The authority is based on past practise in the department with the approval of the provincial auditor.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we are quite a way off from the Minister's Salary, and I would invite the Minister to find out where the authority is. The authority can not be based on past practise. That isn't in my opinion an authority to spend money or to commit the expenditure of money. Past practise doesn't work when you deal with taxpayers' money, and I invite the Minister to get the correct answer, not only for his elucidation but for the committee as well. I won't press it, but just tell him that I don't think he's giving the correct answer, and I can see he doesn't know it. I don't pretend that I know it, I'm just pretty sure that he's wrong, and by the time we get to his Salary possibly he can give us the correct one.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in the construction year of 1970 and 71 we had approved expenditure of \$30,869,000, which was multiplied by a multiple of 1.535 to arrive at a committed program. We can go through the various years up until 1976-77. The department committed 1.549 over their approved expenditure, 1.566 over their approved expenditure, 1.799 over their approved expenditure, 1.977 over their approved expenditure, 1.59 over their approved expenditure, 1.24 over their approved expenditure, all to commit road projects in addition to their approved expenditures, and as a result we use as a rule of thumb, 1.6, and it is derived from past experience, and I have from 1970-71 construction season up until

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

1976-77, as the target years under which those kind of multiples that I just gave the honourable member were used.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the historical accounting is interesting, but does not answer my question, which is, on what basis does the Minister believe he has the authority to commit the taxpayers of Manitoba to spend up to 160 percent of the amount voted to him? Now as I say, he's in charge of the taxpayers' expenditures here. I'm quite sure it is not done, because it was done in the past. I am quite sure it's done because there's a legal authority so to do. And I don't want to press him, as I said earlier, I just invite him to familiarize himself with the correct position so he can tell us. I have to assure him that he's not giving us the correct picture because he's not giving us any picture of where the authority actually lies. It's certainly not in the auditor. So if the Minister wants to discuss this further now, I'm willing to do it, but I suggest to him in a friendly way that he should find out exactly where the authority lies and then we can get better information on that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a similar procedure to what we used to follow in the city, and if I may clarify maybe, that it requires a commitment to a certain number of projects to be completed, of which only certain aspects of them on a cash flow basis will be completed in any given year. So by rule of thumb, somebody has come up with the fact that if you commit approximately 1.6 times what you normally intend to spend in a year, that the cash flow will work approximately to what you have in the expenditures. Is that what it is?

MR. ORCHARD: I understand - the process as indicated by the Member for River Heights is the general process that we attempt to use.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to the Member for River Heights who is Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Finance, that he should get together with the Minister of Agriculture and find out what is the law and what is the authority --(Interjection)-- the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Finance, because the Minister of Finance should know better than either of the two gentlemen. I only say that in the sense he's been around longer. I want to tell the Honourable Minister and the Honourable Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Finance, that if you're committing yourself, you are bound, and you don't bind yourself beyond the authority you have to pay the cheques. I believe it was done a long time ago and was corrected a long time ago, and I think I know how. I don't have the opportunity here to find out exactly. I again invite both gentlemen, who have spoken with some authority, that they should find out what the situation is and then they can tell us once they know, rather than guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, in any types of projects, road construction, highway engineering projects, there are certain levels of commitment. There are commitments to design and there are commitments to tendering projects in pieces and there are commitments to all sorts of preliminary expenditures like land acquisition, and so on. Consequently, it may be that when one commits to a project, it doesn't all have to be spent in one year and it doesn't violate any regulations with respect to the expenditure of money committed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the honourable, the Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Finance, that we're not talking about commitment to a piece of a program or to an engineering project. We are talking about 1.6



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

times the past estimates being committed to be spent. And once you sign a contract to spend it, you sign a contract to spend all of it, not a piece of it, and I invite him once more, and I still say it in a friendly way, to find out whereof he speaks, and not necessarily relate it to a practise that he may or may not be correct, in the city of Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a). The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, I hope this is the right place. I say that I preface everything so that people will know my intentions are honourable at all times.

MR. CHERNIACK: Honourable.

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, honourable. I'm not trying to put anything through on somebody. --(Interjection)-- No, I won't be gentlemanly, as the Attorney-General suggested yesterday, we all were.

I wanted to ask a question about Highway No. 59, on page 3 of the blue sheets here. 15.9 miles was in the projects previously programmed, and I wondered why - this is for acquisition of right-of-way additional lanes - why there is nothing in the 80-81 expenditures for work on the highway, or am I reading it wrongly?

MR. ORCHARD: Acquisition of right-of-way is the step prior to grading extra lanes.

MRS. WESTBURY: Right.

MR. ORCHARD: And it doesn't necessarily mean that even though you have the right-of-way the next year, you proceed with the grading of the lanes. That is contingent on the amount of budget you have and the funds that are available.

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I understand that, but the proposals we have here, the projections I think are for two years, '80 and '81, and I wondered why there was an acquisition of nearly 16 miles and then no work was to be done on it over the coming two years in an area. I've been listening to some of the press reports and I have heard suggestions that highways that are in NDP areas are not getting funds, and I'd like to suggest to you that Highway 59 for about 8 months of the year is travelled probably, the majority of those travelling it are from River Heights, Osborne, Crescentwood, Tuxedo, Fort Garry and the west end of Winnipeg on their way to the beaches. So that when we're talking about the beach highways - I'm not part of that accusation, of course - this is a very heavily-travelled highway, as most of the beach highways are, for certain times of the year and this is the same highway that I was talking the other night about gravel trucks and other similar problems. I would like to know why there seems to be no intention of working on the 16 miles that have been acquired.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, you can certainly see by the comments of the Member for Fort Rouge that any accusations that this was a crass political document are totally unfounded.

MRS. WESTBURY: I wasn't saying that.

MR. ORCHARD: No, I realize that. I'm just saying that you realize now that those allegations were completely unfounded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: I wonder if the Minister could tell us how much does he require to finish the first 14 pages of the one book? How much is required to finish that?

MR. ORCHARD: \$44 million.

MR. ADAM: \$44 million. How much is required to finish the last part of it?

MR. ORCHARD: The commitment on the 1980-81 projects are a total of \$64.4 million.

MR. ADAM: The Minister needs \$108 million to complete those two projects? Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. HANUSCHAK: All of which is not shown in the Estimates of \$108 million. In other words, it says that he needs \$108 million to complete the road construction program, which is shown in the Tory Blue Book before us, but he only has \$80 million shown in the Estimates books. So he needs an additional \$28 million.

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Which is not contained there. Which is a further \$28 million deficit that this --(Interjection)-- the Honourable Member for Minnedosa wishes to assist the Honourable Minister. I'm not sure whether he wishes to accept his assistance or not. If he does . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, to help put the Honourable Member for Burrows' mind at ease, that is why next year, when the Tory Blue Book is printed, there may well be \$44 million of carryover work next year. Or a figure somewhere in that neighbourhood, of unfunded carryover work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)--pass - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: The Member for Rupertsland is not here, he's in the other committee, and he has asked me to ask how much will be spent on 304 this year. For the crushed rock.

MR. ORCHARD: I don't know what the contract is worth, nor do I know how much it will be expended, but that was one of the pre-advertising projects which was pre-advertised in December of this year and the contractor is working on it right now, and we won't know how many dollars are spent, but it will be, well, it will be one of the projects that will be committed this year and completed.

MR. ADAM: All those pre-tendering, that's all finished now, the tenders have come in and the contracts are let. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: I believe they're all to tender. All the pre-advertising programs.

MR. ADAM: So we don't have a figure exactly on what the 304 is, eh?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we don't have a figure on it and we won't have until after the project is completed. It was pre-advertised, the crushing is on-going right now, and we won't know the quantities that he crushed and applied until after it happens this summer.

MR. ADAM: I see. Last year we requested, there were 4.9 miles of work done on PR 278, and I just want to read from the Minister's comments. When I enquired last year about PR 278, here's what he said. "But we are, to repeat again, proceeding with work on 278 involving resurfacing and blacktopping. I believe a contract, I believe of seven or eight miles." I'm wondering what happened to the seven or eight miles. We did 4.7, 4.9.

MR. ORCHARD: I believe the contract was let at 4.9 miles, Mr. Chairman.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ADAM: That's right. I'm wondering why that wasn't completed, because those are some of the petitions that the Minister has received this year. I know the Minister will remember the petitions with all the letters and all the signatures on them, to finish that three, four, miles that would have brought that highway up to the school where the buses are going.

The Minister still insists that the document we have before us is not a political document. We took the trouble to look at some of the projects for the new program, and we find that in the 1980-81 program, under Design Study, Divided Highways, 3.7 in Progressive Conservative constituencies, in acquisition of right-of-way we find 262.3 miles of acquisition of highways, which indicates to us what is going to happen in the future. This is future programs. Opposed to that we find six miles in non-Conservative ridings, acquisition of highways, as opposed to 262.3 miles for acquisition of highways in Conservative areas. This is in southern Manitoba. Out of 142 programs or projects, we find 126 allocated to Conservative areas and 16 to non-Conservative constituencies. Base and asphalt surface treatment: we find 138.9 miles in Conservative constituencies and none in NDP areas. In grade and gravel and second lift: we find 219.30 miles in Conservative constituencies and none in New Democratic Party constituencies. In base and bituminous pavement: we find 97.70 miles in Conservative constituencies and we find about 1/2 a mile, .49 miles in the town of Selkirk. Pavement: we find 7.75 miles and nil, well there is a bit in Selkirk, pavement and bituminous. One-half a mile of bituminous recap in . . . base and bituminous: 15.72 miles in . . . And the Minister still insists that this is not a political document, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to read - the Member for Rock Lake last year, I believe it was, was saying that at last we had a road program that looked after all of Manitoba. "I think that from the program," and I am reading from the Member for Rock Lake's comments, "I think that from the program that we have today, I believe that the present Minister is showing much greater concern for the people of Manitoba, generally speaking, and we were accustomed to reviewing year after year when the NDP were in power." I don't say that facetiously, but I say it sincerely and honestly, because I tell you, Mr. Chairman, when looking at the proposed program today and looking at the program we have been pursuing over the years, I was pleased to hear, in fact I was surprised to hear the comments of my colleague from Dauphin as to how partisan and parochial the previous Minister of Highways could possibly be when he was running Highways. And I ask the Member for Rock Lake and the Minister to take a look at this document today. I say it is a disgrace to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, because if you look at the map, we have taken pains to show what it looks like. The black is Conservative constituencies and those highway programs in orange are New Democratic.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Billie has a bit up by Vogar and Pete has a bit along Lake Dauphin. This isn't Pete's?

MR. ADAM: Anybody who says that this isn't a flagrant political highway program had better come and look at what he is talking about, and the Member for Rock Lake had better look at the highway map to see what it is like.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, there it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time, Committee. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: The Member for Ste. Rose had some figures of bituminous pavement. What were the figures in so-called NDP constituencies again?

MR. ADAM: The figures I was giving were for southern Manitoba.

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, you were talking about the NDP constituencies in southern Manitoba. No wonder you didn't find any road work in them, because there are no NDP constituencies in southern Manitoba.

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, well, that shows how little you know.

MR. ORCHARD: Where is an NDP constituency in southern Manitoba?

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): You are speaking to one right now.

MR. ORCHARD: Does the Member for Ste. Rose represent the community of McCreary or does he not? --(Interjections)-- Do you represent the community of McCreary in your constituency?

MR. ADAM: Southern Manitoba is Swan River and south.

MR. ORCHARD: I would suggest that there are 16 miles of butiminous pavement going in your constituency. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: . . . that you don't know about, obviously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose, if he wants the Chair, get the Chairman's eye.

MR. ADAM: I have mentioned 15.72 miles. I have mentioned that. 14.8, and it is not really a constituency road, it is a road that goes through No. 5 going to Flin Flon, Dauphin and Roblin and Saskatchewan. A constituency road is what you see here, Mr. Minister. All these roads are going north and south, that is constituency roads.

MR. ORCHARD: Including No. 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was intending to deal with some other Items, but I must admit to be somewhat taken back by the analysis that was done by the Member for Ste. Rose. It seems that according to the opinion of the Minister of Highways, any constituency that is represented by a New Democrat has beautiful roads that are in top shape and don't require any work to be done, no improvements, and it is only in Conservative ridings in southern Manitoba that there are road problems. I am not surprised, I don't think any of us should be surprised, because we have witnessed this sort of attitude, the sort of mentality of the Minister of Highways and his fellow colleagues, so I am temporarily surprised, but it does fit in with what we would anticipate from the Minister of Highways throughout. Some reference was made to the past eight years - the Member for River Heights wasn't here - I am sure that the road program would show variations from year to year during that eight-year period, but I want to tell the Member for River Heights that there was always a much more reasonable proportion of work being done in opposition ridings during each and every one of those eight-year periods than you will find here.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I could be contradicted that if we did a similar analysis for the past 50 years, that we would never never find such a blatant example of the sort of narrow partisanship, as we have come to expect to be exhibited by the present Minister, the present Premier of this province and his colleagues. It comes as little surprise, the people of Manitoba I think are recognizing it and I believe this only confirms it.

To get back to the question, I would like to just ask the Minister by way of information, if the highway program is determined - obviously it is determined by a Committee of Cabinet. Can the Minister indicate the members that serve on that Committee?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways is on that Committee.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, and the other Ministers?

MR. ORCHARD: There are none.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister then indicating that the road work that is outlined in this program came by way of recommendations as a whole from his officials, or did they come as a result of his own determination along with consultation with his colleagues?

MR. ORCHARD: The road program is determined from a choice of a number of projects by myself.

MR. HANUSCHAK: 1977 election results.

MR. PAWLEY: When the Minister was provided with choices, am I to assume that his choices represented two percent in New Democratic Party ridings and 98 percent of the work in Conservative ridings? Is that the choices that were provided to him by his officials?

MR. ORCHARD: I am not too certain whether the honourable member has his percentages correct.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I may have been a little bit liberal to the government, maybe it is 98.5 percent, but thereabouts, 98 percent. I gather the proportion of approvals were pretty well in line with the sort of recommendations he received from his officials. Is that what the Minister is telling us?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what I am indicating to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, is that of a number of choices the road program as printed in the final pages of the Blue Book were the ones that I chose to proceed with.

MR. PAWLEY: I think the Minister is assuming the responsibility for that which we have before us. Is this program approved by Cabinet as a whole?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, the program is always approved, major capital expenditures, after I draw up the program, is shown to my Cabinet colleagues as it was in the past. Nothing has changed on that program.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just so that we could be a little bit more precise. The dollars for the program or the actual program are the details of the individual road construction, which, or both?

MR. ORCHARD: The details for the construction program, the dollar funding, is determined, as it always has been, by Cabinet decision as to where the funding priorities go. I draw up the road program as Minister responsible for the Department and show it to my Cabinet colleagues, naturally.

MR. PAWLEY: The Minister is indicating that the details as outlined in the Blue Program before us was approved by his First Minister and Cabinet colleagues?

MR. ORCHARD: My colleagues approved my program, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question I did want to pose earlier to the Minister, until I was taken back by the precise analysis by the Member for Ste. Rose, is what are the plans pertaining to the River Road along the Red River north of Winnipeg insofar as the steady erosion of those banks into the river? There was monies last year, and I believe there is some reference to possible acquisition of right-of-ways and/or rip-rap. I just would like some indication from the Minister as to his intentions during the coming fiscal year.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing for that road project in this year's project scheduling.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought we had observed something here. Is the Minister telling us that there is no monies in his budget at all for the

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

River Road, which is part of the agreement that had been intended, that the River Road would be upgraded pertaining to the Federal-Provincial Historic Sites Agreement? Is the Minister telling us that there is no monies for that road at all this year?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there are no funds yet appropriated in that agreement for road construction.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Leader of the Opposition was asking me if there was moneys in the program for reconstruction and rebuilding of that road, which there isn't. However, there is always money in the maintenance program to maintain and fix road failures.

MR. PAWLEY: Including the banks.

MR. ORCHARD: If that's part of the road.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just wish I could get my finger on it, because I had noticed earlier reference to acquisition 230, acquisition of right-of-ways along that road. Mr. Chairman, maybe some other member could carry on and I'll try to pin that down if the Minister is not aware of any reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Well thanks, Mr. Chairman. I guess I'm one of those people that reap the benefits under this fair and reasonable government that operated in the province from 1969 till 1977, and in that period of eight years I could point out a few things to my honourable friends across the way, and also dealing with the present programs as of the last two years.

Number one, I think, would have to be that I can recall going across to the Minister of Highways, Mr. Borowski, in 1969 and enquiring about a piece of road that was on the highway program; and his reply to me was, "You can go to hell, I'm looking after these guys first." And he pointed at the honourable bunch of gentlemen, unfortunately a few of them are still here.

But, getting back to tonight, I'll start at 1969, and I also have a map here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether you couldn't rule on whether it's fortunate or unfortunate that there's an official opposition here tonight. The Member for Gladstone suggests unfortunately that we are here. I'm just wondering whether that has the approval of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that's a point of order. The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't want to hurt the Member for Lac du Bonnet's feelings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had acceded for a moment till I got the information because the Minister wasn't able to apparently single it out for me so I now I have it; 238, it's on page 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone has the floor.

MR. FERGUSON: Well he gave his point of order. Well he started in talking about 238 so I guess he was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call this committee to order. The Member for Gladstone.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now going back to 1969, I also in case there are a few people in the back of the room that would like to have a look at the highway map, you can take the area through here. No, not south of the Trans-Canada, a lot of mine is north of the Trans-Canada; and in 1969, there are no coloured marks whatever. 1970 there are non whatever. That means that there's no land acquisition, no grade and gravel or no bituminous surface. The only road done in those seven years was an addition to No. 1, which was four lanes. As far as the PTH road that went, there was at no time anything done on it. In 1975-76, we did take the trouble of marking it in blue where the road program went, and I will point out to you, Mr. Chairman, check the area that was held by the former Member for Gimli, Mr. Gottfried, blue; Mr. Pawley, blue; Mr. Uskiw, blue; Mr. Watt, blue; Mr. Henderson, one little spot; Mr. Derewianchuk, blue. Well, the map is so blue, you get up in the area around Dauphin where we had a fellow by the name of Burtniak, who was the Highway Minister, and they were almost laying pavement on pavement. You know the thing was just about solid blue. Go down into Ste. Rose, blue, blue, blue. Now of course, that wasn't a political document, was it? Not at all. But take a look across here. In 1975-76, 9.2 miles. And over here, 9.2 miles. That to me reads 18.4 miles a year in 1975-76, not for one or two areas, but for the whole southwest corner of Manitoba. So don't talk about a political document, my friends.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Member for Gladstone has the floor.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. Now going back to the new document, I can report that there wasn't altogether that much in my constituency at that time either, but I will give marks to the former Minister of Highways. He did have the decency to finish off the roads that weren't completed; if they were in the grade or gravel stage, many of them were surfaced. The Member for Ste. Rose certainly can't take any credit for it, but it happened in his constituency. But they did have the common decency of finishing roads, and they did have the common decency of going ahead and more or less completing what had been started. It wasn't going back to the 1969 road program again where the Minister of Highways tore the thing up and said, that was the Tories we're writing ours. And that's his prerogative, if that's what he wants to do. But to sit and listen to my honourable friends talk about a political document, my God, I would say if it wasn't unparliamentary that it was the height of hypocrisy, but of course I'll have to withdraw that so I can't say it. I guess you could say that, well I wouldn't want to go through the thing of having you fellows go through a point of order again. You have such touchy feelings and I really feel badly.

But we do have a bit of a forward-going program now and recognizing the fact that, in most of our ridings, we are losing our elevators and our rail lines etc., etc., that we do have to have some major roads or some upgradings of our roads. But the Member for Ste. Rose says, so do we; but recognizing that over the past I would say four years that he has probably picked up more bituminous road than probably the seven constituencies from Portage southwest have, I would think that possibly he could bear with us for a little while and let us do a little catching up. --(Interjection)-- Well, I've got to agree with the Member from Inkster that there should be a change of government, but I would hope that it will be in about 12 years so that we do get a chance to upgrade the system of roads in the producing part of Manitoba that basically is the hub of the wheel that keeps the agricultural economy in this province rolling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake. The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of clarification.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I wanted to find out from the Member for Gladstone just what sectors of Manitoba are nonproducing sectors geographically in his opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that anywhere from Churchill down to about 50 miles, or 75 or 100 miles north of Winnipeg.

MR. USKIW: Heavenly days. Well, well, well - I'm sure there will be a number of people interested in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I came here this evening, not with the intentions of getting involved in the debate, because I can recall when we were on the opposition, I don't recall ever going back into the annals of the history of what someone had said in previous years. Rather, we dealt with the document as it was presented to us. I think the Member for Ste. Rose, quoting some of the things that I had said a couple of years ago - and I stand by those words, Mr. Chairman. I do recall - and I'd like to also go back when the NDP became the government of this province - and I do recall the kind of standardized program that we had for our PR roads. The condition that our PR roads in my particular part of the country were in 1969 when we left office and the condition of those same roads three years down the road, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, were completely and absolutely deplorable; because the then Minister of Highways, as my colleague from Gladstone mentioned, Joe Borowski, decided that he was going to change the formula which we used in upgrading and maintaining our PR roads, that is that were gravel roads. I can recall how my constituents complained because we had established what we thought was a fairly realistic and a good road program for your PR roads as far as the gravel was concerned.

Mr. Chairman, and also I make these comments because it appals me when particularly the Member for Ste. Rose sits in his chair and accuses my colleague, the Minister of Highways, of a political crass document that he's presenting to the members of this Legislature. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition, he's sort of joking, saying they shouldn't have done that. I think, Mr. Chairman, we sit back and listen to the kind of criticism they are giving, but you know as far as I'm concerned, I take so much of it, and I think that we have to fight back in realistic terms.

I want to, Mr. Chairman, just use the year 1976-77, and I have the program here, where our road systems that were used . . . and really, when I look at the map for 1976-77, there wasn't all that terrible much roadwork really done. I don't know what they did with money. But, Mr. Chairman, I'll talk on my own constituency, there wasn't one dollar spent in my constituency and I can honestly say that. But I'm given to understand that in the Member for Ste. Rose's area this year, he's getting some money spent in his constituency. That's more than I got in 1976-77; and I can say the same thing for the whole west and the whole south of Manitoba in 1976-77, with exception just a few miles on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 10, which was a road they pretty well had to recognize as a main trunk highway which connected the United States of America to the northern points of the constituencies which they represented in those days. And that's the only reason, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they felt they had to spend a few dollars on No. 10 Highway in 1976-77.

So for the Member for Ste. Rose to sit in his chair and have the gall and the audacity to accuse us of political crass politics is something - you know, Mr. Chairman, the terminology they like to use - what I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is playing dangerously with the truth, the words which the Member for Ste. Rose chose to use. Mr. Chairman, I want those members to understand that, and I would be ruled out of order, Sir, if I were to get into other departments but we could if we had the opportunity, and we will remind honourable members opposite that we are concerned about the people in their constituencies when it comes to health and other things.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the members opposite have no foundation whatsoever for the kind of comments they are making in regards to our road program. Mr. Chairman, we are merely catching up because of a vacuum that we were practically in for eight years in south and western Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I say thanks that we have a government that's going to give some recognition, while at the same time still going to look after the Member for Ste. Rose, because I'd like him to challenge and deny that he's not having a dollar spent in his constituency.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the official Opposition.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that the Member for Ste. Rose has done an excellent job of getting under the skin of the Members for Gladstone and Rock Lake. By their protesting they obviously indicate a certain amount of guilt complex about what's happening. They come in here with maps all outlined. Obviously, they know in their own hearts just what sort of blatant sort of partiality is being demonstrated in respect to the road program. They know that in 1969-70-71 - and I think some credit should go here because the former Minister of Highways, Borowski, has been referred to a number of times - he assumed the responsibility for the portfolio after years and years of total and absolute neglect of northern Manitoba. In fact, we had a Member for Churchill, Gordon Beard, who sat in the Conservative caucus and finally couldn't stomach it anymore because they ignored, they accepted the attitude that was just expressed this evening by the Member for Gladstone. Northern Manitoba didn't exist, it wasn't a productive part of the province of Manitoba, and Gordon Beard walked across the aisle.

And, Mr. Chairman, again we have the re-occurrence of the total and complete ignoring of the highway and road needs of northern Manitoba.

MR. ORCHARD: False.

MR. PAWLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the maps, it was the former Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. One speaker at a time. The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the former Minister of Highways, the Honourable Joe Borowski, he had strengths and he had weaknesses, that recognized the need for catching up after 11 years of Tory neglect in northern Manitoba, and I think that the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and the Honourable Member for Gladstone might have expressed some balance in their statements pertaining to the efforts by the then Minister, Joe Borowski.

Getting back to my earlier question which I wanted to deal with, and which the Minister couldn't get track of, 238, Page 6, makes reference there to commence acquisition of right-of-way and/or river banks utilization. I would like the Minister to deal with the possibility of acquisition of right-of-way, what he has in mind in that regard.

MR. ORCHARD: I'm sorry, I missed the member's last comments. That particular road, as the member is well aware, is part of the ARC Agreement, and we have one of our senior staff representing the department on the ARC Agreement, hoping to negotiate with the federal government for funding of road development, particularly with 238 in mind.

MR. PAWLEY: Is this the committee that's chaired by one Thomas Denton? Advisory Committee?

MR. ORCHARD: I don't know.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister add any further information at all to what's on his program? Because on his program he does make reference to commence acquisition of right-of-way. Are the plans developed there pertaining to . . . Mr. Chairman, again, to the Minister, are there plans in that respect to the river road, to permit the proceeding with right-of-way?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that particular appropriation of six miles for acquisition of right-of-way or river bank stabilization has been on the program for several years.

MR. PAWLEY: So what the Minister is really indicating to us, that we needn't take this too seriously, then, insofar as this year is concerned, that nothing too much is likely to happen. Am I fair in my interpretation of what the Minister is indicating?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there may well be work done on that if the negotiations with the federal government and the ARC Agreement proceed far enough along that we can have a commitment for reconstruction, cost-sharing of reconstruction with the federal government.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Minister then like to elaborate as to how those negotiations are proceeding, and at what stage they are, pertaining to the road.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, they're going very, very slowly. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will recall that there was no government in Ottawa from December 18th, or whatever it was, until just very recently. With the reorganization, the change of Ministers, many, many, many ongoing discussions that we were undertaking are now having to be restarted, and that is one of them. It has been delayed by three to four months.

MR. PAWLEY: The Minister says, since May. There was a group that pretended to be a government from May till December of last year. Did anything happen during that period of time, or did, like so many other areas, nothing develop, so we had no government during that period of time.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of getting into an argument with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his blatantly wrong statement that nothing went on; in case he didn't know, many many things were developing under the Ministry of the Honourable Don Mazankowski, as federal Minister of Transportation. Many projects, mainly the saving of approximately 230 miles of rail line in the province of Manitoba. The almost completed agreement on Yellowhead Highway funding with the federal government, many, many programs were being undertaken, actively pursued, and would have resulted in federal contribution to this year's road program, had we had a Conservative administration in place in Ottawa at this time. Now that the government has changed and we have a federal Liberal administration, negotiations start from Square One, and I don't anticipate having any new dollars come into the province of Manitoba for highway construction.

Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to say that nothing went on. Well, he's living with his head buried in the sand if he makes that comment about the federal transportation ministry under the capable leadership and direction of the Honourable Don Mazankowski. The man is completely wrong.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister enjoys undertaking self-serving statements, it's somewhat typical of him. But I'd like to get back to the river road. Was there any progress made pertaining to discussions relating to the river road. We can discuss the other areas of activity at some other point, but we're dealing with the river road, during the entire period of 1979 - January 1, 1979 to December 31, 1979.

MR. ORCHARD: Very little, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: And can the Minister advise whether anything took place January 1, 1978, to December 31, 1978?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I cannot, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: And it appears, the Minister has, again, please correct me if I'm wrong, the Minister has as much as indicated that we ought not to expect too much, January 1, 1980, to December 31, 1980.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that provincial road 238 has existed in the province since 1969, and I would assume that in the past year-and-a-half, as much activity has gone on on provincial road 238 in the last year-and-a-half as it did in the previous nine years before that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm dealing with representations that have been included in the highway program, I believe, ever since 1978, '79, now into 1980. That's what we're dealing with, representations, and yet we see very little by way

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

of action on the part of the Minister. I'm just wondering for what purpose representations are made, if in fact little is to be ever done pertaining to those representations? And I gather this is not the only example.

By the Minister's silence, I interpret that as agreement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct another false impression that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has put on the record tonight regarding northern Manitoba and roads in that portion of the province. If he will refer to Page 22 of the new program, he will find provincial road 391, 29.4 miles, bituminous levelling; provincial road 391, 55.2 miles, bituminous levelling and shoulder improvements; provincial road 391, 23.5 miles, grade widening and stockpiling of shoulder gravel; provincial road 391, 23 miles, bituminous levelling and shoulder improvements; provincial road 391, 21 miles, bituminous levelling and shoulder improvements, provincial road 392, 20.5 miles, bituminous levelling and shoulder improvements.

If that is a road program which does nothing for northern Manitoba, then I suggest once again, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to mislead the people in this committee, the press, and the people of Manitoba; because, Mr. Chairman, if I were to do a quick add on that, I think we would find somewhere well over 125 miles of roadwork on provincial road 391 and 392, all of which are in northern Manitoba - and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, are the only roads in northern Manitoba.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister could advise us whether these roads are being done under the Northlands Agreement?

MR. ORCHARD: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will just wait a moment or two, we will provide that answer for him.

MR. PAWLEY: Possibly, I notice that the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Rock Lake were so well-advised as to the road program '69 to '77, maybe they would have sufficient information to permit us to compare the road program during those years in northern Manitoba with the Minister's program this evening for 1980-81. I'm sure they've done an equal amount of homework. Possibly the Minister already has received the material from the Members for Gladstone and Rock Lake.

MR. ORCHARD: Just carry on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: All we need is information, Mr. Chairman. It's strange, there was so much information, it was just bubbling out of everybody's ears a few moments ago and I'm just amazed, I don't see ready volunteers here from the Member for Rock Lake or the Member for Gladstone. I thought they would have done their research in this vital and important area. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm a bit shocked now that we don't see that information, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder, also, when the Minister is checking, if he could advise us whether that great patriot he made reference to, and great defender of western Canada, Mr. Mazankowski, whether he was responsible for the Northlands Agreement, or do we have to credit that terrible opponent of the western Canadian society, Mr. Trudeau, with that Northlands Agreement.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was partly right. That terrible proponent of western Canada, Mr. Trudeau. And when we're talking of accomplishments of the Honourable Don Mazankowski as federal Minister of Transportation, I believe he was the first Minister, ever, to bring an icebreaker into the Port of Churchill, much to the betterment of that community and the grain shipment in that community.

MR. PAWLEY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that you would recognize that we are trying to deal with the road program and not ice breakers in the Port of Churchill.

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

MR. DAVID BLAKE: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should think that the members opposite would be happy to see that activity happen. It would encourage the further building of the road to that port to encourage truck traffic as well as rail traffic up there.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm just wondering, does the Minister not have that information? The answers to the questions I posed a few moments ago?

MR. ORCHARD: Just making sure that we give you the right answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, I'll call on the Member for Burrows, if the Leader of the Official Opposition is . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, further to a question which I posed to the Minister . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the road projects that I mentioned to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition were all provincial funding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows has the floor, unless he wants to give to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the Minister can indicate the total amount of funding that would be involved in that program for Northern Manitoba this year for expenditure.

MR. ORCHARD: I haven't got the exact total here, but in rough figures about four and one-half million dollars.

MR. PAWLEY: And your total road program is - I'm sorry I don't have it in front of me. How much is it? --(Interjections)-- Mr. Chairman, then we now see the generosity of the Minister, four and one-half million out of his total program. Then the Minister. . .

MR. ORCHARD: On one road.

MR. PAWLEY: Then the Minister was . . . Well, my question pertained to the roads that you had listed earlier. Are you telling me now that you have only given me the cost for the one road?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, those expenditures, except for one 20-1/2 mile chunk, were all on Provincial Road No. 391, which is one road.

MR. PAWLEY: Maintenance or new construction?

MR. ORCHARD: That is capital construction.

MR. CHERNIACK: What is capital construction?

MR. PAWLEY: So the Minister was really seriously trying to let on to us that there was great activity in Northern Manitoba, four and one-half million dollars out of his total budget. I am not going to prolong that, but I think that the figures themselves belie the story, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows - or did he want the floor yet?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Honourable Minister an explanation with respect to the first project previously programmed that he had indicated to the Committee, that of the 2.2 miles for acquisition of right-of-way for which he had received funds in the previous year, he had only acquired about 11 percent of that, so leaving about 89 percent still to be acquired. Now it is my intention, Mr. Chairman, in order to enable the Committee to sort of get a handle on things, to get a more accurate figure on, oh, about 170 projects out of 218

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

listed therein, you know, which are also described in this vague sort of fashion. I am going on to the second one, Trans Canada Highway West, 3.7 miles west of Headingley, or from west of Headingley to east of PTH 26, acquisition of right-of-way. I would like to know what portion of that had been acquired or is likely to be acquired by the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1980.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chairman, is it the Honourable Member for Burrow's intention to go through project by project for the first 14 pages?

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Honourable Minister presented us with a program listing all the projects project by project and I would suspect that every member of the Committee would want to have accurate information on every project, project by project. In other words, I don't think that the Committee would be satisfied with, you know, just sort of a ballpark figure, so if the Minister is listing these projects project by project, when he said last year that he wanted funds to acquire 3.7 miles of right-of-way from west of Headingley to east of PTH 26 and 11.3 miles from east of PR 340 to the east junction of PTH 10, etc. and etc., continuing on for about 172 projects, I think that the Committee ought to know what portion of that the Minister did in fact do in the fiscal, or will do in the fiscal year, which is to end with this calendar month, and what is remaining to be done. Because otherwise this highway construction program which the Minister has presented us with becomes completely meaningless. So yes, it is my intention to go through the Minister's program line by line, even it takes the next two or three months, and I want to get answers from the Minister.

So therefore, my question to the Minister is: Of the 3.7 miles, which the Minister wanted to acquire right-of-way last year and which he shows again in his program for the forthcoming fiscal year, how much of it has he acquired?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that second project is part of the \$44 million that is required to complete the 14 pages of projects.

MR. HANUSCHAK: My question to the Minister is: Did he acquire 3.7 miles of it, 3.69, 3.68, 3.67 or 0 miles?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that project is part of the \$44 million which is uncommitted and not expended.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister indicate to the Committee - he has been out shopping for land, he has been acquiring right-of-way in this project and God knows how many others over the remaining 14 pages, how much of that 3.7 miles did he acquire? Can he not tell the Committee that?

MR. ORCHARD: The portion of it which makes up the \$44 million which is left to expend.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister tell the Committee whether he has acquired a tenth of a mile or a quarter of a mile or a half a mile or whatever?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the portion which remains to be acquired is part of the \$44 million which it would take to complete the projects on the first 14 pages of the program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Very well. If the Minister has no knowledge of what happened with respect to that particular project, let me go on. So therefore with respect to that one, the Minister doesn't know, and this doesn't surprise me, Mr. Chairman.

Let's move on to the next - Trans Canada Highway West, 11.3 miles. Now there is a longer stretch of highway and well, last year his predecessor had indicated to the Committee that he was going to do more than just acquire right-of-way. He was going to acquire right-of-way, he was going to landscape, service roads, etc. This year the Minister pulled back a bit, all he is going to do is just acquire right-of-way on that 11.3 miles from east of PR 340 to east of east junction of PTH 10. How much of that 11.3 miles has the Minister acquired?

MR. ORCHARD: A portion of it which is part of the \$44 million which is required to complete the first 14 pages of projects.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister be more precise and specific than that, "a portion"? Did the Minister acquire a tenth, a quarter, a half-a-mile? Does the Minister not know? Because surely, you know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, looking at Item 6.(a) in our Estimates, he had rounded off a figure to the nearest \$100. Now surely he didn't guess at that figure, at least I would hope that he hadn't guessed at that figure, that he didn't pull that figure out of a hat, that, you know, he must have arrived at that figure on some basis. He says, for the regular program he needs \$60,415,600, so surely the Minister must know what his department had done up to the time when he prepared his Estimates. He must have known what he expects his department to be able to do up until the end of the fiscal year and then on that basis come up with this figure to the nearest \$100.00. You know, it is not just a ballpark figure to the nearest \$5 million or \$10 million, but, you know, he comes up with a very precise figure to the nearest \$100, and having come up with that figure to the nearest \$100, I am asking the Minister a very simple question. Now surely he knows, because after all, you know, I studied law, a long time ago, about the time when this Minister was - well, I don't think he was even enrolled in school at that time, that's how long ago it was. But I would suspect that the acquisition of right-of-way process, it involves the whole land transfer operation, going through the Land Titles Office and so forth, so the Minister ought to know whether he has acquired 2 miles or 3 miles or 4 or 5 or 6 or whatever of the 11.3 miles that I am talking about. And surely the Minister can answer this question, because he came up with a figure in his Estimates.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the portion of that project which has yet to be expended is part of the \$44 million, which total the first 14 pages of the commitment.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So it is part of the \$44 million which totals the first 14 pages of this commitment. Well, perhaps the Minister may be better acquainted with what has happened west of Brandon, and I will ask him this. Of the 15.3 miles, which his predecessor said that he wanted to acquire the right-of-way to on Trans Canada Highway West west of the junction of PTH 1A, west of Brandon to PTH 121, what portion of that 15.3 miles has the Minister acquired the right-of-way to? And then, of course, well, it is just simple arithmetic to determine what portion is still remaining, if he has not acquired all of it.

MR. ORCHARD: That project is not part of the road program, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am reading from the Tory Blue Book under the column headed Highway, PTH West, under the column headed Mileage, 15.3 under the column headed Location, west junction PTH 1A (west of Brandon), PTH 21, Nature of Work, Acquisition of Right-of-Way, and the cover, I will just double check again, yes, Highway Construction Program 1980-81. So it is listed in his book.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in the honourable member's first question he indicated west junction PTH 1A, west of Brandon to PTH 121; we do not have a PTH 121.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am sorry. Mr. Chairman, I cannot recall saying 121; if in error I did, I correct myself. I meant PTH 21, which is listed both on his predecessor's program for 1979-1980 and listed again in his Tory Blue Book, which we have before us. Would the Minister indicate to us what portion of the 15.3 miles of right-of-way has he acquired during the fiscal year 1979-80, which was on his predecessor's program, and, you know, what is remaining to be acquired?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to tell the Member for Burrows that we have acquired sufficient of that right-of-way to undertake the

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Trans-Canada West 8.1 miles, west junction PTH 1A at Kemnay west of Alexander, grade and gravel additional lanes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: He has acquired sufficient - I am sorry, I missed the rest of that. Would the Minister be good enough to repeat that.

MR. ORCHARD: 8.1 miles.

MR. HANUSCHAK: He has acquired 8.1 miles of the 15.3 miles. Very well. So we are looking at about 50 percent. No, I will be kind to the Minister, it is a bit better than 50 percent, because 50 percent of 15.3 is only 7.65 miles. So he did better than that. Very well.

Could we then move on, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I must go through the 172 projects which the Minister has included in the Estimates for the fiscal year which is about to end. I note that the next project is 1.4 miles on Highway 1A, location, railway crossing west of Portage la Prairie, east of West Terminal Portage By-pass, acquisition of right-of-way. Has the Minister acquired it?

MR. ORCHARD: What is left to be acquired is a portion of the \$44 million which entirely to be spent would complete the projects on the first 14 pages.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister indicate to the Committee what portion of the 1.4 miles of this particular project remains to be acquired?

MR. ORCHARD: Only that, Mr. Chairman, which forms part of the \$44 million necessary to complete the first 14 pages. . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister indicate to the Committee what part of the 1.4 miles is that part of the \$44 million that he refers to.

MR. ORCHARD: Only that which my department has calculated into the \$44 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister indicate what part of the 1.4 miles it is that his Department has calculated into this item.

MR. ORCHARD: Only that which it hasn't acquired.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister then indicate what part it is that his Department has not acquired.

MR. ORCHARD: That which forms up the amount of the appropriation which figures into the \$44 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is becoming quite obvious I think that - you know, there aren't too many members of the Committee left, Mr. Chairman, as you will note, three or four, you know, who are really interested in hearing what this Minister had done in his Department during the past year, and really I don't know whether I want to continue spending my time and that of my colleagues - for the benefit of my colleagues. I only went through four items, there is still 168 remaining, 168 remaining, and this is the type of answer that we are getting from this Minister. So I really don't know whether I should continue, because we are not getting any information from this Minister. Well, you know, I am asking the Minister very simple questions, very simple precise concrete questions, I am asking him, look, you asked for approval to acquire "X" miles of right-of-way, and of that "X" miles of right-of-way, how much have you acquired; all of it, you know, a portion of it, what portion of it? The Minister refuses to tell us. Well, if the Minister refuses to tell us, I think we will have to find another way of dealing with his Estimates at a later point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I can't help but feel that that information that has been asked for by the Member for Burrows is available. I also can't help but feel that it is probably not present in this room, and I would have thought that the Minister would have been well advised to say, well, I will get the information. It must be available. Surely you don't make up a list without knowing what you are at, you don't just make it up, you got to have something about it, when they speak of mileages and percentage of a mile, then surely the information is available. I think that what would be of concern is to see whether or not there are repetitions year by year of projections of doing work, an acquisition of land and no real intention to do so, and I think from that standpoint it is legitimate to ask a Minister to be more precise, and the fact is he didn't answer any of the questions about those four routes.

Now I would have accepted had he said, I don't have the information with me, but it is readily available, because the Member for Burrows is right, there has got to be a record somewhere of what has been acquired and therefore as he says by simple arithmetic one knows what has not yet been acquired. So either the Minister refuses to give the information or the Minister, not having it here, is trying to slough it over and I think both ways are wrong. Having made that point - and I think there is validity to that, we will hear from him the extent to which he is prepared to deny that the information is available somewhere. I don't believe he will - a question I have been wanting to ask relates to the provincial money and the federal money. And I heard the minister say that there was a certain project, I think he said 391, I am not sure, where he was asked is any part of that Northlands Agreement, and he says, it is all provincial money. Could he indicate to us which projects are Northlands Agreement money.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we have some carryover program, which is part of the Northlands Agreement.

MR. CHERNIACK: Where is that shown?

MR. ORCHARD: On page 11, Mr. Chairman, the first project on 391, 21 miles. The next one is 391, 22.7 miles, PR 610, Wabowden to the junction of the South Soab Lake Mine. And, Mr. Chairman, we have \$135,000 left to complete, and I don't see it in the carryover program. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, do I hear some chirping in the crowd there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has got the floor.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, for the Honourable Member for St. Johns, is PR 391, which is from the Thompson Airport to the Pipe Lake Road Mine, there's \$135,000 of a previously tendered project yet to be paid out on that - of western Northlands.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Minister has indicated this \$135,000; he also indicated 22.7 miles at PR 610 and 21 miles at the vicinity of Watsko and Hughes Lake. How much is there set aside for each of those?

MR. ORCHARD: \$1.7 million for the Watsko, and \$1,190,000 for the other one.

MR. CHERNIACK: That would total about \$2.3 million - no, \$2.9 million, plus, that's about \$3 million. Any more money for Northlands?

MR. ORCHARD: Not on 391, Mr. Chairman. That's the extent of 391.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was asking for all the Northlands money.

MR. ORCHARD: Is 392 Northlands, or is that . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: 392 is not here, not on this page either.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: No, the 392 that we're doing in this year's program, in the new program, is not Northlands. None of this year's program on 391 or 392 is Northlands program. It's 100 percent provincial.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was asking what more is there than the \$3 million referred to that's Northlands money.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, there's a project of about, well, it's \$2.5 million on the Cross Lake Road, which is Northlands - western Northlands. It does not show up in this road program because it was part of Appropriation 8, which is not listed on the road program, community road.

MR. CHERNIACK: Appropriation 8 in the current estimates.

MR. ORCHARD: No, no, it was funded last year, and we only had carryover of 2.5.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that 2.5 - is that in this year's Estimates or last year's estimates?

MR. ORCHARD: It's in this year. It's under Appropriation 8.

MR. CHERNIACK: You don't mean Appropriation, you mean Paragraph 8, or Resolution.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Resolution 87.

MR. CHERNIACK: All right. I was trying to get at, what was the amount in the appropriation we are dealing with now, which I believe is 6, more than the \$3 million referred to by the Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Just hold it a minute. I've got to do some calculating for the honourable members.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, looking at this Appropriation 6, which is the one we're dealing with, I see that Item (c) gives \$4.5 million for the Northlands Agreement. Is the \$3 million identified part of that \$4.5 million, or is that in the \$60 million under (a)?

MR. ORCHARD: It is part of (c).

MR. CHERNIACK: This \$3 million we've talked about is part of (c), part of \$4.5 million. Right?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Where is the other \$1.5 million?

MR. ORCHARD: It involves, I've given you 391, Wekusko to Hughes Lake; I've given you 391, Wabowden to South Soab Lake Mine; and I've given you the Thompson airport to Pipe Lake at 135,000.00. As well, we have the Thompson-Split Lake Road which has \$380,000 to complete . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Where's that? Is that on this list we're looking at?

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I must leave. I don't have the time to wait for the Minister to do his homework. I presume he'll get the information.

MR. ORCHARD: And in 327, on Page 9, 327, 28 miles, PTH 6, Easterville Road Connection, we have \$355,000.00. Go to Page 9, Provincial Road 327 - we have \$355,000.00. --(Interjection)-- Right.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, \$355,000 for what?

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Completion of that project.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's for the forthcoming fiscal year.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting that the Minister has that information . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Order please. Have you completed your answer?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, let him babble.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, no, I do not wish to interrupt the Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: And then on Page 11, 391, 34 miles, PTH 10, vicinity of Reed Lake, bituminous pavement and stabilized shoulders - we have \$2.456 million. Now, those projects should total up to \$6,216,000.00. We have \$4,496,000 of that in western Northlands, which we're going to recover back from Northern Affairs. Northern Affairs, has, as you are well aware, the hold-back, the enabling vote, the 15 percent hold-back, so that means the total western Northlands contribution to those \$6,216,000 worth of projects is going to be \$5,289,600; and the province of Manitoba, to complete those projects that we've listed for you, are going to have to put in approximately, well, somewhat less than a million dollars to complete those projects started under Western Northlands.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It's very interesting that the Minister was able to come up with reasonably precise figures on a couple of projects.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows is allowed a second time at this one. I have been on the list for a long time, and I don't know when I'm to be called.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, the Chairman, whom I replaced, did not indicate to me there was anyone on the roster, so perhaps the Member for Burrows would wish to yield to the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I'd be happy to.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. The Member for Lac du Bonnet. I'm sorry.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, since he didn't indicate --(Interjection)-- since we didn't get an indication from the department or the Minister on the bridge question at Selkirk over the Red River, I'm wondering whether it was my omission in not pursuing it sufficiently, and whether the Minister would answer if that is possibly listed under the maintenance program. And I'm talking about Highway 204, the approach to the bridge. The reason I raise it again, Mr. Chairman, is that the former Minister had a series of meetings with different delegations from that area last year, and gave a commitment that they would take a good look at whether or not there couldn't be some sort of structure, or a raising of that road, carried out in a reasonably short period of time in order to solve the flood situation. So perhaps, if it's not in new construction, perhaps it's under maintenance. It could be in either, I suppose.

I would like to know just what the position of the Minister is on that.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that particular project, we are working in conjunction with water resources, as we have to do on those kind of projects. It won't be a maintenance program, that will be a sufficiently large

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

project to be under construction program, and it's my understanding we just don't have the design and all the information and co-ordination done with Water Resources to have that project undertaken this year.

MR. USKIW: Is the Minister then indicating that the department is proceeding with the design works for some kind of a structure as an approach to the Selkirk bridge from the east side of the Red River, and that that has no bearing on the question of another bridge location for connecting up the east-west highway system north of Lockport?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes. The Department - we're not in a design stage. We haven't got a design for that road because we haven't got our complete information package put together with Water Resources.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to determine though, is, well let me put it this way. The Minister says they have not completed their design work. By stating that, he is implying that a decision has been made, but it's merely a technical problem that we are waiting to overcome. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: I would suppose you could call it a technical problem. What we have to do is, No. 1, get our complete data base, shall we call it, from Water Resources. Using that information, we can proceed to a design which we can put a construction estimate upon. And, having a construction estimate on the number of dollars that are involved often determines whether a project indeed can proceed this year, next year, or . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what I'm really trying to get from the Minister is whether or not he is committed to a structure at that point as the answer to dealing with the flood problems, and that merely whether it's a matter of doing some further engineering studies and technical work to determine just when and how much it's going to cost, or is the question still a question mark dependent on those studies? It could go either way, and I would like to know which way the Minister is looking at it.

MR. ORCHARD: I guess I'm going to be a Liberal and I'm going to go down the middle of the road. We have to find out what that particular option will cost us and compare it to the, as we were talking about yesterday, the choosing of an appropriate new crossing location to service the whole area. And I can't tell you tonight that we're going to proceed with the option you're pursuing tonight, as I couldn't tell you yesterday that we were going to proceed at a bridge location at mile 21 or whatever on the Red River. We haven't got that information put together, and it's in the study stage.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would then like to pursue it further. Is the Minister telling the committee that the possibility exists that there may be two projects, (1) in the approach to the existing bridge, and (2) another bridge location for the connection of highways as between the east of the river and west of the river; or is he talking about choosing as between two alternatives, either a new bridge connecting at the highways and no work to be done on the existing approach to the existing bridge?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I suppose what I'm telling the Member for Lac du Bonnet is that we don't know whether to proceed with one bridge eliminating the one he's discussing tonight, or to put in a second structure elsewhere plus the one he's talking about tonight, until we get our costs on what the floodproofing of the 204 is, plus the cost of a new crossing at some different location is. And until we have those two cost estimates and studies complete, I'm afraid it would be foolhardy to make any decision, or in fact, any commitment to him tonight as to which way we are going to go.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that the Minister should make a decision in advance of having all the information. I merely wanted to understand the Minister's position. If I'm wrong, he may correct me. My understanding

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

is that no decision has yet been made, that it is still a matter of review on the part of the department. I suppose that is the safest assumption on my part.

MR. ORCHARD: That would be the safest assumption, yes.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue one other construction project that's been under way for some period of time. And perhaps the Deputy Minister would be in a position to advise as to (a) why it is taking so long to complete, and (b) why there doesn't appear to be a subsequent project, whether it's right-of-way or whatever, from that point on. I'm talking about Highway No. 11, which has been under construction now for, I believe, three years. And somehow, it seems to me it can't be completed for one reason or another. It should have been completed last year. On No. 11, off No. 44 - 44 to 214, Mr. Chairman, to be precise.

MR. ORCHARD: Well it's my understanding that work commenced last fall.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the construction has been under way there for at least two years, if not more. There was a winter construction project, then there was an all-summer construction activity there last year, and it was the intention to complete the project up to 214 last year. My question is, what's holding up the project? (b) Why is the Minister not indicating a further extension to complete that project right into the town of Lac du Bonnet, because I do notice in his current estimates, he has some plans north of Lac du Bonnet to Great Falls? It seems to me that they're going to be missing out that section from 214 to Lac du Bonnet for one reason or another, and I would like to know why.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the paving project was started on the south end last fall with some base laying, and with any kind of good fortune that contractor should finish his contract this summer.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, so is the Minister indicating that it is really beyond the department's control as to when that project is going to be completed, that it is really in the hands of the contractor?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I suppose you could say it is beyond the department's control as to when a contractor completes a given job, but after X number of days that are specified in the contract, should that work not be completed, the contractor is subject to penalty payments, but in terms of forcing a contractor to complete a job, I suppose you could say we don't have the right to do it. We can charge him penalty.

MR. USKIW: Well in any event, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the Minister is suggesting that project will be completed as soon as the contractor finishes his work, that the department really is not involved beyond that any more.

MR. ORCHARD: Right. We've let the contract, the contractor started work and, as I say, he should finish that stretch this summer. He got a start on it last fall.

MR. USKIW: The next question I put to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, has to do with - if he looks on page 2 on his carry-over program, he has here an appropriation of 8.7 miles, that's acquisition of right-of-way from PR 313 to McArthur Falls, but what is taking place with respect to 214 to 313? That section in the middle is not found anywhere, and I'm just wondering why the department is not sequentially completing that highway from one end all the way through to the other as opposed to leaving a section in the middle or before the town of Lac du Bonnet and then hopping over to the other side of Lac du Bonnet and proceeding north.

MR. ORCHARD: I don't have the answer to why that gap is in there, but if the member would prefer we can see if we can determine what the reasons are.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the Minister that that is a very short section mileage-wise, or kilometer-wise, and that it would seem logical if the department is going to proceed north of Lac du Bonnet, that it should indeed complete the south end. It would seem rather silly to have a good road a portion of the way and then get back onto the old pavement, and then another stretch of good pavement. It doesn't add up at all, Mr. Chairman. There must be some oversight somewhere or some technical problem. It's one or the other.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm only speculating here, but this sometimes happens in terms of acquisition of land, and a problem in determining the route of a road as it goes through or by a town, and that particular section of road does involve the stretch by and around or through Lac du Bonnet, I'm not too sure --(Interjection)-- around Lac du Bonnet, and that may be part of the problem, I'm not certain.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Minister, the area in question is open farmland. It is not an area that is urbanized, and therefore it would seem to me that if we're acquiring right-of-way north of the town, that somewhere there should have been acquisition of right-of-way south of the town, unless the Minister can tell me that it has already been acquired. You know, it's just possible that it has been acquired.

MR. ORCHARD: It is possible but I just don't have that information.

MR. USKIW: All right, would the Minister take that as notice and bring the information back whenever he has an opportunity?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, you may recall that earlier I hoped that the committee would receive some fairly precise and accurate information as to the extent to which the projects previously programmed were completed in the fiscal year about to end in a week's time, and how much the Minister wants for the forthcoming fiscal year. And the four examples which I had given at that time referred to acquisition of right-of-way. Now it may be, Mr. Chairman, that it might be somewhat difficult for the Minister to check with the Land Titles Office and the legal department and so forth to find out just exactly how much land was acquired and is in fact now owned by Her Majesty in the right of the province of Manitoba.

So, I would like to make reference to a couple of other projects where acquisition of land doesn't enter into the picture at all. It's pavement. I'm looking - well the first one catches my eye, again it's on the Highway No. 11, 11.5 miles north junction of PTH 44 to Provincial Road 214 base and bituminous pavement. That appeared in last year's Highways program and it again appears in this year's, so I take it that it's not completed.

Now can the Minister indicate to us in whichever way he finds it easier to do his arithmetic, in the imperial or the metric system, what portion of this stretch of road still remains to be paved?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Rather than giving the answer as he did, "Well, the proportionate fraction of the \$44 million," which was the answer he gave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has the floor.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, as all things which are empty, certain things which are empty, words flow through uninhibited, and obviously that's the case with the Member for Burrows, because we just finished discussing that road with the Member for Lac du Bonnet. And the indication at that time, not two minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, was that there was no paving done on it. The contract was only

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

begun last fall and it is anticipated to be finished this year. --(Interjection)-- As I mentioned before, when things are empty, there is no retention capability inbetween.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am pleased to know that. So obviously there must be many projects listed here which you will recall, Mr. Chairman, the Minister had indicated to us before the dinner hour, that the first 14 pages are merely for comparison purposes, to indicate to the committee what was done the previous year as compared to what the Minister hopes to do in the forthcoming fiscal year. But now we've discovered that some of these projects weren't done at all. Well then, that being the case, I will continue. And again I'm not going to refer to the acquisition of right-of-way projects, because apparently the Minister is having some difficulty to determine just exactly how much property he had acquired, even with the assistance of the Member for Minnedosa and Portage la Prairie that he has over here, but even they can't help him.

So then I will go to Highway No. 12. Could the Minister indicate to the committee, and I underline to the committee; there are members in the committee, the opposition, the government side, and I'm sure that both sides of the committee would be very anxious to have this information and they would want to know. They would want to know and, in particular, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa would want to know how much of the 8.8 miles of Highway No. 12, north of First Avenue North, Steinbach, to north of Seine River diversion has been paved, because the Honourable Member for Minnedosa may want to go down to the United States in that direction to promote tourist conventions in Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. ORCHARD: The portion that is yet to be completed is part of the \$44,000,000 which makes up the 14 pages of projects we have here.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is back to giving his pat answer, that it's part of the \$44 million. On certain projects he was able to give the committee very precise answers, right down to the \$100.00. On this one and many others, he said it's part of the \$44 million. Now who the hell is he trying to fool?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Burrows is indicating that I'm down to giving . . . The Member for Burrows, I'll drop the honourable, because he's demonstrating that he doesn't deserve that title. The Member for Burrows has indicated that I am back to giving my pat answer; I might indicate that the Member for Burrows is back down to asking his pat question.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to continue asking my pat question, and I'm going to insist on answers to them. And Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Whoever gets the Chairman's eye is called that way. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have asked one of 172 of my pat questions. I have asked five of them up to this point in time. There is still 167 remaining, and I intend to ask the remaining 167 questions. And, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the people of Manitoba are entitled to an answer from this Minister to questions which I asked, which were unanswered, and the 167 which ought to be asked. Now the Minister shakes his head, that the people of Manitoba are not entitled to answers to them. Very well, I want the people of Manitoba to know that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, in order to give my colleague the opportunity to select the next question he wishes to ask, I want to follow-up on some questions that were being asked a few minutes ago. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The Member for St. Vital has the floor.

MR. WALDING: . . . having to do with the Northlands Agreement. The Minister had given us a number of projects from the list, and I believe one that was not on the list, which added up according to my arithmetic to some 5.82 million dollars. He rattled off rather quickly a number of other figures after that that I didn't get the opportunity to note. I wonder if he can now give me an explanation of whether my \$5.82 million is correct, and how that tallies with the Item (c) The Northlands Agreement of some \$4.5 million.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it isn't going to tally very well, because the \$4.96 million that we have in recovery of Northlands Agreement is 85 percent, the 15 percent enabling vote is not included in there. That will bring the project costs really up to 5.289.6, but if we complete all of the projects that I outlined to the members this evening, it is expected that they will cost \$6.216 million. Now, that means that we are only going to recover 5.289 from Northern Affairs under The Northlands Agreement and the province essentially will pick up the almost \$1 million that is expected to be necessary to spend to complete the projects which are ongoing.

MR. WALDING: I am still not clear. The Minister lost me when he got to the 15 percent enabling vote. Do I understand that that is additional money that is to be spent under this appropriation?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, with the Northlands Agreement, Northern Affairs presents us with projects. They also present us with the funding to carry out that project, but they hold back 15 percent until completion of the project. So that is why in my 6.(c) we have \$4,496,000, which is 85 percent of the funding that is available, because 15 percent of that has been held back by Northern Affairs, and will be paid upon completion of the projects. But, that is only two points out three, the third point being that, with the 15 percent hold-back, we have \$5.289 million available under Western Northlands for provincial trunk highways and related projects. But to complete the projects that we have ongoing, it is estimated - and once again an estimate can vary - but it is estimated that we are going to have spend \$6.216 million. So a further portion is going to have to be funded 100 percent by the province, not on the 60/40 ratio that the Western Northlands Agreement has for us, because we have expended all of the Western Northlands Agreement. We don't have sufficient Western Northlands Agreement to adequately fund the projected \$6.2 million in carryover projects.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has brought in two new figures now, a 5.2 and a 6. something million dollars. . .

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, no, they are not new.

MR. WALDING: . . . which further confuse me. Do I understand from him that the \$4.4 million is an amount that Northern Affairs is going to pay to his Department this year, and that there will be a further 15 percent paid at some time in the future for projects that total 5.82, which won't necessarily be built in this year.

MR. ORCHARD: No, it is anticipated that these projects will be finished this year, and when we finish them we will get the 15 percent this year.

MR. WALDING: Let me follow that through. The five projects that the Minister listed to us came to, in my arithmetic, \$5.82 million.

MR. ORCHARD: I am sorry.

MR. WALDING: The five projects that the Minister listed for me came to \$5.82 million, if my arithmetic is correct.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Well, you must have missed about a \$380,000 project, because the total that is anticipated these projects will cost is \$6.216 million.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister confirm that he gave us five projects, four of them on page 11 and one of them on page 9?

MR. ORCHARD: And there was a \$135,000 project which wasn't listed.

MR. WALDING: That is the fourth one on page 11?

MR. ORCHARD: The Thompson to Split Lake Road at \$380,000 does not appear because it is not a numbered road. It doesn't appear in the carryover program because that particular one is not a numbered road, and that is \$380,000 - that will be the sixth project.

MR. WALDING: That is where the arithmetic is, so we are then to \$6.2 million in six projects that the Minister expects to have completed in the coming year, and 85 percent of that, I assume, comes to \$4.496 million, is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: No. We have a total of \$5,289,000 in Western Northlands Agreement; they have, you see in my Estimate Book, 85 percent of that, okay, for \$4,496,000.00. We are going to have to fund the other, roughly a million dollars, out of regular program, because we don't have sufficient Western Northlands Agreements to complete those projects. We are going to be over-expended.

MR. WALDING: A question that arises from that, Mr. Chairman, is why did the Minister list that million dollars as a Northlands expenditure?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, when you put in roads and projects, you anticipate given expenditures and sometimes expenditures are more than necessary, and what we could do is save \$1 million and just chop off the project half-done. But we complete the project because a lot of these are on 391, and as I have already indicated in this year's program, we have got 172 miles of work that is 100 percent provincial dollars, so it is really quite irrelevant whether we spend another million on carryover from Manitoba-Northlands Agreement. The work has to be done. We are getting the maximum dollar that we can out of Western Northlands, we have expended it all, and therefore if we want to complete these projects, we have to use 100 percent provincial dollars.

MR. WALDING: Well, if the matter is irrelevant, then why does the Minister tell us that it is a Northlands project?

MR. ORCHARD: Because a portion of it will be Northlands project, and it started under initial funding of Northlands project, but the costs went beyond the \$20 million or whatever the figure was that we had to play with over the three year period at Western Northlands.

MR. WALDING: Another question, Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, since we are speaking of construction of roads and the Northlands Agreement, the Minister made mention a few minutes ago under appropriation 8 - and I believe it was (d) - that there was some construction there under Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement. Will the Minister explain why there is a separation of those two amounts, and are they similar?

MR. ORCHARD: That is the Cross Lake road, which is in appropriation 8, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, under Western Northlands.

MR. WALDING: My question to the Minister is why?

MR. ORCHARD: Pardon? It is not a numbered road, Mr. Chairman. It is under the Community Roads Program, which is a specific part of Acquisition/-Construction of Physical Assets.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. WALDING: Is that the criterion then, Mr. Chairman, for deciding whether something is a capital project or not, that is has a number to it?

MR. ORCHARD: You see, the difference between 6 and any other roads that we may build as community roads is that the majority, well, the roads in No. 6 are PR and PTHs. Roads in Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets under the Western Northlands Agreement are community road, are access roads to communities.

MR. WALDING: Is the Minister suggesting that any roads that he builds under 6 are not capital projects?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I am not suggesting that.

MR. WALDING: Can I ask the Minister then - maybe I should ask him later on, but can he assure the Committee that the \$5 million under the Northlands Agreement, is that all for road construction and is that subject to the 15 percent hold-back, the same as the amount that we have seen in 6.(c)?

MR. ORCHARD: What \$5 million?

MR. WALDING: Appropriation 8.(d) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreements, \$5,155,300.00.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you. I have been listening to all of this discussion in the Highways Estimates with interest, but as a city member I have some concerns about roads and bridges in the city, and I am just wondering whether anywhere in these Estimates there would be any funds available, I won't mention the padding of the boulevards on Henderson Highway, but what we do need down in our end of town very badly is some more access to the downtown area. We have, up until this past year, in the last ten years and more, had an extremely large amount of new housing up in the East and North Kildonan areas, and we are getting into larger and larger traffic jams, and I am just wondering whether there is any money available through the Highways Department for the City of Winnipeg, and especially one project has been suggested, and that is to build another bridge at where the Redwood Bridge is right now, a two-lane, and then take down the existing bridge and build another two-lane so that we would have a four-lane from Henderson to Main Street. I would certainly hope that the provincial government would give consideration to something like that in order to alleviate some of the traffic jam problems which we have both morning and night every working day of the year. It is costing us an awful lot of time and an awful lot of energy just sitting around and waiting for people to be able to get across the river.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: On a point of order. I think, Mr. Chairman, we discussed that under Resolution 84 and it has already passed. I don't want to prevent debate or information, Mr. Chairman, but this is under Resolution 84, which deals with assistance to urban areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)--pass; 6.(b)--pass. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: You motioned to me, Mr. Chairman, that there were three or four speakers ahead of me. I presume that I am now number one.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet. I often have names down here in committee and if there is no showness, I re-check and I just go on.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister why the department isn't completing the reconstruction of Highway No. 12. The Minister may not be aware, but the Deputy certainly would be, that it was reconstructed up to Highway 317 and was never pursued beyond that point. There is still another stretch of 12 left to bring the reconstruction area up to Highway 59, and I'm just wondering why nothing is happening in that area. It's a very old, old road.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it may well be a very old, old road, and it's one of a number of very old, old roads in the province that we have to allocate a limited number of construction dollars to, and it wasn't one of the ones that went into the program.

MR. USKIW: In view of the fact that I can't identify one single project in the constituency of Lac du Bonnet in the proposed program, Mr. Chairman, I raise those kinds of questions. It would seem that the department would not have difficulty in finding some work activity in that whole area. The second question I would place is, why is the department ceasing to further four-lane the 59? The first section has already been completed and acquisition has virtually been completed for a second stage, but I see nothing in the Estimates here that would indicate that there is anything going to take place for the further development of a four-lane system on 59, towards the beach area, of course.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the same kind of an answer applies. We have to take a limited number of dollars for construction of roads, and that particular road project did not proceed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there must be a deeper answer to that one. Mr. Chairman, the Minister must be aware, and I would ask him, if he is not aware, just how does Highway 59 rate in terms of traffic volume as compared with any other road he wishes to select in Manitoba? How does that highway rate, if you just talk in terms of traffic count? --(Interjection)-- No, let me finish, Mr. Chairman. In particular, the months of April through to November, the summer period.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt whatsoever that during those months the Member for Lac du Bonnet is mentioning, the traffic count on that highway is high.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister aware that at intersections, people are in the position of having to wait for half an hour in order to get across that highway where it is not four-laned, and that is presenting a very serious hazard to the motoring public of Manitoba, both from urban Winnipeg and the local people in the area. Certainly the Minister can't shrug that off as of no consequence with respect to priorities on spending. It just doesn't add up, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister could simply shrug his shoulders and say, well, we're just not looking at that one this year. That doesn't add up in my mind at all, Mr. Chairman. We're not really talking about servicing my constituents, by and large. We are talking about a major traffic artery in Manitoba that happens to carry a tremendous number of people back and forth from Winnipeg out to their cottages and back to Winnipeg, mostly Winnipeg residents, so it's not from the point of view of my particular constituency that I'm addressing the question, Mr. Chairman. It just happens to be a real problem.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, inherent in the Member for Lac du Bonnet's comments have to be the hidden allegation that has been made earlier on that this is a political document, which it isn't. That, among many highways, are in need of upgrading. We should be extending the twinning of No. 1 Highway further than we are this year; No. 16, the Yellowhead Route is getting to such a traffic volume that that is becoming a highway that we should be twinning, there should possibly be a \$6 million or \$7 million grade separation put in at the junction of 16 and

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Trans-Canada; there are many, many, many projects. And what doesn't add up in my mind is how to do it all with a \$70 some-odd million worth of capital construction dollars each year. If I had \$150 million to expend in this province, I could probably complete No. 12 Highway beyond the intersection of PR 317 for the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet; I could probably twin Highway 59 for the summer traffic to their cottages and to the lakes, but Mr. Chairman, I can only assure the member that should this government find an extra \$75 million and put it into highways, the members opposite would be the first ones to jump up in the House and say, we put pavement before people, we are heartless, all we're doing is black-topping the whole province. So I have a great deal of difficulty in rationalizing a limited budget, which in previous years has been highly criticized by the Members of the Opposition, and the numerous requests in needs for highway development that we have.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm very disappointed that the Minister chooses the type of answers that he has chosen. The Minister is condescending in his comments; he is attempting to imply that the opposition is really not responsible in its requests or in its perusal of this program. You know, he's not positive with respect to his answers, and I regret that, because logically, Mr. Chairman, the first year of a Minister's duties tend to place the stamp on that Minister as to his performance. I would think that he would want to review his attitude to the position that the opposition has taken, that he would want to reflect further on whether or not he could be more conciliatory in his approach to highway programming, and in his response to members of the opposition.

Now, I know that it's not unusual to find that certain members might sort of get under one's skin, if you like, if I can put it in those terms, Mr. Chairman, and sometimes one can't be blamed for not wanting to respond in a reasonable fashion, but Mr. Chairman, the attitude that I witness on the part of this Minister can only confirm for me the fact that the Minister is really not treating his responsibility on the basis of the public good of Manitoba, but has decided to play a very cynical, political game with members of the opposition in the consideration of his Estimates. I don't think that does well for the image of this Minister, Mr. Chairman.

I thought if there was any particular highways construction need in the province, that a further extension of the twinning of 59 was one of them that stands out away ahead, and we get a very cynical response from this Minister. If he would say, well, we're going to complete our acquisition and we're going to plan to do it a year later, that would be an answer, but the Minister doesn't even want to venture that much, Mr. Chairman. That, to me, tells me that we are really not before a Minister that is looking at his responsibilities with more than a grain of salt as far as the interests of all of the people of Manitoba is concerned.

MR ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it's interesting to note how the Member for Lac du Bonnet turns a request as to why twinning of PTH 59 did not proceed in this year's capital budget, and the answer that it was deleted because of a choice of a number of priorities this year, and then translates that into the allegation, and as I said first off, into the allegation that the balance of his colleagues have attempted to lay on this road program, that it's a political document, that is completely inherent in his remarks. He considers this a political document; any answer that would be forthcoming from any Minister, not just myself, would be considered to be cynical, etc. In reality, what the member wanted to know is why it didn't proceed this year. I gave him the answer as to why it didn't proceed this year, and he translates that answer into a future case. Such a response was not given to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, and such a rationalization by the Member for Lac du Bonnet indicates that he, as the rest of his colleagues, believes that this is a political document, much to my derision. Because it is not a political document, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to waste a great deal of time debating with the Minister whether it's a political document. I recognize, Mr. Chairman, the fact that there are very glaring examples of omission in terms of the Highways program that happen to coincide with political boundaries. Now, the Minister may want to interpret that in whatever way he wishes. I know that I can

hang this particular map up on a wall at a public meeting and a six-year-old child, having some knowledge of the politics of this province, would be able to point to me the politics of the Highways program, Mr. Chairman. It wouldn't be very difficult.

I don't think it's an accident that the Minister doesn't provide, in a number of constituencies, hardly a dollar's of activity for the next 12-month period. I believe that's a very callous approach on the part of this Minister, Mr. Chairman. I think it's sad to witness such a callousness towards the, not the member who the Minister doesn't happen to like or agree with, but Mr. Chairman, what are we doing when we take such a cynical position with respect to highways construction? I assume, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister doesn't really know the full impact of those decisions. It's one of the things that smacks of a degree of irresponsibility, Mr. Chairman. When you put together a highways program that has a magnitude of \$150 million or \$200 million, what you are also doing is revealing to the general business community what their expectations will be for the next 12 months, based on a government thrust, which is a very important thrust to the economy of this province. Not only to do with the access that is provided and the road system that is being improved or newly developed, it has to do with the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we have people that have invested certain sums of money throughout this province on the assumption that there is some stability in public works, and through which they will receive opportunities to bid on government contracts or whatever the case may be.

When you cut out a whole region from government spending, Mr. Chairman, you are causing a very serious impact on the economy of the region as well. You are causing a problem to the many small contractors that would normally be involved in providing services to the department of highways or to the government, whether it's gravel hauling or gravel crushing, or whether it's paving, or whatever it is, Mr. Chairman. Whatever it is, this Minister has chosen, with a stroke of a pen, or the lack of it, to disengage from the normal construction program, a whole region of this province. That's really what he has done. I don't believe that if the Chambers of Commerce of these communities were aware of what is taking place, that they would want to endorse his program for 1980, Mr. Chairman. I think they would wish that there was a means of having this Minister replaced with one that has a little bit of common sense, Mr. Chairman, because the implications are indeed severe. And I regret that we have to face this kind of cynicism in the administration of public policy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly glad to see that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, in his many years in this House, is maturing in his attitude because, as we are all aware, and was pointed out by the Member for Gladstone, he was part of an administration which developed a road program in 1975 which eliminated, with the exception of some few miles of road, all constituencies west of the Red River and south of No. 1 Highway which, in his terms of reference that he has laid out tonight, was a very cynical thing to do, irresponsible, and totally unthinking of the future of the communities in that area and all the Chambers of Commerce in that area. I'm certainly glad to see that the Member for Lac du Bonnet has matured in his attitude since he was part and parcel of a government that pulled those kind of definite, blatant, political documents in the road program, quite the contrary to this one that I presented to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Highway No. 59 north of the city, is the map correct, that is, is the highway four-laned at this time to approximately east Selkirk?

MR. ORCHARD: Past east Selkirk.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just past east Selkirk. Is it correct that there is no work planned for this year past that point on Highway No. 59?

MR. ORCHARD: There's no grading of additional lanes, no.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. SHCROEDER: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I'm somewhat surprised. I am aware that the Land Acquisition Branch in this last year, and in fact not that many months ago, was negotiating for the purchase of property at Libau and in the general area of Libau, not on a long term basis, but I'm aware for instance of one farmer who received compensation because his pasture would not be used this coming spring because of course the graders would be there, the bulldozers, and they would be taking his fence down. He was compensated for that, and rightly so, because there was an assumption on the part of other departments of this government that this particular program would be going ahead, and that was in the year in 1979, that was not in 1977. And therefore, I really would like to know why it is that this particular project, which was obviously on the books for the Highways Department, was not off of the proposals for this year.

I've heard the Minister's explanations with respect to money. I agree that you can only pave so many miles of road in any one year. But I also note that there are many other areas where the province is working, where there is new construction going on, and where the proposal doesn't have the same age, that is they are of more recent vintage and there isn't the urgency. As the Member for Lac du Bonnet pointed out, this is not something which is required by a few people living out at Libau; this is something which thousands of people from the city utilize in going to the beach every weekend in the summertime. This is something which is not only for their convenience, but it is also for their safety. And there's more and more people going out there on summer weekends all the time, and it's more and more urgent. And placing that highway in limbo as compared to many of those highways in western Manitoba, I suggest, does smack of some decision-making based on considerations other than what is in the best interests of the majority of the people of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, some of the comments of the members opposite, particularly regarding Highways programs and their being drawn with purely political claims in mind, when I had a moment I picked up one of the previous Highways programs, the program for the year 1973-74, and simply transposed that program onto a road map and found that there were vast areas of Manitoba that were left out or left with a very sparse amount of Highways program, and by happenstance they happen to be areas that were at that time represented by Conservative members. At the same time, I notice that, where there is quite a lot of Highway's activity, happen to be in a couple of ridings that were at that time represented by members of the NDP government. --(Interjection)-- Well my map pretty well indicates that at that time . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield has the floor.

MR. ANDERSON: It would be the ridings of Springfield, which I now represent, and the riding of Lac du Bonnet.

A MEMBER: Which roads?

MR. ANDERSON: I'll direct the map over to you and you can follow through yourself. I think, Mr. Chairman, we have spent a lot of time at this matter, and I think the point that should be made is that we got into a case of the pot calling the kettle black, except some members opposite are not pots but pressure cookers. I just hope that, when they say their prayers this evening, that they include the line, "lead us not into the paths of self-righteousness."

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a). The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, thank you. I'm not going to belabour this very much longer, but I just wanted to, for the record, put into the record that the former Member for Ste. Rose in 1968, who was a Liberal, a member of the opposition, received \$425,000 worth of roadwork, maintenance and the whole bit; and then during the change of government in 1969 he did approach the new Minister of Highways and pleaded with him for more assistance for our road work, that he had been

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

ignored for 11 years previous to that, and that he did receive over \$300,000 more for the next year of work in the Ste. Rose constituency. And the following year, in 1970, he received \$860,000 for the Ste. Rose constituency. And it is only in 1971 that I was elected, but it did show some compassion on the part of the Highway Minister, Mr. Borowski, to look after the needs of a Liberal member that had been excluded from the highway program. I recall during the 70's, and perhaps the years that you mentioned, the Member for Springfield mentions that I do recall bringing after the Member for Roblin criticizing the government for lack of roadwork, and I have the records down in my office. I can bring them up tomorrow. But I remember that in one year the Member for Roblin got \$3,500,000 of roadwork in his constituency. That doesn't look to me as a government that would ignore everyone.

I wanted to read in the record the words of the Highway Minister of last year in which he says, and he's speaking about the road program for last year, "that geographically we, of course, try to distribute the load as fairly as we can." That's the words of the Minister of Highways last year. He was referring to distribution of the road program, and I can read it again, "geographically we, of course, try to distribute the load as fairly as we can."

And I ask members here to look at this program and what I have read in the record, and I have taken the pains - it took me about four hours to do it - but I have tabulated all the acquisitions of highways and the base and asphalt and the grade and gravel and second lift and the base and bituminous and base and concrete and so on in all the projects, and anyone that looks at that can't help but come to the conclusion that it's more than a coincidence that all the roadwork should be in the southern part of the province. But we're very happy that those people who live down there are getting roads. That's not the point. The point is, and it was well raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that there is regional disparity that takes place. There are going to be recessions coming into those areas where there's no road program, and every citizen of this province has the right to expect that road programs will be divided as equally as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just several comments with respect to the statements of the Member for Springfield in dealing with the road programs. It seems to me that it is in no way self-righteous to be talking about trying to determine why it is that a road program, a sensible road program, of twinning 59 north was discontinued. It is not only the fact that it was discontinued, but I suggest that there was money wasted on hurry-up acquisitions which were made on the assumption that that program would go ahead this year. There was money wasted on those acquisitions. There was no hurry in making those acquisitions because we're not building the highway, and I think that the Minister should take that into consideration. I hope he would comment on that whole area of going in there and having one department of government jumping in on the assumption that the other department needs the property, and then finding that the Department of Highways comes along and doesn't need the property at all.

We are talking here about a highway which is not for the benefit of the particular constituents or the constituency through which it runs. We are talking about a highway which is for the benefit of the people who live in the city of Winnipeg by and large, and those people are represented not only by people on this side of this table, but also by the Member for River Heights, the Member for St. Matthews. All of the city members have constituents who use that highway and who deserve the safety and convenience of a four-lane Highway No. 59.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)--pass; 6.(b)--pass; 6.(b). The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM Yes, on the highway-strengthening program could the . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, before we get to 6.(b), I believe that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Rossmere, asked the Minister a question and the question basically was this, now, could he explain the rationale for spending money on the acquisition of right-of-way if he is not going to use it.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

And here is one example of a piece of road where property was acquired for right-of-way and he's not using it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: On a point of order. I've been listening to the comments from the members opposite, and it seems to me that the Minister has, I think, in a fair way answered questions, and it seems we have had repetition here for the last hour-and-a-half. And I think, in all due respect to the comments from the Member for Burrows, that the Minister has given an answer to the honourable members when he talked to, discussed the matter with the Member for Lac du Bonnet. I think we've got repetition going here, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest that the Minister having given an answer, we should get on with the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In answer to the Member for Rock Lake, I really - the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On a point of order, there is no repetition. I repeat again, there was a question asked, there has been no repetition up to this point in time, there has been no repetition. But I must repeat again, for the benefit of the Minister, because a question was asked of him, to justify the acquisition of land for right-of-way which he is not using, and the example that was given was the extension of the four-laning of Highway 59.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We really have passed 6.(a). I've clearly looked around; we are now on 6.(b). If someone wants to speak on 6.(b), we're open.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If that's the decision of the Chair, fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose had the floor on 6.(b).

MR. ADAM: I had the floor, but if the Minister wants to reply to the member, I would be glad to allow him to do so, if he wishes to do so. As a courtesy.

MR. ORCHARD: I suspect the question is liable to resurface on highway strengthening, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose in that case.

MR. ADAM: I'd like to ask the Minister, we have \$16 million, \$4 million more than last year for highway strengthening. Could he advise where these roads are going, and do we use the same criteria as for the regular programs, we put more in the programs than what we actually spend? Or is this for specific roads?

MR. ORCHARD: This highway strengthening is a carry-forward of the highway strengthening cost-shared funding, that the previous administration had undertaken in 1974-75. And although we don't enjoy the benefit of any federal funds, as participation in that \$16 million that we're expending this year, this will be in the ongoing effort to complete the projects initiated.

MR. ADAM: Do you have a breakdown of those programs? Are they on the list here?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. ADAM: Well, I guess that's about it. I don't have any more questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(b)--pass; 6.(c)--pass; 6.(d)--pass; Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$76,415,600 for Highways and Transportation, Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects--pass.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: I think we can finish one more appropriation or two tonight, gentlemen. These next ones are very, very straightforward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have heard the motion of committee rise.

A COUNTED VOTE WAS TAKEN. MOTION DEFEATED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 86 7.(a) - The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister give us an idea here what's happening in the Air Services? How many planes do we have?

MR. ORCHARD: 14 aircraft, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: Is that a decrease or an increase?

MR. ORCHARD: It's the same as last year.

MR. ADAM: Are we leasing any?

MR. ORCHARD: We lease the MU-2, and we lease one Piper Aztec.

MR. ADAM: Where do we ask for the logging, the flight logs?

MR. ORCHARD: You mean the hours?

MR. ADAM: Yes. Do you have all the . . . ?

MR. ORCHARD: The total hours for government aircraft in 1979 were 5,381.8, and on leased aircraft, were 628.4.

MR. ADAM: What about the fire protection, the planes used in fire? Where do we find that?

MR. ORCHARD: Those are all in their division.

MR. ADAM: Are we using ours, or are they leased? Do we have any that . . . ?

MR. ORCHARD: We use CL 215, the Otters and the Turbo-Beavers, all in water bombing. We flew 262.6 hours on specific water bombing missions last year.

MR. ADAM: Do we have a figure on air ambulance?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, I believe so. A total of 195 flights were carried out, and we transported 220 patients and 219 escorts in the air ambulance.

MR. ADAM: What else was the air service involved in, as far as flights are concerned?

MR. ORCHARD: They provided, for instance, in the Attorney-General's Department, for the court parties in the north, and in general, passenger service for government employees to carry out their duties in various areas of northern Manitoba, and in southern Manitoba.

MR. ADAM: The \$885,000, what does that cover? It doesn't cover salaries, what does it cover?

MR. ORCHARD: That's the net expenditure in this appropriation. It includes salaries and the operating expenses of the aircraft less the recoveries from other appropriations, in other words, departments using our aircraft are charged a usage fee for the aircraft and so we recover \$1.5 million, but our total expenses are \$2,385,500, so we have an expenditure of \$885,000 combination expenditure.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make this statement for the record, it's interesting that in this particular appropriation, the Minister appears to have figures right down to the tenth of an hour in terms of aircraft usage, he knows exactly how many passengers were transported, the various types and categories and so forth, but when we asked him earlier about his road construction program, whatever number of miles was acquired or paved, that information he did not know. But in this instance, he seems to have these figures. I'm just merely making that comment for the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that there were 262.6 hours flown in the activity of water bombing. Is that by government-owned aircraft, or is that by both publicly-owned aircraft and leased aircraft, or tendered aircraft?

MR. ORCHARD: Those are the hours logged on government aircraft.

MR. USKIW: Is the Minister in a position to tell us how many hours were logged on aircraft that were either leased or hired?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman, like in firefighting, they would be retained by the Department of Natural Resources. The only records we have are our aircraft, which were used by natural resources for firefighting, which are the 262.6 hours.

MR. USKIW: So the Minister then, is suggesting that the proper place to find out information of that kind would be with another department.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, because I don't have that figure here. All I have is the utilization of government aircraft, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: There's one additional SMY here, I see on the sheet. Is that another pilot?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes. We have to have a co-pilot to satisfy MOT regulations for the MU-2. That's for that extra pilot.

MR. ADAM: When did that regulation come in?

MR. ORCHARD: Just this year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)--pass; 7.(b)--pass; 7.(c) - the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister under this appropriation, whether there is to be any increase in the rates charged to other departments in the coming year?

MR. ORCHARD: The recoveries under (c) reflect an upward revised rate schedule for certain things. We haven't changed the rate schedule since 1974, we're upgrading it, and that's reflected in the 275,000.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister tell us what the increase is on average, or in aggregate, for the coming year, as to last year for the same number of miles?

MR. ORCHARD: Some planes remained the same, and I don't have the revised - we haven't adopted it; we plan to adopt it; it is figured into the Estimates under the new schedule. The MU-2, if memory serves me correctly, and the Aztecs will increase about 10 percent or so. It's not a major increase that we've got. There are a couple of aircraft that aren't changing, if memory serves me right, in terms of their charge-out rate.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. WALDING: Is ten percent then, the maximum that it is being increased by . . .?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I wouldn't want to commit myself to ten percent being the maximum. There may be one plane that goes up slightly more.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, this item indicates an increase of approximately 20 percent. Obviously the increase in rates accounts for a part of that. Can the Minister tell us what the remainder of the increase is accounted for? Is it to be accounted for by increased use of the aircraft by people from other departments?

MR. ORCHARD: That is part of the budget, part of the increase as well.

MR. WALDING: Does the Minister have a figure for that amount?

MR. ORCHARD: Not specifically broken up, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Could the Minister perhaps supply us with that figure at some future time in his Estimates to indicate what this particular branch expects its load to increase by?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, that can be provided, but I would caution the member that I won't be able to provide that tomorrow because we haven't adopted the new rate schedule. We have one proposed. It isn't formally adopted and it may not get adopted for, say, a couple of weeks, depending on the Cabinet agendas. When adopted, it will certainly become public knowledge.

MR. WALDING: Perhaps the Minister misunderstands me, Mr Chairman. I wasn't asking for the specific rates of increase per passenger mile, or however it's figured out for the individual planes. I wanted an explanation of why this amount has gone up by 20 percent, and the Minister has told me that it's partly due to an increase in fares and partly due to an increased expected utilization. Now, I want to know what the expected increase in utilization is, and from that I would assume that the balance would be in increased fares. Now, if there is some other component in there, perhaps the Minister could advise me of that as well.

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(c)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$885,500 for Highways and Transportation Air/Radio Services--pass.

MR. WALDING: Committee rise.

MR. ORCHARD: Why don't we try one more Item; it is just a small one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, just on that one, I would like to suggest that some urban members would like to be here on Aids to Cities and Towns, and I think it would be unwise to proceed with that at this stage. There are many urban considerations there.

MR. WALDING: To the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I know at least one of my colleagues from the north who wishes to be present when this is discussed, presumably for winter roads - I am just guessing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Committee is sitting. If they wanted to talk, they should have been here.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am at the hands of the Committee. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, well, there are two Committees sitting concurrently, and it is difficult for all members to attend both. It might be that certain issues might arise in one Committee that are of concern to them, and hence it makes it difficult for them to be present at the other. I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this might be an appropriate time for the Committee to rise, seeing that we only have one Item left to deal with, plus the Minister's salary - well, that and the Motor Vehicle Branch - and that that could be proceeded with tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I might make the suggestion that any member, and I know that some of the members, probably the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Churchill would like to make enquiries on winter roads for instance. As the Honourable Member for Burrows has pointed out, Minister's Salary is a wide open debate, and those things can be asked at that point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, if members of the Committee, my colleagues and others, may wish to obtain some detailed explanation or breakdown of the various appropriations, it will not be possible to obtain that under 1.(a) Minister's Salary, because the Minister will not have his staff with him at that time. So I think it would be more appropriate to accommodate the members of the Committee by having the Committee rise at this time and proceeding with Items 8. and 9. the next time the Committee sits.

I would therefore move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

#### SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to page 16 of the Main Estimates, Department of Civil Service. We are under resolution No. 25, 1. Civil Service Commission, (a) Salaries--pass. . . . The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN:..Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the committee last met I was engaged in defending what I consider to be an attack on the previous government. I was a member of that government, and it was suggested that our government had offered the chairmanship of the Liquor Control Commission to Gurney Evans. And if we had done that, Mr. Chairman, I would have considered that to be nothing but a political appointment in the most opportunistic sense of the word, political, the sense that it is being used.. Mr. Evans was a Cabinet Minister of the previous administration, I respect that. He had no particular qualifications in the area of liquor control, and there are numerous people who could fill that job who were competent and also in line with government thinking. It would seem to me that for a government to ignore such people in favour of appointing a previous conservative cabinet minister would be an unusual thing and I do not believe - I didn't certainly participate in making any offer - but if an offer was made I am certain that there was no Cabinet approval of such an offer, and I don't believe that such an offer would have gone through Cabinet, and that Mr. Evans would certainly not have been appointed. And I say that, Mr. Chairman, because I have been listening in this House from time to time about the criticism of "political appointments", and they have come in as irrational a fashion from the Premier of the Province as from anybody, who kept referring to the fact that there were New Democrats on the payroll and what have you.

It would seem to me that if the Premier of the Province, the leader of the conservative party, was elected to government, he would want around him people who could pursue the objectives of his government. And if he didn't want such people

around him, then it seems to me that it's an awful waste of time going out to people, asking them to support the Conservatives, collecting money, working for Conservatism, and then, not having the expertise and the capacity and the will to implement a conservative program. And it goes the same, Mr. Speaker, for New Democrats. If the New Democratic Party in government is not prepared to have as its main policy, people, advisers, competent people who are also completely in tune with the objectives of the government, then it seems to me that they conduct the greatest misrepresentation, running around the province saying that they want to get elected, asking people to give them donations of 50¢, \$1.00, \$2.00 and \$10.00, asking people to go out and pass out literature, asking people to work on getting them elected, to find that when they are elected, they say it doesn't matter who we have working around us. And if the New Democratic Party is proposing that that is the way they are going to behave in government, Mr. Chairman, then I think that it would be a very, very great affront to the people who put them there.

So I, Mr. Chairman, have absolutely no hesitation in saying, that when I was in government, I was looking for competent people whom, I repeat, I would more likely find amongst my friends than amongst my enemies, and when we appointed Doug Duncan to be chairman or head of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Chairman, it did not pass by us that he was a competent person, that he was a New Democrat and that he was a New Democratic Party candidate in several elections; that when we appointed Mark Eliason as Chairman of the Planning Secretariat, we did not close our eyes to the fact that he was a very active New Democrat.

When we were looking for a person to fulfill the position of Deputy Minister of Mines, I can tell the honourable members of the House quite frankly, that I was looking for somebody who I could be satisfied would be in tune with the mining policy that was going to be generated by the government, and that Mr. Jim Cawley was a former New Democratic Party candidate, a former deputy minister, in a CCF New Democratic Party government and a very, very competent person in the area of mineral resources. When we were looking for someone to work in the Education Department, it did not escape us the Lionel Orlikow was a New Democratic Party candidate, a New Democrat, and one who would be in tune with the policies of the government.

When we were looking, Mr. Chairman, for people in different fields --(Interjection)-- pardon me? Well, you know, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa says that he wasn't capable. I say that he was very capable, that he was considered to be capable by Conservative administrations in the Province of Ontario - I believe he worked for the Provincial Government in Ontario - that he was considered one of the best educators in the Province of Manitoba when he was here, or grew up in this province and worked in this province; he was very highly regarded as an educator. But really, we don't have to argue about the competence; you can say he wasn't, I can say he was. I can tell you that we looked for competent people and we also looked for people who could do that job, as far as I was concerned, and I believe that that is generally how the government chose people.

Now, that doesn't mean, Mr. Chairman, nor could it mean or should it mean or would it ever happen that the Civil Service becomes loaded with people of one political complexion; that would be wrong. And most, a vast majority, I would say that more than 99% of people who are selected to work for the public service are selected through the Civil Service Commission. They are based on qualifications and they are hired. And the names, when they are presented at the ministerial level - quite often we have to screen people - the names meant nothing in terms of knowledge as to who they were. They were selected on a . . . Mr. Speaker, three names were sent up by the Civil Service Commission. The minister screened them. I know I screened them and the three names meant nothing to me, and if the Honourable Minister will look beyond the Deputy Minister in the department - because he took over the department I was in - if he will look beyond the level of deputy minister he will not find any suggestion of any appointments made on the basis of politics, none whatsoever.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am telling you that he will not find it because it was not done. And I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, not because I am at all sensitive towards the making of appointments on the basis of political sympathy in those areas where the thrust of the government depends on it.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

In the development corporation they will tell you that the people that I named were, as often Conservatives in the business world as they were New Democrats, but that was a particular field in which expertise of various kinds was needed and obtained. But the general level of appointments - when Bill Janssen was appointed to be the Deputy Minister of Agriculture I am certain that the Minister of Agriculture appointed Bill Janssen on the basis that Bill Janssen was considered by him to be completely in tune philosophically with the position of the government in power. Now, is there anything wrong with that? And if there isn't, why are we, both sides from time to time, protesting that it occurs. I find it ludicrous! Well, the Honourable Member for St. George says, "who's protesting"? Perhaps he was not in the house; I've heard it protested on both sides. I've heard it protested that a Deputy Clerk of the Legislature was once a Conservative, or let's say he was a committed Conservative and worked as the president of the constituency. I tell the honourable members that every Deputy Returning Officer that was appointed by the New Democratic Party Government in power, wherever we could find one was a committed New Democrat.

The Deputy Returning Officer in Inkster was the president of the New Democratic Party in Inkster and they are not here, outside, they're where the votes are being counted. And that wasn't one situation, that wasn't my situation, that was the situation throughout, and they happen to do very conscientious jobs; they happen to do very conscientious . . . and have done. Because a person is a member of a political party doesn't mean, or it never has meant to me, that suddenly he gives up his integrity; suddenly he becomes a person of no character; suddenly he becomes a person who will do anything for a political party. It is not that way, Mr. Chairman. People can be honest, strong character people of integrity and belief in a political party and support the political party. I think that there about 57 of such people in this room when the House is full.

So, I say this, and I had not intended to speak, but I was told that my government offered the chairmanship of the Liquor Control Commission to Gurney Evans before we gave it to Frank Syms. I defend the previous government as not having done that. Maybe somebody suggested it to him, but I do not believe that such an appointment would have gone through the Cabinet of the previous New Democratic Party government.

HON. KEN MacMASTER, (Thompson): Well, I was looking for the Member for Fort Rouge. I assume that maybe the lady is in the other committee; I'll save the answers for her when she returns.

It's been suggested before but denied by others but it is the first time that the selection of people within a department under the NDP administration has been so widely and well expressed. And the system, of course, which was in place when the members opposite, has been expounded this evening that in fact there was a selection of three people and those three people's names were sent up to the Minister for him to select one of those three. That's interesting; I have suggested that before and it's been denied by some people. --(Interjections)-- The system that we are --(Interjection)-- That's interesting; I'm glad that's on the record.

The system that we are proposing this evening, which we've outlined extremely thoroughly to you, is that the departments themselves will . . . And I won't go reading all through the details of how the departments will make their selection but the Deputy Minister is where the one final choice of departmental people will go. That, I think, is a difference worth noting.

I can't totally agree with the Member for Inkster when he says that anywhere and all places political parties should pick their own people, prominent people --(Interjection)-- Well, if I can just finish, maybe the Member for Inkster may feel that I should be corrected but the one area that I think that he did say which was of interest was that Mr. Duncan had been a prominent card-carrying NDP member and that he had run as an NDP candidate, I think he said on more than one occasion, and that he was put in as a full-time Commissioner, really, partly in charge of the Civil Service Commission. That particular appointment I have some reservation about whether a political party should make that precise type of appointment, Mr. Chairman.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster. Might I just mention to the Honourable Member for Inkster, if you have a point of order you are allowed to stand in your place and you would be recognized immediately.

MR. GREEN: I know but the Minister wanted to continue and I let him because I thought maybe he would qualify what he had said but he didn't.

He said that I said that in any and all places; I said that in 99 percent of the places it would have no relationship to politics. I said in the top policy-making areas where the thrust of the government is a part of the person's job, but I said that in 99 percent of the places that I thought that one should have - there should be no regard to politics. It's a straight matter of choosing people on the basis of competence. So I disagree that I said that in and all no matter where, I think, were his words, places, I never said that.

MR. MacMASTER: Well the point that the member has made is well taken. He's saying that in top policy-making areas, which in the reign of the members opposite would have been under the NDP policy philosophy, then the point is made that a particular NDP candidate who has run several times, a prominent NDP card-carrying member was put in the Civil Service Commission full-time position job to carry out NDP policy. It all ties together. That's precisely the words used by the member opposite, they should be put in high policy area positions; high policy area positions, prominent NDP candidate, NDP card-carrying member put in a high policy position as a full-time Civil Service Commissioner, making decisions as they relate to the operation of the Civil Service in the province of Manitoba under the NDP ring. That's what the thread of circumstances and words say to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member makes an interesting syllogism logically. He said that because I said that I would look for people of competence to put in high areas of policy thrust decisions where the policy thrust of the government is important, he says that by virtue of that any New Democrat who is put in the position is in such a position; which, you know, that may be the mentality of the Minister if he wants to choose it that way. But that's not true; I didn't say New Democrats shouldn't be put in other positions - and the Civil Service Commission is not a position and I so indicated - in which you have a policy thrust. The Civil Service Commission is for hiring people where there is no policy thrust, and I said that. I said that as I was on my feet that 99 percent go through the Civil Service Commission where politics is not a feature, but I certainly didn't say, nor would I say, that a New Democrat is precluded from having that kind of position. I said that he shouldn't be in the other position but I didn't exclude him from the position of being a Civil Service Chairman and I specifically said, Mr. Chairman, that I do not regard a New Democrat, who is chosen to do a non-political job, as suddenly losing his integrity or his honesty or being a person of no character. He goes into the job and does it properly, and I certainly have no objection to the way in which Mr. Duncan did it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass - the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, before we broke for the supper hour, did not answer questions that I posed as to the actual procedure that is now undertaken by the departments that have a contract with the Civil Service Commission in carrying out their . . . I'm sorry I didn't get a copy of the contract that the Minister promised that he would give me and also he didn't indicate the procedures.

While he is getting that contract, I'd like to know from the Minister whether or not with those departments that the Civil Service Commission is not directly involved in the personnel administration. He didn't answer as to how many staff have been hired by the government to carry out the personnel functions that were originally carried out by the Civil Service Commission staffing officers and the staff within the Commission, whether there have been transfers of staff from the Commission to the Departments or who or what has been hired and how the process works, whether or not the one personnel officer that may be for example in the

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

department of Municipal Affairs, whether he makes the sole decision of the recommendation to the Deputy of who shall be the qualifying candidate or candidates. I'd like to know that.

The Minister indicated that there was a procedure whereby three people were selected or recommended to the Deputy or to the Minister, and those three names were the choice of the Minister. That is only one of the procedures that was involved and I want to tell the Minister that that was one of the procedures that was involved when we were in government. The other procedure was, I believe - and I stand to be corrected - there were some Ministers who did not want to even have a choice of three candidates. Some of the Ministers in our government said that you pick me and recommend to me the best candidate that you think should fill a job, and there was only one name that was submitted to the authority, and the ultimate authority, of course, is the Minister in charge of that department.

So there were really two procedures that were involved in the selection process. But I, Mr. Chairman, want to know from the Minister --(Interjection)-- Although I was not the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission when we came to government - I was not a Minister - and I take guidance from my colleagues who said that the procedure was a carry-over from the previous Tory administration in respect to the Civil Service Commission. So that the process was virtually not changed when we took power in 1969 and carried on virtually until 1977, until this last year, is where we see, or at least the impression is given to me by just my few questions that I was not aware of, now that we have a complete different approach in terms of the recommendations, in terms of the personnel recommendation and selection process within or without the Civil Service Commission because they are no longer directly involved.

The Minister cited the Act as giving the powers to the Commission to delegate authority and I certainly respect that comment that gives the authority, but I would like to know what involvement the Commission has in terms of looking at the qualifications of the candidate. Is there someone from the Commission that looks at the qualifications of the candidate in the process that is now in effect with respect to those five departments that the Minister indicated? Are they involved in the tests that are given? Who makes the final recommendation? Is it the personnel officer within the department himself or are there more people within the department involved in it?

I know that in terms of the previous system, if I recall, there usually was the personnel officer involved. If the department did have that personnel officer, he was involved in the selection process. It usually was the director or some other person delegated from the branch of that department that would sit on that selection board in conducting the interview, and the third person would be the staffing officer from the Civil Service Commission. There could have been from time to time in terms of higher, middle or upper management positions that there would have been somebody from the government in terms of looking at the senior positions from the Premier's office that would have been involved in that as one of the other board members. I am going by memory but I think that was generally the selection process that was handled.

I would like to know from the Minister, in some detail, as to what the procedure is now.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I laid out in reasonable detail and talked for substantial time and I have put together an agreement, the terms and conditions, the responsibilities, the signature sheet, the criteria for delegation, and the principles of the staffing audit; I have put together the whole package for the Member for St. George, and I think he will find, in all respect, that everything that I have said to him is in there and possibly questions that he hasn't even thought of seriously you will find in there and it will only take you a minute or two to read it. Really, it is very basic. It follows along Civil Service Commission recommendations and the authority; it is all written out very emphatically. In fact, I have added some extra sheets that the member didn't even ask for, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To get back to the Minister's Report, I agree that the government does have the responsibility when it comes to the appointment of senior officers. I think that, as has been pointed out by the Member for Inkster and others, that Deputy Minister and ADMs are senior positions where policies of the government are carried out and I have no doubt that the new Deputy Ministers and ADMs that have been appointed by this government across this Chamber have been people who have at least the same philosophy as the present government. I would expect them to do that. And since we now find out that the process of recruitment and selection, in five of the departments out of the 17 or 18 departments that we have, has been turned over to the departments and the final selections are being made by politically-appointed Deputy Ministers. The appointment of these people who will be appointed could just as well come from the Minister, because I am sure they are in tune with the Minister's thinking. I mean that's basic.

Perhaps maybe one of the mistakes that we made is that we didn't remove some of the Deputy Ministers when we came in. I don't think we removed one Deputy Minister when we took government in 1969. There was certainly not the witch hunt that went on when this government that we see here before us today took office. There was a witch hunt and it went down a helluva lot lower than the Deputy Ministers and ADMs. It went right down into some of the secretarial staff; that is where it went. It was just about as bad as what happened in Saskatchewan when Ross Thatcher took over, where they fired some of the cleaning staff because they might have been politically motivated one way or the other. That is about the only people that you didn't touch; that is about the only people. And to say that you are so politically pure is utter nonsense and you know it; you all know it over there on the Treasury Benches. I don't blame the people on the back benches because I was a backbencher; I wasn't privy to what went on. But you are the Minister; there is only one more of you in here right now, but you are the people that are making the decisions.

I just wonder what is going to be the final function of the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps it is going to be as it is stated here on Page 7, "The function of the Civil Service Commission is to act as an appeal body with respect to appeals on all position reclassification initiated by employees and all appealable matters emanating from employees not covered by the provisions of the collective agreement."

And if we keep going the same way as we see the present wage negotiations, where we don't even know if it is a matter of policy of this present government that certain people will be taken out of the collective bargaining unit, well they maybe have a big job then, because maybe that is the way that they are hoping to go to destroy the whole collective bargaining unit, have them all outside the collective bargaining unit.

But I have to agree with the Member for St. George. Sure I know that The Civil Service Act states that this is a way and the Minister can say that it is done elsewhere the same way, but you have, by the actions of your government in the past 27 months, have really put the Civil Service in Manitoba into such a position that there is tremendous fear; there is fear of civil servants to be seen, fear of even being seen talking to members of the opposition because they may not know where the axe will fall. That is how you have scared the Civil Service in this province. Civil servants that I have talked to before are now afraid even to talk to me or be seen talking to me and I am sure that is true of other members on this side of the House. That is the kind of fear that you have instilled in the Civil Service, and certainly I think that is not the way that the Civil Service ought to operate.

I think in the very senior echelons of the Civil Service, yes, people that are going to be appointed DM and ADMs and senior advisory personnel should, when they enter that Civil Service and those appointments are made, know that their tenure may be only as long as that government is in power. But when you start reaching down into the lower echelons and the lower ranks of the Civil Service, such as that government did, then I think you are going to destroy the whole integrity and the Civil Service Commission as it has operated in this province.

Just what function is going to be left to the Civil Service Commission and to the Board of Commissioners? It was only because we put so much pressure on you last year that your position as for the appointments of the people, it was almost



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

an appointment that you behave yourself or we'll make sure that you come off, in violation, I might say, Mr. Chairman, of The Civil Service Act that the Minister is so wont to quote today. To hell with the Civil Service Act last year, because it suited your purposes, we will operate the way we want to. And it was only because of pressure that was put on from this side of the House that you made the appointments permanent. Making appointments for two months, three months, six months, a year, in direct violation to the Act.

So don't come in here and pretend that you are lily pure white, because you are not. The people of Manitoba are going to be the final judges of that and they will. You can call the election anytime you like and you will be sitting on this side of the House and we will be over there and not very many of them at that will be over here.

That is the sort of a situation that is in place here in Manitoba today and so, again, I say that I really wonder just what is going to be the function of the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps the Minister can give us his thoughts of what the final function of the Civil Service Commission will be, because I know he says at the present time only nine of the 17 or 18 departments would qualify for to be able to have the recruitment and selection. Just what is the criteria for deciding that? Who decides that, the Minister? The Treasury Benches over there? Who decides that? The Civil Service Commission? The Commissioners? I think we need some answers to those questions too, Mr. Chairman.

Because you can set your criteria high or you can set your criteria low for a department to qualify, and when you have all, 17, just then what is going to be the function? An appeal function? Monitoring function? Is that what the Civil Service Commission is going to be? That and nothing else. Well, you may talk about a politicization of the Civil Service and accuse us of having politicized the Civil Service, but you're doing a pretty damn good job yourselves, a real good job, and a better job perhaps than we ever thought of doing.

You, perhaps have done more to harm the Civil Service in this province than any government previously.

MR. GREEN: It's a rat-infested nest.

MR. JENKINS: That's exactly what the Minister likes to say. And God knows what kind of a rat-infested nest we're going to inherit when we do become government.

MR. GREEN: That's Sterling's phrase.

MR. JENKINS: That's the sort of --(Interjection)-- weed them out, he's going to weed them out, and you know he even said to his people, I think it was to his MLAs to go out into the constituencies and weed those people out of their constituencies. . .

MR. GREEN: Traitors, they're all traitors.

MR. JENKINS: Chase them out of the province. Talk about hate-mongering, we have seen nothing but hate-mongering by the First Minister of this province, every time he has spoken in this House. Just the other day, what was it he spoke of? New Democratic demonology, demonology. You would almost have thought that the members on this side had gone out and derailed a train. That is the sort of legacy that you are going to leave to governments in the future?

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

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wonder if you could provide for my guidance if the word "hate-mongering" is parliamentary? Would that be considered unparliamentary, hate-mongering?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, you'll have to wait your turn because I'm now looking up "rat-infested nest".

The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, after that line it's very hard to follow. But it's not me that introduced some of the terminology that's been in this House, and I think someone quoted the other day that Mr. Lyon, after nearly 2 1/2 years as Manitoba Premier is still fighting the election of 1977, and after 2 1/2 years in the province's top seat he is still attacking the former NDP government in the rat-infested nest. If the member takes offence to my use of the word hate-mongering, where was he on the night that the First Minister of this province was raising this type of terminology in this House? I don't think it's one of the no-nos in Beauchesne, either one of them.

But to get back to the discussion that we were having, the First Minister is not satisfied. I guess now he's going to spread out across the whole environs of the province, because he suggested that his members rout out these nests of socialism within their constituencies. Where's he going to chase all these people to? He's chased enough people out of this province already, is he going to chase the other half out?

So, Mr. Chairman, I really don't know just what this Civil Service Commission is coming to under this government. I'm certainly glad that I'm not one of the commissioners. I'm certainly glad. I don't think I could operate under the terms of reference that you're going to lay down for these people. They are going to be simply there, nothing more than rubber stamps for decisions of Deputy Ministers, of who's going to be appointed, who's going to be recruited; and those Deputy Ministers in turn are, and I think the Minister will agree with me, I'm sure I'll get agreement on this side at least, that these people that you are appointing as Deputy Ministers and ADMs are certainly people of your ilk. I'm sure they're not New Democrats that they're appointing as Deputy Ministers, not one. If you can tell me one DM that you've appointed that is a New Democrat, a card-carrying New Democrat, then I will stand to be corrected. But I certainly don't know of any that you have appointed, so the decisions, the final decision - and those are the Minister's words, and if I am misquoting him, I'm sure he'll get up and correct me - but he said, the final decision on who the appointment will be will rest with the Deputy Minister, a Deputy Minister of the same political stripe and thinking as the Minister. So the appointment could be just as well made by the Minister. At least it would be far more honest if it was made by the Minister. And there's nothing wrong with it. But to hide behind the Deputy Minister, who is your appointee, and who cannot defend himself in this House, and I'm not attacking those Deputy Ministers, but it is the criteria and the system that you have set up yourselves, the system that you have set up yourselves.

If the former Minister that was in charge of the Civil Service wishes to make a speech, I'm delighted to sit down and let her rise and make a speech, because her handling of the Civil Service was nothing to write home about either when she had that honour of representing that portfolio.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): No wonder you're choking, with all the lies you're telling.

MR. JENKINS: I'll just ignore that remark, Mr. Chairman, as it seems that you have ignored it as well.

I think that the Minister has a lot to answer for, I think that this government has a lot to answer for. I think your handling of the --(Interjection)-- and the Premier, I think the whole government that we have today, well, it's a problem that the people of Manitoba will solve.

I now would like to turn to Page 8 and deal with some of the items that are there. I would like to know who has filled Mr. Best's position, at what classification, was this an internal appointment or was the position advertised? Just how was the position filled? Was it filled by appointment of a Deputy Minister? Or was it done through the Civil Service Commission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm getting an answer for the last question. I have the answers for some of the others. The Member for St. George wanted to know if there was going to be additional staff. I answered that before supper but I'll answer it again. There was in fact personnel people within those particular departments

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

and they have had upgrading courses that were put on by the Civil Service Commission in the area of recruiting and had to in fact complete those courses satisfactorily, that was part of the criteria for the department, if the member reads it he'll find - and that's not meant as sarcasm because I gave it to him after he asked the question - but I outlined before that was part of the criteria for getting that particular authority.

Some of the Deputy Ministers that we are making reference to, I really don't think the Member for Logan means all that he was saying because four of the five departments that he's talking about, the Deputy Ministers in those particular departments range from 15 to over 20 years of service, good honourable service with this particular government. And I think the Member for Logan will think for a minute about the departments that I have been talking about and he'll think of the individuals involved. Some of them . . . If somebody wants to get up and ask a question that's fine. I'm trying to answer the questions that were asked. Some of them have served for 15 to 20 and some of them more than 20 years, good service for this particular province and the people in it.

The Member for Logan should be made aware that really this is a tightening up of the procedures as he will follow if reads the agreement. It's making it pretty tight as suggested and as directed from the Civil Service Commission. There were departments that had a thing called the Work Share Agreement. That was an arrangement that they had outside the Civil Service Commission, without authority of the Civil Service Commission, without any auditing process in place of the Civil Service Commission, without delegated authority by the Civil Service Commission as the Act called for. There were two such departments that were handling recruitment without any of those authorities or audits or delegated authority under the previous administration. I doubt if they worked very well; I doubt if the checks and balances in any way, shape or form could have been in place. I think really if the Member for Logan will think about it and have a look at what the Member for St. George has for criteria, agreements, stipulations, if you really have a good look at it and just think about it for a little while, I think you'll really agree that the system is being tightened up rather than permissiveness of any type of looseness in any way, shape or form.

But there were two departments under their administration, the NDP administration that had, (a) no delegated authority from the Civil Service Commission; they had no audit system in place; they did not have any kind of authorization but they did their own recruiting; and that was your community services portion of the health department and community colleges. Now that's a fact. We can talk about it or we don't have to talk about it but that type of arrangement was in place. I'm not suggesting to the Member for Logan or the Member for St. George, they're the two that have been debating this, that politics were played in those two particular departments. I'm not suggesting that at all, but I think you'll agree that if you want an arrangement of delegation outside the Civil Service Commission, that some of the criteria that the Member for St. George now has should be in place. The Act is permissive of it. The Act allows it. Other jurisdictions, provincial jurisdictions across the country are doing it quite successfully, the federal government's been handling things that way for 10 years.

There's another section in the Civil Service Act - Appointments Made Under Delegated Authority - a different one from what I referred to before. It says No. 21, quite clear, "where the Commission has delegated the responsibility for selection of personnel and selection procedures to an employing authority any appointment, promotion, or transfer, or reclassification of a person to a position by the employing authority is subject to (a) to this Act; (b) to the regulations; (c) to review by the Commission and to the decision given on any appeal." It's very clear, there's nothing unforeseen about what we're doing here this evening or what we're proposing to do and what in fact is partly in place.

There was another question that I had an answer for. The Member from Logan, I think, I don't think it was the Member for St. George, wanted a breakdown of the clerical, and secretarial and professional people. If he wishes to look at his chart I can give it to him very very quickly. The Civil Service Commission is a commissioner, of course, and one secretary. Underneath that is the Staff Relations Division which is one senior officer, 2 secretarial, and if you go over to the other side and we'll stay there now, it's Personnel Services Division, senior officer and 3 secretarial. Down below under Employing Health Counselling

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Services, there are 2 professionals, and 1 paraprofessional; and under the next there's 3 professional, 5 clerical/secretarial. If he wants that further broken down I can do that at a later date - 13 professional, I'm sorry. Under Staff Development there's 4.5 professional, 1 paraprofessional, and 2 clerical. Under the Personnel Records Administration there's 1 professional and 9 clerical types. Now again if he wishes that further broken down I can do that. Under the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, they're classified as 2 professionals. Compensation Service 3 professionals. Pension Group Insurance, 1 professional. Negotiations and Grievance Arbitration Services, 5 professionals and the Equal Employment Opportunity, the special programs there's 2 professionals in that and I told him the other 2 were the personnel trainees to be assigned throughout the Commission.

Bob Best is currently the Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission. The functions performed by Bob when he was given education leave, those functions were integrated with other functions that were transferred from the management committee and they're absorbed by the Director of Personnel Services. You may recall that there was a coming together of those particular functions and that's how that ultimately has worked out and now Mr. Best is the Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission for the province of Manitoba.

MR. JENKINS: So there is no one presently, that position that Mr. Best previously filled and absorbed in another position. Then there has been no new staff hired for that position?

MR. MacMASTER: No.

MR. JENKINS: In the breakdown the Minister, in Regional Offices, in the figures he gave me this afternoon, we have 1.5 staff man years and yet he tells me you have two professionals. Is that breakdown, one of these two people, is one of our professionals out of Staff Development and Training; is that where the other half of a staff man year comes from?

If the Minister will look down the left hand side of the page, as I hold it towards him, that person comes from Staff Development and Training to pick up that other half staff man year?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the Minister made mention, and I would like to get more, I was not aware of that comment but I would like to be a bit more aware of the instance he gave that - for my own information - that two departments of government were doing their own recruitment in the former government. I certainly accept that. I would like to know from the Minister whether the entire process that was conducted by the two departments he was talking about - I think he said Corrections and one other department - whether or not the staffing officers of the Civil Service Commission were involved in that process or were they not involved in that process at all in terms of being there when the recommendations for selections were going to the Minister or his authority?

MR. MacMASTER: The recruitment and the selections were made by the departments. If the departments at any time requested assistance they were given it. If the two departments in question made a selection, made a choice, they sent, in fact, the selection to the Commission, who stamped it and said, fine.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Is this the process that is going on now in the departments, the five that are involved in the contract?

MR. MacMASTER: None of the documentation that the Member for St. George was handled by myself. None of that was in place at that particular time, so it is a whole different situation all together. That is what I am trying to say to the member. He asked me before supper to try and explain to him what type of

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

safeguards there was. The documentation I have given him, my goodness, spells it out pretty tight, and that has been set out by the Civil Service Commission, not by me. That has been set down by them under the terms of their Act; they have laid it out. It is pretty tough stuff for the departments. The departments want to fill their positions faster, want to have that latitude; they want to send their people through the courses put on by the Civil Service Commission. If they want to do those kinds of things, then they are entitled to try under our procedure. That is simply what I am saying. Those types of procedures were not in place in any way, shape or form before. All the criteria and the auditing and the authorization, the delegation under the Act, running the personnel people to see if they are qualified.

You know, personnel people are like MLAs, there are good ones, medium ones, and ones less, and personnel people are the same way. The Civil Service Commission has run personnel people who have required this authority through a pretty tough course. If they qualify, that's part of the criteria; I forget whether it is point No. 2 or point No. 3, it is in the literature that I gave the Member for St. George. But those things weren't in place.

So simply what I say to the member is, let's get them in place, let's speed up the filling of positions and ultimately provide a better service to the citizens; let's build up the personnel personalities and the qualifications of the people within those departments. You know, some departments ran around saying they had a personnel officer. Well, what does that mean? Some companies in this country have personnel officers and I know some companies that have personnel officers in name only. They think it is the thing to do. It makes the employees feel better, it makes the union feel better, we got a personnel officer. Some of them are pretty ill-equipped, not because of being human beings who want to do a job but because they have never been given the opportunity to really get training in personnel work. I can't repeat again, I can't emphasize any stronger than I have said before, how terribly important good qualified personnel people are, good ones. That is part of this exercise. These departments now have excellent personnel people that were there before but never had the real opportunity to really test themselves and get themselves trained and get themselves in place and do a real meaningful job on behalf of that department. They can solve an awful pile of problems, a good personnel person.

You talk to unions across this country and they will tell you "X" company has just a heck of a great personnel officer or a good personnel department and we can sure get things resolved. A good company has a personnel man that can walk into the president's office just as quick as the comptroller; it is a very important function.

That is what we are trying to do and I really sincerely want to get that message across to the Member for St. George. I know, I have been there. I have been involved in that kind of work off and on, and I know I really feel pretty strong about how important it is. And that is what we are trying to do here.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the comments of the Minister. I don't think there has been any argument on my behalf that staff was ill-prepared or didn't have the qualifications in their role or didn't have the abilities to upgrade themselves or the like; there was not suggestion there. But what I wanted specifically to know from the Minister is whether or not the same procedure that he outlined that was handled by the other departments when the recruitment was done by that department, by the personnel people in those departments, those two that he mentioned previously, whether or not today the selection process, when the recommendations are made by the department, do they today go to the Civil Service Commission staffing officers to look at, prior to forwarding them on to the hiring authority?

MR. MacMASTER: No, today there is no need once all that criteria is in place, which was never in place before. There is no need, no need for that to go to the Commission to stamp it. What the departments do, in that literature that I gave the member, pretty damn clear, they have got to document every move they are making and those moves are going to be audited. If they are not following those precise tough stringent rules, they lose the authority; no question, no question, Mr. Chairman. That is the difference. Those things on that paper are pretty

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

encompassing. None of that was in place before. It is in place now, so it is a whole different situation altogether.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased with the comments that the Minister made. At least I now understand a little bit better, and maybe I didn't understand everything when I was responsible for that department for a short period of time. But, Mr. Chairman, that is where the Minister and I differ on the procedure that he has implemented.

The Minister has indicated that the authority for delegating the responsibility for selection of personnel can be made by the Commission and the Commission, I think 13(1) of the Act indicates "that where it is in the public interest to do so, the Commission may delegate the responsibility for selection of personnel and selection procedures to an employing authority", and as well he used the authority in Section 21 of the Act, Mr. Chairman. Then he made reference to the tight procedures that are within the agreement that the Minister has implemented between himself, his Deputy and the respective, or at least the Civil Service Commissioner and the Deputy Minister of Labour, his Deputy, and as well the officials of the department who the Deputy Minister of Labour may exercise the delegated recruitment and selection and the Personnel Director of the Civil Service Commission.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this Act, this contract I mean, not the Act, this contract certainly does not live up to the expectations that the legislation, I think, demands of the Minister and his government. I believe that this contract certainly contravenes the intent of the legislation that is now on the books. Mr. Chairman, the contract gives the authority to the department to waive competition when deemed appropriate, providing justification accompanies the appointment documents received by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated today and he revealed to us that no longer is there a routing of the recommendations through the Civil Service Commission, it is done directly within the government departments. The whole procedure has now gone, circumvented the Commission entirely, that now has been implemented by this government.

Mr. Chairman, they have completely put the Civil Service Commission out in left field. Nicely at least they have used the verbiage in the agreement that they can audit, they can do all kinds of things with respect to the selection process. I have no argument, Mr. Chairman, that the departments can do the necessary recruitment work, the bulletining, the describing of the positions in consultation with the personnel management within the Civil Service Commission. I don't see any difficulty with any of the departments if that is the wishes of the government to go that route, using that route, with one exception, Mr. Chairman, with the exception that I believe the Act indicates that the Commission shall determine merit for appointment, promotion or transfer to a position by competitive examination, which may take the form of one or more of the following: a review of documentary evidence of qualifications for the position, as one of the criteria that the Commission shall employ. Mr. Chairman, if you examine the document, the agreement, nowhere in the agreement is there any comment or mention that the Commission shall review the documentary evidence of qualifications for the position. Mr. Chairman, Section 12 of the Act, which is, I believe, one of the operative sections of the Act, which says that for each position filled under this agreement a file for audit purposes shall be kept consisting of the current job description, all advertising data, all applications received, lists of the selection criteria, lists of the board members, lists of questions asked at the interview, the Selection Committee rating of each candidate, method of screening out applicants, copy of letter of offer and any amendments, other related correspondence: example, requests for and replies to, reasons for non-selection. That is what is to be kept by the Department with respect to the selection process.

But what is demanded by the legislation, Mr. Chairman, of the Civil Service Commission in terms of its authority, and I have just given one, there are four others, written or oral tests or a combination of tests designed to reveal knowledge, aptitude, intelligence, personal qualities and competence of the candidates in relation to the duties of the position; interviews conducted with a view of determining the technical and personal qualifications for the position and for such other purposes as the Commission considers appropriate; trade and practical

tests designed to reveal and measure technical knowledge and skills related to the duties of the position, Mr. Chairman, those four areas. The legislation indicates that the Commission "shall determine merit for appointment". Mr. Chairman, what does the agreement say? I believe the agreement indicates, in Section 6 it says and I quote, "Staff of the Civil Service Commission may participate in the recruitment selection process on the request of either party". Mr. Chairman, there is a complete removal of responsibility from the Commission to the government, to the Minister responsible, albeit he wants to say that it is his deputy that is going to be making the decision; even in the agreement he wants to create the illusion at least for cosmetic purposes to state that it is the Deputy Minister of Labour who shall receive the reports with respect to the effectiveness of this agreement, that it is not he who will be receiving the reports, that he will have no involvement in judging whether this agreement is effective or not.

Mr. Chairman, let him not hide behind this sham that he is indicating is a strengthening of the procedures. Mr. Chairman, this Minister, who indicates to us that he has now brought in such an agreement as to strengthen the procedures in respect to selection and recruitment within the Civil Service is a bunch of garbage. Mr. Chairman, that is putting it bluntly and very mildly, because, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that he has circumvented the legislation, that the intent of The Civil Service Act was to provide an effective role of the Civil Service Commission within the recruitment and selection process. He has now side-stepped the Commission and what has he done, Mr. Chairman, to try and create an impression that he has done more for the Civil Service Commission? Mr. Chairman, what they have done is in effect taken the old staff of Management Committee, in terms of the personnel management team, the Staff Relations Officers, that groups of people who were tied to Management Committee where their functions were kept separate from the Commission, because the Commission was considered the appellent body to decisions made by Management, and now we have, for a nice purpose of indicating, well, look, we have strengthened the Commission, we have taken over these functions and brought them under the Commission, the Commission is a lot stronger than it was, but we have in a very neat way, Mr. Chairman, circumvented the legislation and if ever there can be an accusation made of the government that the Civil Service will be politicized, here is the evidence, Mr. Chairman, with respect to this agreement. The agreement is very clear in terms of who shall make the selection.

If the Minister is indicating to us, or attempting to indicate to members on this side that he does not give direction to his Deputy in day-to-day management, where he indicated that, look, there have been Deputies within the Civil Service who have had 15 or 20 years service, look, they're not going to do anything. Are you suggesting, Mr. Minister, that if you give an order to your Deputy that he will not obey you? Mr. Chairman, if I was the Minister of a department and the Deputy was not prepared to obey me . . . What did your Premier do? He fired them. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that you would do the very same thing if you gave an order to your Deputy that he did not want to obey. I think there would be a quick falling out between yourself and your administrative arm, because there is no way that the Deputy Minister of the government, following your direction, will not, not only agree, but carry out the wishes of his Minister. He may argue with him and say, look, this is the kind of problems that you will face if we carry them out, but the fact of the matter is he will carry that order out.

If the Minister is trying to leave that impression that this will not occur, I suggest to you, Sir, that he is fooling no one but himself, that he is now, by the very process that he has set up within those five departments, Mr. Chairman, circumvented the Civil Service Commission and his merit principle just went out in a puff of smoke, Mr. Chairman.

If there is an intent of the government to circumvent the merit principle, this is where it is. This is a very neat way of doing it. If the government says, I want to have the direct responsibility in terms of the hiring process, I will respect him of doing that and this is the way they can carry it out, but not to create a sham and say that we will have the merit principle carried on within the Civil Service, while in effect they are circumventing the legislation and the intent of the legislation of the Act, Mr. Chairman.

And if ever, in the history of this Legislature, a government and a Minister can stand up here before us and try to leave the impression that they are holier

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

than thou, certainly we have evidenced that tonight by this Minister when he tried to create the impression this was the first time that he has come under fire in his Labour and Civil Service Estimates. Mr. Chairman, he may have slid past some of our members, but he certainly hasn't slid past the members on this side of the House with respect to the issue dealing with the Civil Service. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister, if he is really sincere in what he is doing, will amend the legislation dealing with what his responsibilities are and he will remove those contracts that are now in place.

I have no argument with the procedures with respect to the way, the recruitment and the selection process and the auditing process is concerned, but Mr. Chairman, I have an argument with the intent of the Minister in the way he is trying to portray this whole situation.

And Mr. Chairman, this Minister is certainly no credit, no credit to the Civil Service position of this province.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, it gets more enjoyable the longer I listen to the Member for St. George. I don't know how many times he's going to pop his head up and get himself in trouble, but he's managed to dig himself a few more holes in his last few minutes of rambling and nonsense. I wonder what he thought the NDP was doing when they were in government and they had two departments hiring, recruiting and selecting people, with no authority under the Act. He's made reference to the Act, Mr. Chairman; they had no authority under the Act They weren't given the authority in any way, shape or form. They had no authorization in any way, shape or form. And there was no audit in place to even see if those apartments were doing a job or not.

What were they doing in those days? I have said here, in kindness, and I insist on staying with the words, that I do not suspect in any way that politics were being played at that particular time. But believe me, Mr Chairman, when that was taking place in those two departments, talk about violation of the Act; total, complete disregard for the Act was taking place. And the Member for St. George was the Minister in this province responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Whether he held the job in that particular time or not, he was the Minister. He should have known. He should understand the Act. Obviously again, he doesn't understand the Act.

The Act, let's read it, the same section he was talking about. But he didn't want to talk about the whole section. He just wants to pick words here and there. It's called taking things out of context. The same section he talked about, "notwithstanding any provision", and he went on to say, "reviewing the documents, evidence, qualifications, written or oral, 13.3". Missed a few words, Mr. Chairman. It says, "notwithstanding any provision of this Act, but subject, as in this Act otherwise provided." Pretty important words. And I suppose some wise person some place, somewhere in the past, put that in there. Because if you don't have "subject, as in this Act otherwise provided"; those are words that are common in collective bargaining agreements right across this country. And what it says is the management of this particular company has all the rights to hire and fire and do all the other things of manager operations, subject to the conditions of this particular agreement. And then it goes on, in the agreement, to take away the management rights. Pretty familiar; pretty familiar.

Maybe it's familiar to me because after 20 years in union halls screaming and yelling about contracts, I have an idea of what that means, so I'll excuse the Member for St. George if he doesn't understand. But he should read, he should be able to read. "Subject, as in this Act otherwise provided", and right up above his nose, if he'd read that, it would say, in 13(1) "and where, in it's opinion, it is in the public interest to do so, the Commission may delegate the responsibility for a selection of personnel and selection procedures to an employing authority."

Now, I'm not a lawyer, but you don't need a lawyer to read that. That tells you, but "subject in this Act to otherwise provided", it means otherwise within the Act it provides you can do other things. And that's what has been chosen to be done by the Commission in this particular instance. Otherwise provided, the section above says, they can delegate. And they're choosing to delegate under some pretty stiff rules.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

If the Member for St. George would just think for a minute of the kind of rules that prevailed with those two particular departments under their reign in this province. There was no rules. The Act gives you the authority to delegate but the Civil Service Commission under their conditions, their times, did not delegate that authority, but they did it. Now, that's breaking the Act, Mr. Chairman, that is breaking the Act.

Let's talk about a couple more things. Again, I excuse the Member for St. George because he doesn't understand agreements, obviously he doesn't. Obviously he's never read a Manitoba Government Employees' Association agreement and quite obviously he's never read the Act even though he was chairman responsible and held those responsibilities, because he'll find if he reads them - and he can do a little home work tonight, he can read them and think about them - he'll find a promotion. He's concerned about us waiving the competition for promotion. Promotion, that particular word within the MGEA agreement and the Act, it's permissible to promote within the Civil Service without a competition.

I'm sure I gave him the example of the Clerk II that moved to a Clerk III. You don't have to have a competition. That's permissible, agreed to by the union, internal promotion. Transfer, you don't have to a competition for a transfer. A person can laterally transfer. People can do that. Where the competition takes place, he read out what has to be done in the case of a competition. I don't have that in front of me; I gave him my copy. But he read it out and it sounded pretty clear to me. They've got to put it in a folder. It going to be audited by the commission and that right will be taken away if it's not done right. But those personnel people have run through the course. They've run through a course to teach them how to recruit, to teach them to check about the typing speeds and the merit principle and how you run the interviews. Most of those personnel people have been sitting on boards for a long time. They know how. The Civil Service Commission has a condition of delegating. They had to take a course.

Let's talk about the last point the member makes. I really hope he keeps getting up because it's . . . January, 1974, there was a report written. It was called the Report of the Task Force on Equal Opportunities in the Civil Service in Manitoba, signed by the Member for Inkster, who said that one of the greatest qualified persons that they had promoted and put in the spot, the good NDP candidate, good NDP card carrier, very qualified, nothing to do with him being a candidate or carrying a card, but I said I had reservations about him going on the commission, Civil Service Commission. No reservations on the opposition's side to put this ex-NDP candidate on the Civil Service Commission in the province of Manitoba. That particular gentleman signed the document, the document I just referred to, the Report of the Task Force on Equal Opportunities in the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Duncan, the chairman of that task force, what does he say? The Member for St. George says here's what we did. We brought this management committee in and they should have been kept separate so they could do their function. This highly qualified person that they brought in to run this commission and give them some good thoughts, here's what he says, page 44, that "The present divided central authority for personnel administration should be integrated by restoring to the Civil Service Commission the powers and the functions for total personnel program in Manitoba in the Manitoba government." And further, "The staff members' records and facilities of the Management Committee should likewise be transferred to the Commission."

Mr. Chairman, they went out and found themselves an ex-NDP candidate, good card carrier, allegedly, by the Member for Inkster, a very intelligent man. He writes up a report and it happens that he made not a bad recommendation but the NDP wouldn't listen to it in 1974, '75, or '76 or '77. I don't know why. The member opposite said we did something wrong. Well, we happen to think it's reasonably right and we've done it.

We've done a few other things too. We've done a few other things that we'll get into as we go through the commission. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, well we've had the Minister try to give to us some of his diversionary tactics and trying to say well you did this then and

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

since you did this then, a few years ago, that the departments didn't have authority, it's okay for us today to go ahead with what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, the member of the committee that he just mentioned was an NDP hack to the Minister of Labour, who didn't know anything and he didn't agree with him but all of a sudden, when it suits his purpose, he wants to quote from a report that gentleman wrote and signed his name to, when it suits his needs, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, had we agreed with the functions of personnel management we would have made those moves when we were in government. If the Minister of Economic Development wants a statement I will give him a statement. The Minister of Labour, while he can say that someone didn't read the legislation and didn't quote to him very accurately, Mr. Chairman, I read him the section that I said that I felt that his government was not living up to. Whether the statement is in the legislation with respect to subject to this Act otherwise provided, in my mind, Mr. Chairman, and I read the act, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that if that is the interpretation that is put on by the Minister and his colleagues that they are really reading into the legislation, that the section there is contradictory with respect to the intent of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister now will say, well it's not so, that's not what we want, that's not what we believe in. Of course that's not what he wants to believe in, Mr. Chairman. When he makes mention, Mr. Chairman, that no one here understands collective agreements and the procedures set out in collective agreements, no one spoke about collective agreements, Mr. Chairman. We know that pretty well the entire appeal procedure and all the sections of a collective agreement go beyond and are excluded from the legislation with respect to the MGEA and the government. Most of all the appeal mechanisms and everything else dealing, which were normally held within the Civil Service Commission, now are handled by the collective agreements. So the Minister doesn't have to even make mention that those matters are not now handled by collective agreement because the majority of them are.

Mr. Chairman, the Civil Service Commission primarily now handles appeals. Primarily in the last year that I recall were appeals with respect to, if there were any, with respect to staff that was outside of the bargaining group; very few, if any, appeals. I'd like the Minister to indicate whether the procedure or the process has changed: very few appeals, since the expansion of the collective bargaining process, have been conducted and held through the legislation.

So, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister wants to hang his hat on the section 13(3) saying well, it still gives us the authority to do likewise, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they have circumvented the intent of the legislation. He can stand up and deny it all he wishes. He can say, well, you fellows don't know what you're talking about, he will have to live with the procedures that he has enunciated and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the procedures that they have set up are certainly not foolproof, as the Minister tries to make members on this side believe. Mr. Chairman, the procedures that they have set up certainly can be circumvented and the intents of those procedures should be changed so that the Civil Service Commission is involved, as has been intended by the legislation and is now being circumvented by the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: What we did with those procedures, Mr. Chairman, I said there were many jurisdictions in Canada that have the same system that we have in place. The member will find, if he really wants to do his homework he can check the procedures in all the other jurisdictions in Canada including the federal one, and I suggest to him he'll find none individually as good as the set we have.

And I don't think I really have to tell him, but I will, why we think ours are the best because what we did is we went to those other jurisdictions and we found out what their rules were, their procedures were, how they handled their situation and they were all open and honest with us and told us of problems they had with them, the areas they thought were a little weak that they should correct; we pulled that all together and now we have, we consider, the best set of procedures to fall along the lines of just about every other jurisdiction in the country.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

And he's right, he's right on the appeal procedures, that's what the commission board, that's what the commissioners handle. And he's right that grievances are and have been for some time handled under the collective bargaining agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I want to apologize to the Minister that I wasn't in the House at 8:00 o'clock. Apparently he was prepared then to answer some of my questions. This afternoon I was at a meeting with the Winnipeg Teachers' Association and I just wasn't able to get back in time. And I wonder if he wants to answer now or if he would like me to talk to him privately.

MR. MacMASTER: No, there's no problem, Mr. Chairman. The department, the Civil Service Commission has education leaves which people can take advantage of. They are over and above and in addition to what departments have and there were three specific type leaves granted last year for educational purposes and it just happened that two out of those three were for women.

All departments of government have quite extensive education leave opportunities for people within their departments. I don't have the numbers and I don't know how many months it would take me to dig them all out but there are an awful lot of women taking advantage of those leaves. Courses are being put on continuously. If the member would like the breakdown of the number of women that are taking advantage of the courses that we're offering, I can get that for her. I'm not sure if that breakdown was in the report or not but I can certainly get that for her and, by and large, there is a majority of women in virtually the majority of all courses that are offered. I can't remember whether it's 4,000 or 5,000, in that neighbourhood. A tremendous amount of people within the Civil Service took advantage of the courses.

If you look at the types of courses that are being offered, you will find that there are a lot of them which will provide women with the opportunity to upgrade themselves, which is what they have been saying to me within the Civil Service, that opportunities come along and they haven't had the opportunity to upgrade their education so that they can apply for the higher jobs. They are certainly taking advantage of those opportunities today.

There are some courses, university courses, that are being run in noon hour so that some of the working women can take advantage of those particular courses. There are programs within the Development and Training Branch of the Commission which provide for skill development and management training programs; again, not totally absolutely geared for women but we know that the women are taking an awful lot of advantages of them. There are several and I think within the report . . . Has the member got the commission report? You'll find that there are several new positions, not new positions, that's not the right terminology, there are several positions within the Civil Service in Manitoba that are now being filled by women which are, I guess the word is sort of non-traditional, they certainly weren't in there before.

So, if you put that together you can see that there is quite a push by ourselves, not a physical one but certainly an encouraging one to women within the Civil Service to provide them with the educational opportunities, the upgrading courses. We're even bringing the courses now into the buildings where civil servants are working and there are several new positions that are now being held by women within the Civil Service which weren't before.

So, I think a lot of good things are happening There's really no question that it's being appreciated, the efforts that we're making, and it's certainly being taken advantage of in the way it was supposed to be by the women that are within the Civil Service.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairperson, and thank you, to the Minister for that very positive report. I'm wondering if the Minister has at any time given any consideration to assisting people, not only women, all Civil Servants who are in the lower paying categories particularly and who want to upgrade themselves but find it difficult to find the financial resources to pay the tuition fees for courses, whether he has given any consideration to assisting them with the payment

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

of fees. At the same time I realize that it would be reasonable to expect them to sign an agreement to stay for a certain period of time with the department so that any such assistance would be repaid, you might say, in terms of service to the department, because I think, not only with women but with other minorities, with native people and with handicapped people, very often those people are in the lower paying jobs and perhaps they may need that kind of financial assistance.

MR. MacMASTER: Departments have the authority now, Mr. Chairman, to pay up to 50 percent of course costs for people within their departments. That is in place today and the point that the member raised about signing an agreement that, thou shalt work for us sort of thing, that isn't necessary, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. WESTBURY: It sounds like a very liberal program, Mr. Chairperson. Can you tell me how long that has been in place, that sharing of fees, one year, two years, ten years, five years?

MR. MacMASTER: Since approximately the early '60s, so that's 16, 17 years, something to that effect.

MRS. WESTBURY: I got a question from somebody on my right here, Mr. Chairperson. Is it true that the fees are only paid on completion of the course? I see, so that, if I may, that still makes it difficult for anyone to kind of initiative this upgrading for themselves if they can't put out the money for a bookkeeper to upgrade herself or himself by an RIA course, or something like that, and they may find it difficult to find those kinds of fees which are really quite high.

MR. MacMASTER: It could be broken down if a course has three sections to it. If they complete section by section, or could pay year by year, but I don't think you'd want to get yourself in the position where if a person was taking a one-year, two-year course and just gave them whatever the X dollars were, and they decided to drop out somewhere along the line. I think you have to have the target for them to aim at, Mr. Chairman, and it's not that they would have to put the money out for a multitude of years. A system can be worked out where a segment of the course can be completed and paid for, or a year by year, that system is in place and we haven't had any difficulty with it, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. WESTBURY: Just one more thing, then, Mr. Chairperson. I'm afraid that too many people in the Civil Service who may take advantage of that are not aware of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to get into the previous debate, but I would like to indicate to the Minister that I do have a concern, and the concern is this, the fact that most of the people who are his colleagues have professed that the least government, that's the best kind of government, and of course, with the propensity of people in a lot of institutions to do some empire building amongst themselves, I find that unless the audit system is very well monitored and very well adhered to, that there is a danger with the ministerial attitude of laissez-faire, that this Civil Service will not be able to control the hiring practices and that the system may deteriorate with the best of systems involved, because of the attitude of his colleagues. Now, if he wants to debate it on that particular issue and he's prepared to say that that is not going to take place, then, we'll have to take his word for it. But that is the danger, that they have a laissez-faire attitude towards government, they've stipulated that in public, many of them, and consequently when they decentralize, which sometimes is necessary for efficiency, there is the danger that you get inefficiency, or that you get, as I said, empire building.

But aside from that, as I said, I didn't want to get into the debate on a lengthy note, I would like to discuss some of the training thrust that has been indicated in the report and I find that in view of the answers that the Minister gave to the Member for Fort Rouge, there is a certain amount of training going on

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

in respect to management, skill development, executive search and executive compensation and so on. But I do see very little in the report in respect to doing this same thing to the people that are involved at the lower scale of pay development, although I do recall reading that there were some training programs, but they were minimal as compared to the management section, and I would like to have the Minister give us some detailed information as to whether the greater bulk or the majority of the employees are also getting an opportunity at government expense, because I know that management expenses are paid for in most instances, including which we found out last year that they even have membership in some of the clubs around the city, so therefore I'm just wondering whether the Minister is prepared to give equal opportunity to the members at the lower echelon of employment as well in the Civil Service.

MR. MacMASTER: Part of the philosophy, part of the situation that I personally felt existed, was people in all segments, all the rungs within the Civil Service, were saying, different people at different times and different categories, were saying that they would like to be able to get themselves in a position where when the next posting comes open they would be qualified for that. And that was in all levels and both sexes. If you look at the type of program that were run they may appear to be earmarked for a specific category of people, but I think you'll find that in a lot of them, if you just look at them and feature people within the Civil Service, there are just literally hundreds of people that could, in fact, involve themselves in it.

The administrative support development area is certainly of interest because there is an awful lot of topnotch secretarial people within the Civil Service who are saying they would like to become administrative officers, or they'd like to hold a more senior sort of a position, and the four or five programs in there are, training towards supervisory development, introduction to supervision for support staff, administrative support staff workshop, task and personnel management, management for office employees. And we could go on all down through them. I know what the member is saying, that the titles may lead you to think that it's for the top-salaried civil servants, but I don't think you would really find that if you looked at the content of some of the courses. Essentials of management; financial management; organizational development; negotiating skills; conducting effective meetings; you know they're all pretty basic things that people could use to upgrade themselves to be in a position further to apply for a particular job.

The apprenticeship program that's established within government now, I can't remember the numbers, the Member for Kildonan or Logan asked me the other day, I don't know whether it was 16, 18, 20, or whatever, that was started with the help and encouragement of the Member, I think, from Kildonan and that is run through here and there are 15 or 20 people that are now working under the apprenticeship system in the government, electricians - I'm guessing now, I can't remember - carpenters, auto mechanics, that type of thing. So we're really trying to do the kind of thing that the Member for Kildonan is saying, we're trying to gear a wide variety of courses which will suit. . . you know at the Civil Service Commission the Civil Service is a tremendous big operation, there's an awful lot of people scattered throughout it, some with some aspirations in all different fields to get ahead.

And certainly the types of courses are subject to review. If the members opposite have any specific types of courses that they think this government should be putting on, by all means drop me a line or write them down or whatever you wish, if you think it will help the civil servants within the province of Manitoba upgrade themselves so they can advance themselves, that's what it's all about.

MR. FOX: Yes. I appreciate the Minister's remarks, I also appreciate the fact that some of these workshops, or whatever they were, have some fairly good names, in fact exotic names, because having done some evaluation of electors voters list, I find people like to give themselves some real exotic titles, and so of course you have to go along with that if that's what people want.

But basically what it boils down to is this. Can the Minister give us a breakdown in respect to the percentage of people who are in the management capacity and who have had management upgrading, and in the other areas, the percentage, to see what kind of involvement there is in participation. And let me

also ask the Minister what kind of initiative and incentives is he providing for people to participate because, having been in the work force, he should know as well as I do that management sometimes frowns if you take a couple of days leave of absence to participate in any kind of course, unless management wants you to go and then you may have to go whether you like it or not.

Now, these are the things that the Minister should be informing us of what the Civil Service is doing to make it more accommodating for people to participate and upgrade themselves. Because if you just have the courses and you don't create the climate so that they can participate freely without any coercion or intimidation being present, and some managers will create that, now maybe that's why some of those managers need upgrading skills, but nevertheless, living amongst humans this is what may occur. So therefore the Minister has to tell us what kind of incentives and initiatives are created.

Let me go another step further in line with what the Member for Fort Rouge may probably like, and which I think we, as government, have a role to play in respect to leadership. Has there ever been any consideration to have any day care involved in the Civil Service since the preponderance of the employees are women? These are some of the areas we have to consider if we're going to create incentives for our employees.

MR. MACMASTER: Mr. Chairman, last year there were 4,122 people took advantage of the different types of courses that were put on in the seminars. That sort of tells me that there is an awful lot of interest. It's approximately 318 more than there was the year before. Departments themselves do encourage people to take courses, and I mentioned previously that leave is granted, I mentioned before that departments do in fact pay portions of the cost of the courses. If the member wants me to try and break out, which I certainly do not have, but if he wants me to try and break out management types that took this course, then he would have to, in all sincerity, tell me what he considers a manager. Is a manager a girl who is in charge of two other girls in the office, who sees that she has the opportunity to become an Administrative Officer I or something? Is he talking about directors of divisions? If he really wants me to try and pick out of that 4,122 types of management-type people, I guess we can do it, Mr. Chairman, but it will take some time and we'd have to have some cut-off line that the member could determine and explain to us.

We have been working with the departments, trying to identify needs in order that we can get closer to the kinds of courses that the employees want and need. There is no one person anywhere who designed, sat down and said this shall be the types of courses that we are going to run. These courses all came out of a mix of ideas from the various departments and the Civil Service Commission as to the needs and the desires of people that work within the Civil Service.

So I really think if we sat down for a few hours and tried to work out the qualities that people had, the classifications they had, and the courses that were run, I think you'll find that it's an exceptionally good mix. We are continuously doing that. The summer courses that we run, departments are feeding in all the time the types of courses they'd like to see run because they're "X" groups of people within their departments that are desirous of the opportunity to upgrade themselves.

So I really don't know how much more I can say. In your book that you were given, the Civil Service Commission Report of 1979, if I dug out a '77 report you would find that there were 1,800 participants in courses in 1977, 1,800, and in 1978 there were 3,784, exactly double it. Now I'm not going to politic with that but I'm going to say that with the good help of an awful lot of people, departmental people and commission people, something is happening that is very meaningful to completely double from 1,800 to 3,784; that's more than double. Last year we certainly weren't successful in doubling that and I don't know how we might be able to handle that kind of - but last year there was an increase of 318. So in two years there has been from 1,800 to . . . It has gone up to 4,122, which is about 2,300-2,400 more people are taking part.

And I think it is an ongoing thing, Mr. Chairman, that we'll find that hopefully the courses are attractive enough and I think the success is really because the departments themselves and the people within the departments are saying the

kind of courses they want and the kind of courses they need, and what the people themselves have aspirations for.

I hope I've answered the member's question. I sincerely have been trying. Maybe there's some point I've missed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, I thank the Minister for his comments and I'm not going to press him for the breakdown although he should be able to give it to me because he wrote it up, or his staff did. He's got here a lecture series for senior managers and the other area of training he's got as summer workshops. I compared the two and I find out that there's very little training involved in the summer workshops, which I would assume were for other employees than those of senior management. No place else do I see anything in respect to training for employees. The ones under the summer workshops come under Safety and Health Awareness; Basic Measurement Statistics; Voucher Preparation and Processing; Employee Benefits Information Seminar, which is strictly not a training program; Conducting More Effective Meetings - that is; Creative and Effective Media Techniques - that is; Effective Speaking for Technical People; Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation - that is not a training program; it's essential but it's not an employee training program for the Civil Service; Treasury Board Submission Format, that is; Cancer Education. Again, so out of ten there's about three that aren't regular training programs but they're necessary in a social order.

But then I go down the lecture series for senior managers and there's 11 of them and they're all pertinent towards developing personnel skills and so on. So I'm saying again that if the Minister gives me the assurance that the employees, aside from senior management, have equal opportunity and get the same kind of benefits and the same kind of opportunities then I'm going to be happy with that but what we have in the report doesn't indicate that. Outside of the fact that he gave us a large figure, I don't where those people attended. They may have all attended one course for all I know, even though there were ten of them put on. So, as I say, I'm not prepared to debate with the Minister that he isn't doing it but I'm suggesting that the report doesn't indicate that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) - the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): The question I have relates to the delegation of authority, which I believe the Minister answered partly this afternoon; at least he indicated which departments had been delegated authority. I wonder if he could indicate if the Department of Natural Resources has been delegated authority under this Act and, if so, when.

So I take it from the Minister shaking his head that department has not been delegated authority. I wonder if the Minister then could comment on a report that four regional supervisors were selected by the Department of Natural Resources and they were apparently interviewed, with the regional managers not asked to sit on the board other than one token one who was in a minority position on the selection board, and that at this interview selection board the other two members of the board were members of the Department of Natural Resources and there was no Civil Service Commission representative present at those interviews. Since the Minister has indicated that he has not delegated authority to this department to conduct selection recruitment without the Civil Service Commission present, I wonder if he could comment on this situation.

MR. MacMASTER: It's a good question and I have some difficulty with the answer, to a degree, and I think the member will understand the degree of difficulty. Do you want to hear the answer? Does the Member for St. George want me to answer the Member for Rupertsland or does he want to get involved? He gets in a little more trouble when he stands up than the Member for Rupertsland will, I know that. The Member for Rupertsland has asked what's happening to this entire situation and I have to tell him very simply that presently, right today, there are five appeals before the Civil Service Commission and until they are dealt with I will answer his question somewhere down the line. He can make a note of it. He's fairly good at remembering things. When those appeals are dealt with, handed

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

down, then I'll deal with that particular situation. It's not for me, as the Minister, to involve myself in appeals on those positions. Those exact positions he's talked about are now being appealed to the Civil Service Commission.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, given that, as I understand it there is an appeal on this particular case, is that what he's saying, four or five appeals related to the case which I brought to his attention here. I wonder if the Minister is looking further than simply the appeal procedure since apparently the department has broken the rules here in that it has not included a Civil Service Commission representative on the board of selection and recruitment for purposes of filling these positions.

The Act clearly states that the Civil Service Commission must be involved unless there is a delegation of authority and I believe there is certainly room for interpretation even on that point, Mr. Chairman, because the Act reads in one case that the Civil Service Commission shall be involved in the selection and recruitment particularly with respect to reviewing the documentation of the candidates to insure that there is merit involved in the selection process.

Now they can do this, I suppose, after the case has been completed but it certainly would be an unsatisfactory situation if the Civil Service Commission were coming in a year or more later to review a decision made by a departmental selection team and finding out that, whoops they've made a mistake, that they should not have made the appointment on the basis of the documentation available. The Civil Service auditing people may find that the selection was made not on the basis of merit but on some other basis and, Mr. Chairman, an audit of this kind of procedure, in my opinion, is inadequate in the selection of personnel since the audit can be done so much later so as to not be able to right the damage that has been done.

After a person has been in a position for several months to a year it's pretty difficult for the Civil Service Commission to go back and right the wrong that has been done. At the point at which the wrong has been done some individual was appointed to a position, in this case, a hypothetical one that I'm discussing, a person may be appointed to a position on some other basis than merit and other people that were applying for the position would therefore be wronged in the process. Their case, if they did not immediately appeal it, would not be brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission until the audit was done and that, to me, is an unsatisfactory procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there are two or three points. I can talk around what you are saying and try and be as specific as possible. It points out what can happen, because the appeal procedure that I have outlined is a very effective procedure and that appeal procedure by five people. The Member for Rupertsland is correct there were four positions in question; there are five people appealing what took place. So I don't wish to weigh that one way or the other or throw any weight. What the member has said, he can stand up, and rightly so as a member of the House, and he can say all the things he thinks was wrong but that's what your commission is for. That's what those five people hear those appeals about. And I suspect that they are certainly armed with the information that the member has just said and probably with a heck of a lot more. I certainly don't involve myself with appeals but I know enough about it to know that I should keep my nose out of it. So I don't involve myself in any way, shape or form with appeals. I have no indication that the opposition ever did or any other government did and I certainly don't think I should be.

The member makes a point that in the departments where the agreements have been signed that it might wait a year or two before a situation could be corrected. That's a point that's a very valid question but initially, (a) you have run the personnel people through their course and hopefully that they're credible, trustworthy and that they understand what they're doing. That's the first point.

Secondly, the commission is not going to just give it over and let it go. They'll work with them for a period of time to insure that what they have taught them is, in fact, taking place.



Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Last, but not least, going back to exactly the very valid point that the member raised, be it any employee who is not satisfied with the decision of a Board within a department, he has that exact procedure that the member has raised, that is open to him, not two months, six months, or two days, he doesn't have to wait for the Commissioned audit tomorrow or next month. He can appeal or he can go through the grievance procedure with the MGEA. So there is a series of checks that are in place. Whether he is saying the system is perfect, I am not sure of any system that is perfect. I think it is the best that there really is in place in the country, and other jurisdictions are working quite well. I suspect that other jurisdictions who have had this system in place for a number of years have appeals. That is why the appeals are in place; that is why there is a grievance procedure in the CBA too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the case in point here is one which I believe is quite serious and one which the Minister should be taking a personal look at since it is in violation of the Act, it is in violation of the procedure which he has established in his department to establish signed contracts with the departments. Here is a department that did not sign a contract, chose to proceed to select four regional supervisors through an interview process and didn't bother to have a Civil Service Commission representative at the meeting, which is in violation of the Act, so that the whole procedure here of selection, since it is in violation of the Act, I would think the Minister would be justified in throwing out the whole selection process and directing the department, in this case the Department of Natural Resources, to re-open this competition and proceed in concert with the Act; and that would be to bulletin the position, make it available for competition, and when the selection is made, to have a competent Civil Service Commission representative at the interviews that are set up to ensure that appointment is made on the basis of merit. There is a lot that goes in behind this particular case which I am referring to and I haven't referred to all of the details that were brought to my attention, but I would think that here is a classic example of the kind of manoeuvring in a department which can seriously damage the morale of the government public servants.

I believe that we have a case that has been brought to my attention whereby this was done without the authority that a department can arrange however through this contract arrangement, and this case in itself outlines what is possible in terms of the obvious wrong that was done to members of the department who applied for the position. There were a number, the Minister indicated five have appealed, so obviously in this case, which may only be the tip of the iceberg, there were five members of the department that were dissatisfied with that process and the way in which the selections were made.

Mr. Chairman, if this kind of thing becomes common practice in the government by way of the Civil Service Commissions signing agreements with departments, this will become commonplace, whereby the department will handpick their Selection Committee and that Selection Committee will proceed to make promotions and makes selections for positions throughout the department without any on-the-spot supervision by a competent person from the Civil Service Commission.

Now that has always been a good practice in my mind when we in government, when I was the Minister of a department, it was a good practice, I thought, to have a Civil Service Commission person, at least one, on the Selection Board who would provide that objectivity when it came to interviewing applicants. It was not a person who knew everybody in the department, he wouldn't be accused of making recommendations on the basis of his friendships or his ties or the working relationships that he may have developed over the years within the department. It lent a good bit of objectivity to the process. I think as far as the employees were concerned, they had the confidence that there was this person, at least that one person there, who was looking at them objectively and not looking at them by whatever good or bad feelings they may have created with their supervisors over the years. They would be looking at their work record, looking at their education, looking at their experience, looking at their abilities, and making their recommendations purely on the basis of merit, not on the basis of personality or

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

politics or whatever other criteria may come into the selection process if you don't have that kind of system in place.

Mr. Chairman, I note that in the contract which the Minister is proceeding to sign with the departments, the Deputy Minister of the department can choose to waive the competition when deemed appropriate, providing justification accompanies the appointment documents received by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous procedure that the Minister is adopting. It is dangerous in the sense that it can create a situation in which empires will be built in departments based on loyalties and friendships and working relationships, and where people will be afraid to appeal, because, Mr. Chairman, there are ways in the Civil Service, I can assure you, where a member of the Civil Service who is marked will have a very rough time of it in a department. All he has to do is step out of line, appeal this internal selection procedure one or two times and he is a marked person in that selection procedure from then on. The ones who will get ahead under that system are the ones who will have very close personal relationships with that Selection Committee or it may even be that the Deputy Minister and the Minister will control the selection procedure, because, Mr. Chairman, in this situation the Deputy Minister or the Minister, through his Deputy, can appoint a handpicked Selection Committee and he can instruct that Selection Committee as to what they will do. They will choose the people that the Minister directs them to choose and there will be no checks and balances in the system. I mean documents can be built up, a case can be made for a particular selection, and that documentation can be forwarded on to the Civil Service Commission and it is just a bunch of paper; and when the auditors even go through that information there may be all kinds of justification there on paper for why the selection was made and the way it was made. But, Mr. Chairman, we are setting a dangerous precedent here in doing this.

I would appeal to the Minister to not follow this route, because he is going to be establishing the opportunity for the most serious kind of empire building this province has ever seen within government departments and we have seen enough of it in the past. That is something I believe that every Minister in the past with any experience has had to guard against that kind of thing, whereby particular Deputy Ministers or Assistant Deputy Ministers or Directors or whatever it may be, would attempt to build an empire around himself or herself based on the "Old Boy Network" as one of my colleagues has mentioned. I mean we all know that sort of thing happens. We all know that if a Director appoints a person to a Selection Committee that that person that is going to be doing the selecting is following that Director's advice. Is the Minister trying to suggest to us that that person who is appointed to be the selection person will not come to the Director with the list of applicants and say, hey, who do you think should be the one that we select? Do you think the Director is going to be oblivious to that process? Or if it goes to the level of the Deputy Minister or the Minister, do you not think that the Deputy will go to the Minister and say, hey, here are the applicants for this position, who do you think we should appoint? And with no objective check in the system by means of having a Civil Service Commissioner representative on the interview board, every time the selection will be made on the basis of the person who is in authority, and the Minister of every department will from this point on be suspect every time there is an appointment made in his department, because his department is directly and solely responsible for that selection.

He will not be able to say that that appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission, it was made on the basis of merit, because it was not; if it is made under this system it will not have been made on the basis of merit, it will not have been made on the basis of merit, because, Mr. Chairman, we all know, as I mentioned earlier, documents can be established to back up whatever decision is made by an interview committee. At least where you had a Civil Service Commission person in the interview, you had that check.

I can relate a personal experience in that regard. Shortly after I was Minister of the Department of Renewable Resources a selection application came to my desk where there were three Conservation Officers applying for a particular position, and the recommendation was, as my colleague mentioned, they had it in the order 1,2,3, I checked off the first one, which was recommended by the Commission, and signed the document, passed it on to the Civil Service Commission. A

few days later the Civil Service Commissioner contacted my office by way of formal notification that an appeal had been made on that and they would notify us in due course as to what happened. Mr. Chairman, I believe it was the second or third one on the list who appealed the selection of the first one, and he appealed it with a full knowledge and I think security that he was appealing it, not to the Department, he was appealing it to the Civil Service Commission, who investigated the situation and indeed found that that person had a valid case for appeal and appointed that person, and rejected the appointment of the other one. This was the case where the appointment had already been made and the Civil Service Commission reversed it on the basis of reviewing the documentation, reviewing the case, and reviewing the merits of the individuals involved.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that selection may have just been, in the first place, influenced by the departmental people who were on the Selection Committee; but in this case, Mr. Chairman, because the Civil Service was directly involved, the person felt the security that he could go and immediately appeal this process.

I note that in this case that is before the Minister now, the one I brought up tonight, the person who brought this to my attention indicated that he would not be appealing this case, because he sincerely felt that anybody who appeals the boss' decision in this particular department is a marked man, and he feels that if he were to appeal the case that his job would be in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that is a very serious situation, when the morale in the department is at that all time low that a person who applies for a position, sees the selection procedure so subverted that they feel it necessary to make representations in other ways than going through the Civil Service Commission and making an appeal. I feel that is a very serious condemnation of this whole process and I think it is an example of how this process can be a dangerous one for this government to adopt. I would recommend to the Minister that he not proceed with this. I think I have the concurrence of my colleagues in this, that we do not feel that this is an appropriate procedure that he is following, that he should reassess it, take a careful look at it and make sure that he is not doing something that is going to be detrimental to the public service of Manitoba. At least have that courtesy to the Opposition to have a look at this thing because we're not raising this to grandstand; it's 20 after 10 at night, most people are not even listening at this point in time. We're not doing this to grandstand; we're bringing out a sincere and, I think, reasonable request to the Minister that he not proceed with something in haste but look at this very carefully and make sure that he not doing something which he will regret later. Because we will certainly be watching this process and if we see the process being subverted . . . . And don't forget that the Opposition is one place that people will run to from within the Civil Service, whether they do it through anonymous letters or phone calls or whatever; they will bring things to our attention when there are things that are happening in the public service that are not right. There will be these cases brought to our attention. And we will be aware of at least the more serious examples of situations where the merit principle is not being followed.

There were situations, as the Honourable Member for Inkster mentioned earlier, where at senior levels of the public service people were appointed that were political appointments. That's a common fact of life and in fact it's a necessary thing, as the honourable member mentioned, that one must have at their service at the senior level people who have ability and who are in agreement with the policies and principles that the party in power wants to carry out.

Mr. Chairman, at the middle level and Civil Service level that has been regulated and policed by the Civil Service Commission every effort should be made by any government in power to make sure that that system is as fair and equitable as possible, because if you're going to have a good public service, one that is going to be doing a good job for the people of Manitoba, then you have to have people that are happy; you have to have people that feel secure in their jobs; you have to have people that feel that they have an equal opportunity within their respective department for advancement and promotion; and you have to have people who feel that if they work hard and do a good job that they're going to be recognized and they're going to be promoted if they get an opportunity to apply for a position, a senior position in the department. And you can't have this kind of thing going on where a Minister or a Deputy Minister can come in and put up a phony selection committee and appoint his friends, or whatever, because that kind of

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

thing will kill the morale in the department and you will have poor performance from that department throughout. You will not get the best for that department; you will not get the best for the people of Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: We seem to keep getting back to the fact that you can waive the opportunity for people to bid on a job. That is nothing new. That's nothing new in this agreement. That is established today. It's a fact of life today and it has been for a long time. The MGEA contract permits that; the Civil Service Act permits that, in case of internal promotion upwards, or in the case of transfer you can waive the competition. That's agreed to by the Civil Service Commission; it's agreed to by the Act and it's agreed to by the Union. So I hope we can forget about those particular words.

I must say that the Member for Rupertsland certainly wasn't responsible in any way for the Civil Service Commission or probably dealing with the MGEA so he might not have been aware of that particular facet of operation, which has been a fact for a long, long time.

The member mentioned that a particular individual is afraid to file an appeal. You know, there are literally hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of union people across the country who will not take advantage of the collective bargain agreement. They say exactly what the Member for Rupertsland said, my goodness I wouldn't want to file a grievance, some foreman, some superintendent or something will mark me. That's a fear inbuilt in some people, regardless of what system you have. But the fact of the matter, that one person did not wish to appeal, for whatever reason, the Member for Rupertsland said it was through fear. In my union days I've heard hundreds of people say the same thing and we attempt to convince them that there is no fear, and if this person had gone to the MGEA executive or one of their union stewards, he would have got the same assurance from them that I have given to dozens and dozens of men and women in my lifetime.

But that one person was allegedly afraid to appeal, but five people weren't. Five others are exercising their right under the provisions of the Civil Service Act to appeal, and that provision is there today and it has been there since the Member for St. George was Minister and the members before him, whoever has been Minister going away back. That procedure was there, it's still there today, it'll be there tomorrow, nobody, but nobody, no government or Minister would ever have the lack of understanding or the foolishness warped into his mind to ever take out the appeal procedure. The appeal procedure for those not covered from the CBA is the same as the grievance procedure in a collective bargaining agreement. And who in this country would ever dream of trying to take a grievance procedure out of a collective bargaining agreement?

So the appeal procedure is in place, has been in place, will be in place, is in place under the agreement, is in place without the agreement, was in place before, and was in place when the Opposition had two departments that were running without any authority, without any audit; that appeal procedure has always been there.

The Minister's name keeps getting into this, not just me as a Minister but a Minister. The Minister is not part of that agreement. The Civil Service Commission, under the authority of the Civil Service Act, is deemed to delegate authority and it spells it out very clearly to the Deputy Minister. Deputy Ministers cannot build kingdoms of people certainly, and that was made reference to today because Ministers have to present budgetary numbers as to how many numbers of people they can have.

The appeal procedure is still there, as evidenced by the fact that I submitted to the Member for Rupertsland the fact, and it is, that five people are appealing to the Civil Service Commission, not to any Minister, they don't appeal to the Minister, they appeal to the Civil Service Commission, the board, those five people. That is there. The member is doing what is logical and I don't condemn him for that. He's prejudging the facts to be what the Civil Service Commission Appeal Board will be hearing, and he's prejudging, which I'm not going to do, he's prejudging that the facts that he has presented this evening are the only facts. That's why you have a Civil Service Commission Appeal Board, to deal with all the facts. Those five people that are appealing, there is no question they know in their minds what the facts are. Departmental officials, whatever they deem the facts to be, the Civil Service Commission Appeal Board will hear all the facts and

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

they will hand down a decision. I don't wish to be part of that, and I don't think the member really wants me to be part of that and circumvent in any way the authority of that appeal board.

The member talks about the department appointing people. He knows now; he said himself that the department appoints, and has for years, appoints two out of the three people that sit on the board that reviews people. So if in fact all these mystic little things that the member mentions that might happen; the Minister might tell the Deputy to put two people on, that they'll do his bidding. If that was to be the case, then I guess that could have been the case in the '60s, in the '50s, in the '70s, and it could be the case in the '80s.

I don't say that any Minister opposite, I don't say the Member for Rupertsland, when he was a Minister, that he went to his Deputy and said, I want Johnny and Billy on that board because we've got to get this guy on. If he had chosen to during his days, he could have done it. In those days, the member outlined it very clearly this evening, two or three have, that three names went up to the Minister. Our system doesn't talk about even going anywhere near the Minister with three names, never mind one. I think there's a difference, and I think the member, when he really thinks it out, will agree that the difference is advantageous. If in fact people go to the opposition or people are appealing and we find that the system is being abused in any way, shape or form, and the Civil Service Commission finds that's being abused, that department is going to lose that agreement in a heck of a hurry.

Here's a department that has five appeals and they don't have an agreement. --(Interjection)-- Okay. It's alleged that things weren't run right. The Appeal Board of the Commission will deal with that. The members opposite can stand up and say how they perceive things to be, but they're not members of the Civil Service Commission Appeal Board, and if things have been done wrong, they can rest assured they'll be righted, the same as they have been in the past. I'm sure there's been appeals under the previous administration and there were appeals before that and there will be appeals in the '80s, there'll always be appeals. I hope there is because that's a sign that the system is working. And I hope, I really hope sincerely that people have no fear of appealing; they shouldn't have. I've said that to people all my life and there's no real difference this evening.

I hope I've cleared up . . . I know that the member opposite, for some reason - I don't think in total but for some reason - doesn't hope that it won't work, he has reservations about how well it's going to work. Well, we'll see how the appeals work and we'll see how the Civil Service Commission moves in on departments if they're abusing it, and we'll see how many letters go to the members opposite and we'll see how many Ministers are getting phoned and how many Deputies are getting phoned and how many grievances take place. We'll see how the system works. I don't say that the system is perfect, I said that before, and the members opposite have my assurance that if this system is found not to be working and I think corrective measures should be instituted, then I assure them that they will be.

We're trying to make the system better. Other jurisdictions in this country, several provinces, have done it for years and found it works well. I suspect they have appeals too. The federal government's done it for ten years and they found it works well. And I suspect they have appeals, too. I don't say it won't be without appeals, but we're going to give it a try.

If the members opposite want to bring to my attention at any time, by phone or in the hall or over a coffee, or a note or a memo, as many of them do, they bring points of interest, points of concern to my attention; I don't think there's one sitting opposite that hasn't brought a situation to my attention that hasn't been answered. Maybe we don't always resolve it exactly the way they want but many of them have had their situations resolved, they've had them looked at, that's what we're all here for. The members on my side can do the same thing. The Member for Fort Rouge can do the same thing. There is no barring that in any way, shape or form.

And I hope they bring to my attention any points about the operation of the Civil Service Commission or the procedures in this province that they don't feel comfortable with, or they think people in their constituency or citizens at large don't feel comfortable with. I'm prepared to listen to them. We want to give this a try and see if it works. Who knows, a year from now the Member for

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

Rupertsland may stand up and say, "I had a lot of reservations last March but I haven't had too many complaints. It seems to me that maybe positions are getting filled quicker. I know of personnel people within departments that are really doing their jobs now. That department is more meaningful now. The department is running better now." Let's hope that he is saying that a year from now, even with his reservations which he is certainly entitled to have tonight, but we want to give it a try, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--pass - the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in his comments that he makes about the appeal procedures being available to staff and the like, I want to tell him that I don't think anyone on this side is denying that the appeal procedures will continue that are in existence either under the Act or under the collective agreement and they will exist. There is no doubt about that. If that's the one point that the Minister wants to impress upon us, that there will be appeal procedures if there is something goes afoul. What we are trying to suggest, Mr. Chairman, is really the process.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister admitted to me or indicated to us when he spoke about the two departments that were handling the recruiting and selection process under the previous administration, if I understood him correctly, he said that the selection process or the recommendations still went through the commission even though the entire process was carried on by the department, if I understood him correctly. But they did go through the commission.

In the procedure that he is now establishing there is a fundamental difference: The commission is totally bypassed. And that is the point that we have been trying to get across to the Minister, is that the functions of the commission, while they will have a review mechanism, they will be able to set certain procedures into motion, which I'm not sure that the procedures are strong enough. Because when you look at the staffing procedures for competition, what is the role of the commission as defined in Appendix B of the agreement? The commission's role will be to receive and record the commitment document and attachments as the department requests, right? They will review the commitment document to insure compliance with the staffing restraint guidelines. They will review documentation and assign the appropriate classification and they will review the documentation to determine whether position can be filled from re-employment list, and then they will forward the bulletin data to the Queen's Printer and advertising data to advertising audit, where it says, and that's an asterisk, it says, "Bulletins and advertisements will advise applicants to submit applications to the departmental personnel office", and they will return the commitment document and job description to the department.

Mr. Chairman, those procedures, as the first responsibility of the Civil Service Commission, are very very routine in terms of the day to day processing and stamping of the forms of the requests for hiring process as I understand. If I don't understand it correctly, I'd like the Minister to correct me because I sense this is a very routine matter. The department says we have an opening for a position; we check it out with the commission and the commission agrees that this position has been approved, and we go ahead with the bulletining process, and that's the initial process that the department undertakes in those five responsibilities.

And then, Mr. Chairman, there are three more responsibilities of the commission. Create a personnel file for new appointee or, in the case of internal promotion of a civil servant, update the current file. And then the second one, forward copies of commitment document to Department of Finance for entry into MEIS, and I'm not sure what the terms mean but I presume that has something to do with the payroll and identification of the employee, and I guess if there is an appeal, prepare for arbitration hearings, if there's an appeal in the process.

Mr. Chairman, there is no argument. I don't want to give the Minister an argument to say that there is anything wrong with the responsibilities there but the one point that we have tried to make to the Minister is that the whole process of going through the commission and having that staff person, the independence of the commission on that selection process is being bypassed. That's the point we're making. If you want to speed up the process go ahead. No doubt about it,

but don't . . . Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines says, "Hire contracts." Mr. Chairman, he can do as he pleases. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, they will do one of two things when they'll be in office. They will want to do certain things that they will have a hard time, I believe, through the Civil Service Commission, if they want to do special projects. And they will either do one of two things, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources. They will either hire by contract. They will go back to the same system and try and justify that they need contract people and I think from time to time you do need contract people. If our departments, and I would venture to say in some instances there was abuse of the contract system. I don't deny that. From time to time you will be put in that position, mark my words, or if you want to circumvent that system you know what you will do, Mr. Chairman, you will go to outside consultants. You will then go out and hire outside consultants like you've done in the auditing of the Crown agencies, Mr. Chairman. You will transfer the responsibilities from the Civil Service and say, hey public of Manitoba, we have cut down the Civil Service by umpteen numbers of positions and one of them was because we removed the auditing of the Crown agencies from the Provincial Auditor and there is no longer need for this Civil Service.

But, Mr. Chairman, they haven't done anything. What they've done is transferred the responsibility from where it should be, within the Ministry and within the government, to some private person's consulting firm and they will pay, Mr. Chairman, through the nose. It will be inefficient and it will be costly. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that extra cost will be born out this Session and I will give the Minister an example. I venture to say tonight that the auditing costs, for example, of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation will virtually double as a result of the moves that the government has made with respect to transferring the responsibilities from the provincial auditor to the private agencies.

Mr. Chairman, that's the way that they will get around to try and con the public of Manitoba and say we have reduced the Civil Service in Manitoba in either of those two ways. They will either do that.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister should recognize the one point. Maybe I was too carried away and vociferous in the remarks that I earlier made but I urge the Minister, as the Member for Rupertsland has done, to reconsider that one procedure. Nothing to do with the streamlining and wanting the departments to be able to hire in a much more efficient, orderly and quicker manner. I have no difficulty with that. Whatever procedures you can put into being, we have no difficulty with that. The one point is, do not side-step the integrity and the independence of the commission in terms of the staffing officers being part of that selection process. That's what we are arguing about, that one point, no other point. The procedure that you have in place in terms of trying to streamline the operation, the bookwork. That's all it is, Mr. Chairman; it's trying to streamline the redtape and the bookwork that has developed over the years. No one argues that.

But I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, there will not be a diminution of the workload that the Minister says the commission will speed up the process, you will build up the bureaucracy within the departments and the commission will still be saddled with the job of looking over the shoulders of the departments without having any effective role in at least sitting there and having that independence that it has had over the years. That's the point we are making, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister may not want to recognize that, that's fine, but let us serve notice on him that's at the point that we are fundamentally opposed to.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, just one, two or three points. You know we are sort of repeating ourselves but I suppose it bears out that we should. All the authority that is given now in the review of procedures, review of interviews and the review who applied, the resumes and the audit, those things weren't in place when the two departments under the previous administration were carrying on in a particular manner that they were carrying on.

The Member for St. George says yes, he agrees that there was probably abuses of the contracts that the government had and he just said now from his seat, sure. --(Interjection)-- Well there was 1,100 of those contracts, Mr. Chairman; 1,100. You know, Mr. Chairman, you talk to union people from any union and ask what they think of that system: Totally, absolutely in violation of every principle of

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

unionism that there is in North America to circumvent the union procedures, that's what that was felt to be, by any union. And we have 140 contracts today, not 1,100, and the union has a list of who they are and the union knows the reason for each individual one because the one point that the Member for St. George said, which is correct, there will always be a need for some type of contract employees, certainly not 1,100, to do away with the whole principles of unionism.

Well, the members start to chatter now, so maybe it's touching a bit of a sore spot, but the MGEA now has that list. They review it, they see it, they understand it, they know what the contracts are exactly for. That was never the case before, never the case before. So I don't know how much we can say on this particular topic but I guess we're open for any more questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (BUD) BOYCE: I'll put it on the record what I said from my seat, Mr. Chairman. If you're not going to do anything, you don't need anybody. If you review those contracts by contract, I believe there were not abuses. There may have been one or something, I don't know, maybe my colleague from St. George is familiar with something that I am not. But most of those contracts were relative to programs which the government was carrying out to determine the utility of such programs.

But, Mr. Chairman, the contracting out philosophy of this government instead of contracting in, I would agree with the Minister that is against union practices across the country. That's one of the difficulties in the City of Montreal at the moment. It's the kind of philosophy followed by the city administration in that city, which is the philosophy of this particular government.

I hadn't intended to enter this debate but I just wanted to put on the record what I had said from my seat. But, Mr. Chairman, having been the Minister for but a short while, regardless of the procedures that are implemented I was astounded that the system works at all, because it is a monolith of a system, and we get talking about the system rather than the human beings that are involved. And as far as the way the commission functions, in my experience, they did a darn good job. In fact, even my secretaries were hired through a board which was established, and I appreciated their efforts in their regard.

I want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, they were bandying about political affiliations and efforts that people had made on behalf of political parties before they entered the Civil Service. And when we needed somebody to review some of the expenditures and the upgrading of the correctional system in the province, if the present Minister of Community Services, I think they call him now, thinks the cost of the new Brandon institution was horrendous, he should have seen it before Perry Kelly took a whack at it. And I may have said it before, but if I did, I'll repeat it anyway, that I believe that the man literally worked himself to death on that project. But I bring his name up in reference to this kind of debate, because when Mr. Kelly, who at the time that I met him was working with Management Committee of Cabinet, had done an excellent job in anything in which I saw him involved. So when they set up that small bureaucracy, for which I was responsible, I asked him if he would be interested in giving us a hand and he reminded me that he had worked on a political campaign for Gurney Evans - I don't know how his name entered the debate, how Gurney's name entered the debate - but nevertheless I reminded him that Tommy Douglas had said one time, it's easier to make a socialist out of an engineer than it is to make an engineer out of a socialist. And all I was really interested in was how he had done his job. The pompousness of politicians sometimes, from both sides from all political parties, really sickens me, because in the final analysis, I don't care what we write in these laws, and we hire people to circumvent them, if it so pleases us. We just have to remember Mr. Diefenbaker and the episode with Coyne and Fleming. We put up these independent bodies that governments and politicians will keep their hands out of and they'll be run as autonomous bodies. I think that's a farce and I don't think people are that stupid, Mr. Chairman. Governments are elected to be responsible and make the system function.

I know that there was some suggestion a few years ago that the whole Civil Service Commission Act be scrapped and that the Industrial Relations Act apply. I



don't know where that sits as far as the government is concerned or as far as the MGEA is concerned, but nevertheless, as I say, the miracle in my mind is that the system works at all.

I only entered this debate, as I said when I first started, to put on the record the fact that the government, in trying to make the case that they have reduced 1,110 contracts to 104, Manitobans don't need to be reminded that each one of those people who is not working was relative to a program, and most of them, Mr. Chairman, were in northern Manitoba where they're crying out for help of any kind.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make sure that the Minister doesn't - I'm sure he will continue - continue using his diversion, little diversion tactics of trying to take statements out of context and blow them out of proportion in terms of when one member says that I acknowledged that there were abuses in the contract system. Mr. Chairman, I venture to say the abuses in the system that I would have to acknowledge is that our Ministers, in departments when they set up new programs in terms of federal-provincial agreements, did not, in the long term, allow the process and hiring of staff go through the Civil Service, and in those areas, as was brought out by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that's what I would acknowledge would be one of the abuses that one can agree with. There's no doubt that in many areas, as time went on, as the programs were set into place and were more of a long-term and permanent nature, that those staff positions should have been converted into permanent civil service positions. But initially, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the decision to hire people on a contract basis in terms of the lack of guarantees and the uncertainty as to how the federal-provincial programs would carry on, certainly would not be constituted or even acknowledged that there was an abuse of the system.

What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in another area, is the government's commitment, at least the statements that are in the annual report of the Civil Service Commission for 1979, is the government's statements with respect to equal employment opportunities. I'd like to know from the Minister what mechanisms are in place now to allow for the target groups, and I'm making the assumption that the target groups have not changed in terms of women, the handicapped, and the native people of our province in terms of trying to bring these groups into the civil service and into better positions and providing opportunities for these groups to better themselves within the Civil Service.

By reading, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's statement on Page 13, and I quote, "The government is committed to ensuring that all segments of society have an equal opportunity to enter the Civil Service on the basis of open competition, and to advance according to their relative ability, consistent with the basic precepts of the merit principle." Mr. Chairman, if this statement that has been put into the document as the policy of the government, somewhat, and I would like the Minister to clarify it, somewhat gives me the impression of contradicting itself. And I will go on to say how I believe it contradicts itself. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if the government is seriously concerned and committed to a policy of equal employment opportunities, that there has to be an affirmative action program within the Civil Service and there has to be changes made in the recruitment, the selection process, in the job description process to allow those target groups, that you say that are still the same, to be brought into the Civil Service, and be allowed to come in. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, and I say this from experience, at least as limited as I did have while I was Minister for a short period of time, there is no way that I, if I was a personnel officer in a department, would agree to hiring people who may be, in the normal process as it exists today, to hiring people who would be part of the target groups because they may have some impediment, they may not quite meet up the standards of other people who would normally qualify in the regular recruitment process unless there are fundamental changes made in the system of how we recruit, how we describe the jobs. Because if we don't do that, then the words that we put down, that we say we believe in, are nothing but a sham.

I'd like to know from the Minister how many people and what kind of specifics can the Minister give me in the last two years since they've been in government, which target groups have been specifically reached, how those job descriptions

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

were handled, in which departments and how many people have been hired under the Equal Employment Opportunities commitment that this government says it has? By departments, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly I remember, Mr. Chairman, when we were in government, although we were committed in principle to the very same thing, I want to tell the Minister that my colleagues, they wanted to run their departments in the best way they knew how, and if they were uneasy about whether they would give this program and principle a push, Mr. Chairman, unless the Minister of that respective department said, "I want you to go out and do whatever is necessary to bring in a number of people into the Civil Service, it will not happen, it just will not happen.

It will be a bunch of nice words. We will all sit here and say, gee, we're a bunch of nice guys, we believe in the principle and there won't be one person hired, Mr. Chairman. Oh, we will talk about that there will be some women hired and maybe one or two handicapped people hired in some position or other, maybe some native people in some areas hired, that will be tokenism, Mr. Chairman, that's all that it will be.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the New Careers Program is still in existence. If it is in existence, and I hope that the Minister would be able to - I don't know if it's under his department since in the Department of Labour all manpower-related issues are under his jurisdiction - I'd like to know if that program is still in existence within government, because certainly that was one mechanism that the government could have used - and I'm not sure that even when we were in government we used it that effectively - to use the New Careers Program to provide a stepping stone for people who were . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, before I acknowledge the Honourable Minister, New Careers has been discussed under another department fully and passed. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I was just going to say it has been discussed. It is in place.

MR. URUSKI: Yes. Mr. Chairman, then just a brief point. It is under your auspices of your department? Okay.

I am hopeful that the Minister, although I missed that debate because I was likely in the other Committee of the House, in the Attorney-General's department Estimates, and that is only one mechanism that the government can utilize, and I would hope that the Minister would comment on that, how effective that one mechanism has been utilized? And I would like him to tell us how much further progress he has made with the departments.

The policy and the direction of signing agreements with the departments was in place in 1977. I don't know whether they've discarded that type of procedure. If they have I'd like to know about it and what alternatives they have used and how successful have you been. Because I can tell you, I had a hell of a time convincing various departments that they should provide Outreach programs in terms of recruitment and selection, if we were really serious about providing an opportunity for people who would not normally be able to work themselves into the Civil Service through the long established process unless we made a definite commitment to change.

I'd like to hear from the Minister how he has progressed.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there are several things that I can point out.

First, going back to the original conversation by the Member for St. George, the contracts, whether they were abused or not; I say the system was abused, the member admits that possibly they were, or they were in some cases. But the real abuse of the contract system that was utilized so extensively by the previous administration, the real abuse - and maybe they have missed the point altogether - that contract employees - lots of them, one year, two year, three year people - those people could have been called term. They could have been converted to term and there's a big big difference and this is the abuse of people. They chose to keep them contract outside the MGEA, outside the agreement with very little benefits. They could have called them term, the same situation.

But what they would have had if they were term and were denied as contracts; they would have had seniority rights, they would have had pension rights, they would have had the grievance procedure, the appeal procedure that we've talked about tonight, the grievance procedure we've talked about tonight and they would have had the merit system that would have applied. But when you're contract you don't have any of those things.

Now, I'm not going to argue with the member whether it should have been 1,100, or whether it should have been 600, whether it should have been 400, the number game isn't the game that I'm talking about this evening. We suggest very strongly that there was too many and in the number itself it was being abused.

But, Mr. Chairman, the real abuse - and the member knows it, if he didn't know it before right now, then I hope that he just learned it now. I hope that the two gentlemen, one from Rupertsland and one from St. George, sitting there as previous Ministers, I hope they didn't understand the difference when they were Ministers or they were abusing people, not the system, they were abusing people, denying people of their rights: their rights of pension; their rights of seniority; their rights of grievance; their rights of arbitration; their rights of a merit system. That is what they were denying people of. That was the abuse. It seems to have gone over their heads. They claim that they are tied in tight with Labour. The Member for Inkster has quit the party because they are so tied in with Labour. Why couldn't they understand what they were doing to people? They had 1,100 people on their payroll with no pension rights, seniority rights, grievance rights, arbitration rights, no rights whatsoever, and they could have converted them to term. They could have converted them, but they didn't, so they denied those people for months and years of those particular rights.

Mr. Chairman, that is the abuse; that is the abuse where I come from. That is the abuse where I come from. Hundreds have been converted since we came in; hundreds have been converted, Mr. Chairman. Hundreds have been converted to term and permanent by agreement with the MGEA, right within the Civil Service Commission.

The member talks about what they were doing about equal opportunity. He knows that in 1974-75 there was a push-on by the Commission, documented for the particular group opposite, the NDP when they were in government, to establish, just it happens, coincidental as hell but it just happens, to set up an equal opportunity group within the Civil Service Commission to do the very things that we are doing today, but they chose to ignore it. He talks about superficial words. They possibly got a press release or two or three or a hundred out of really being interested in affirmative action and really being interested in equal opportunity, when the very basic thing, the very initiative that was suggested by their own Commission to set up a group was never adhered to. They wouldn't listen; they didn't do those things.

The member would like to know a few of the things that we are doing. Well, we set up a system of outreach recruitment. It has been maintained whereby the Civil Service job vacancies are now circulated to such target population groups as the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped, the CNIB, the Kiwanis Centre for the Deaf, Manitoba School for the Deaf, Indian Metis Friendship Centres across the province, Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, Office of Native Employment, Winnipeg Native Pathfinders, and the Manitoba Metis Womens Association. Those are the places that we are in communication with and where our postings go. That was a very positive move.

Current emphasis as part of the re-organization of the Civil Service Commission, we have set up a separate group of equal employment opportunities section; that has been established, as was recommended years ago. The members opposite chose not to do it, chose not to do it.

Two staff have been assigned to work specifically in this particular area and implement the government policy in this area. The major objective of this section is to facilitate the entry into the Civil Service, an advancement within the Civil Service of those groups of Manitobans who are not proportionately represented in the Manitoba Civil Service, including the particular groups that the members opposite have mentioned: women, physically handicapped, native people, older workers and economically disadvantaged persons.

The Equal Opportunity Section is working closely with departmental personnel managers, staffing officers of the Civil Service Commission and special resource

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

groups in the community in implementing and carrying through the initial work for the Equal Opportunity Committee. Staff have already met individually with the majority of departmental personnel people. The Equal Opportunity Section has access to the full resources of the Civil Service Commission, including staffing and classification resources, but with particular emphasis on the educational resources and staff development training branch.

Special emphasis is being placed on the utilization of specialized resources and programs already in existence within organizations representing the various target population groups. For example, the past few months since the creation of this particular group, the staff have met with representatives of numerous agencies to explore ways of co-operating and working together to avoid duplication of effort or competition. Some examples include the office of the Native Employment; Federal Public Service Commission; Equal Employment Opportunity Training for Women; Federal Public Service Commission; Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Persons. You know, I hope the members keep giggling and laughing, Mr. Chairman. It is an indication of their concern for the people we are talking about. Society for Crippled Children and Adults; CNIB . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is attempting to indicate that any humour we find in his statements is attributable to a lack of concern on our part. The only humour we find is in the ridiculous comments the Minister is making and the lack of programs that his department has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member does not have a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I will get back to discussing seriously from this side of the House the people and the groups that we are trying to do something for. Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Person, this is the Manitoba Health and Community Services Group; the Society for Crippled Children and Adults; CNIB; Native Pathfinders; Equality Employment for Physically Handicapped; Anokita, a joint public sector/private sector group seeking employment opportunities for natives. That's the people we've been meeting with and dealing with.

A referral system is being established within this section as a support to government departments and in co-operation with the Civil Service Commission staffing officers which will provide the link between the outside agencies and access to government job vacancies.

In the specific area of equal employment opportunity for women, particular emphasis is being placed on encouraging career change and movement to judicial male stereotype classification. The section is concentrating on the identification of bridging positions and the development of educational training and development opportunities. Arrangements have been made with the Women's Bureau to offer their course choices and changes to women within the Civil Service.

To some degree, evidence already exists within the Civil Service that women are applying for and obtaining employment in areas which have been traditionally male stereotyped. For example, women are now employed in the following classifications: conservation officer, public health inspector, sheriff's officer, drafting technicians, resource technicians, compliance officers, employment standards officers, assistant power engineers and I have two or three inspectors within my Department of Labour; none of these positions before filled by women.

Even at the professional levels, such traditionally male dominated professions such as engineering and geology now have women on their staff. The Equal Employment Opportunities section of the Commission wants to capitalize on this trend and encourage movement wherever possible.

So the general approach, Mr. Chairman, is to achieve equal opportunity in the government. My government does not intend to use a cohesive or autocratic approach, as has been attempted unsuccessfully in the past through the imposition of quota systems and mandatory directives issued from a central bureaucracy to impose and enforce equal opportunity and affirmative actions on departments. Rather, it tends to bring together existing resources within departments from the

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

many outside agencies, working on behalf of specific target population groups, and develop positive and practical means of achieving equal opportunity goals.

It is our belief, our sincere belief, Mr. Chairman - and I wish the members opposite would share it - it is our belief that attitudes are changing, and we intend to speed up and encourage that process wherever possible through a concentrated and co-operative effort with all parties concerned.

Mr. Chairman, that's the only way you can go with this particular type of program.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gives us a lot of words but, to be very brief, his actions speak louder than his words and the people of Manitoba are judging this government by their actions, and I think this is one area where they have fallen down miserably. This Minister, in particular, has fallen down miserably, in terms of his activities while he was Minister of Northern Affairs, as well as while he's been Minister of this department. His actions in firing the people that were in his department when he took it over and, particularly, removing almost all of those who were of native descent working for the Government of Manitoba, have revealed his particular government and his actions as Minister to be callous, uncaring and certainly no one believes him anymore when he says that he is going to be taking action on affirmative action in government.

The spiel he gave us over the last few minutes possibly one should not find humorous because it's too serious to be humorous, and the lack of action on the part of this government has caused a lot of suffering to a lot of people and given very few people cause for hope that there will be any opportunity for the future, in terms of having an opportunity to work in the Civil Service of Manitoba.

And I think no better example of the people's attitude towards this government and their actions in an area where affirmative action means so much, and that's in Northern Manitoba, where in the short two years of this government's tenure the Progressive Conservative vote in that area, as judged by the last two federal elections, has dropped from first place to third place. And I don't think I could say anything which would make it more obvious what the people of that area think of this government and their affirmative action program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister gave us some beautiful rhetoric here this evening but I want to ask the Minister some pertinent questions with regard to the Equal Employment Opportunities. How many people were taken on in the Civil Service, be they permanent, term or contract, in 1978; how many were taken on in 1979, department by department? I think we've asked for that, one way or another, this evening. We haven't received any answer.

You know, you can give us all the beautiful rhetoric in the world. It doesn't mean a damn thing, unless you do something. Is there any money; is there any money within the Budget for the hiring of these people? You can put programs into place, but if you have no money to hire people then it just makes nice reading. It is, it's beautiful reading. Who is the director in charge of Equal Opportunity? I think that's another question we should have an answer to.

Like I say, we have not been able to get out of the Minister this evening how many people have been taken on. I know and I share the Minister's thought on this that we shouldn't single them out by racial or handicap, whatever they have, but at least give us an idea how many people you've taken on. It's all very well and good to say you've got a program, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. If you're not getting anybody on staff, then I say that your program is failing.

I'm not saying that the system that we tried to superimpose on to departments was right; maybe, that was the wrong thing. Maybe your method is better, but how many people are you taking on? It is the same thing that we have in the apprenticeship system, where we have 11 females and none in government service. That's evident, not one, and we should be setting examples. You can't go to your friends in private industry and say, "You take people on", when you're not setting an example yourself. The example has to be set by this government. By this government I mean we, as all members of this Legislative Assembly. We're the ones that have to set the example for the private sector, and we're prepared to take these people on and give them the opportunity. But if we're not prepared to do that but

just put it down in nice fine print in a report, and the Ministers stand up and read us some nice beautiful-sounding prose here this evening, but we want to know is how many people have you really been able to do something for? You've had twenty-seven months. Surely the Minister must be able to now . . . The Minister has been, I think for the last two years, in charge of this department. Surely within the time frame that he has had, he has been able to leave some imprint on the department. Like I say, I think that's something that we want to find out about.

I had a few questions that the Minister is taking down. He might want to deal with them when he gets up next to speak. The report that we had tabled in the House, on page 7, states, "In the area of personnel administration, the commission has successfully completed integration of the classification and staffing functions within one branch of the Commission, which has resulted in the provision of a more comprehensive service to various client departments and has enabled departments to deal with one designated officer of the Commission for the majority of their personnel needs."

A question flows from that. Just how many classifications do we have within the Civil Service pay scale? Can the Minister give us that? That would be appreciated. Also on the same page, the report goes on to say that, "Significant progress has been made towards the production of a new consolidated personnel manual to assist management in understanding personnel functions and serve as a working tool to enable personnel staff to carry out specific personnel management directives consistently." How long did it take to produce this document? Is there a copy that could be made available to members on this side of the House?

And finally, "Complementary to the efforts," on page 10, "in the area of management training and development, the Civil Service Commission has developed a proposal with respect to human resources development, which includes recommendations for implementations in the areas of manpower planning and performance evaluation, management development, training, management classification, executive search and executive compensation." To whom was this thing submitted, when, and what is it's present status?

And also on page 13, dealing with the Equal Opportunity Employment, "Two permanent staff members have been specially assigned to the EEO programs and are working closely with the Classification, Staffing and Development Training. Who are these people and what are their qualifications? That's some answers we would like from the Minister.

The Member for Kildonan, earlier on this evening, touched on some of the Development and Training that has been going on. In the Lecture Series for Senior Managers, why has there been such an emphasis on the managerial section in the content of courses as compared for, I imagine, those in the lower scale of the Civil Service? Now we're getting some words of wisdom from the Minister of Economic . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't know what they are but he's mumbling something over there.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): I said if you don't have management, the company will go broke.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I quite agree with the Honourable Minister. But the program that is laid out here, which is a fairly comprehensive program, and I think it is something to be looked at. But surely, if we're going to have a development of people from the lower echelons rising up through the ranks, I think we could be perhaps having some of these people attending some of these courses.

I'm not saying that they are going to become managers right away but I think that some of these summer work shops that were held and the course content there, is, well some of them are all right but some of them have certainly nothing to do with - and I think the Member for Kildonan pointed out earlier - have nothing to do with their functions as civil servants. And it was summer workshops. Where were they held? What was the cost of these programs? Were they cost shared between the Commission and the employees? The same thing would apply for the Lecture Series for Senior Managers. Or was the cost borne in whole by the department or the Commission?

And I think I have given the Minister enough at the present time that he perhaps can get those answers to me. I'd be pleased to hear his answers.

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. MacMASTER: Equal Employment Opportunity group has been in place for a short period of time, so you don't have any magic numbers of what has taken place. Special spots are not being found. We hope to work with the Civil Service Commission and the outside organizations and the agencies and the personnel managers to put these people in regular employed jobs. I think that is more acceptable to the agencies. At least they tell us that they don't want us to create a special little nook for somebody disadvantaged. So that's . . . --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. JENKINS: . . . is in total, by departments.

MR. MacMASTER: I have no intentions of giving numbers so that we can now say that the Department of Agriculture has two of them; I'm sorry. The organizations that we have been dealing with are reasonably satisfied that we are making progress and I suppose if you want to talk to the Society for Crippled Children and Adults and ask them, fine. I don't intend to spell out the number of "X" people that we are categorizing and bringing into the Civil Service. Two people that are involved is a Susan Kowal, who is the co-ordinator. She reports directly to the Director of Personnel. She has approximately six years service in government in personnel work and development and training. The other gentleman that works with her is Jack Schmidt, who has approximately three years. He is an extensively trained counsellor. That's the two people.

We have approximately 850 classifications within the Civil Service. We have reduced, as I am sure the member is aware, the number of categories, from five down to three, within government. I will send the member a copy of the personnel policy booklet that he was asking about.

The cost of the summer workshops, the only costs that took place, there was no cost. The member specifically asked if there was a cost to the employees. There was no cost to the employees at all. The only true cost, and it's a cost, is the amount of time that staff spent putting those courses together during work hours with pay.

The Member for Logan asked the identical question as the Member for Kildonan as to the series of courses and classes and I won't take ten minutes to reply. I'll just simply say that it was a series of classes and courses that were put together in conjunction with departments as they determined the aspirations and needs of the people with their department so they could get ahead, in conjunction with the Training and Development branch of the Civil Service Commission. What may appear to be heavy management-type for a huge variety of reasons, those courses are all there and, as I said before, if there are certain groups within departments that aren't making their desires known of the type of courses they want, if any member opposite or anybody wishes to bring that desire forward in any form to myself, we are certainly prepared to consider it. We are not in the business of trying to put on courses that people aren't going to take advantage of. The courses have jumped from 1,800 participants in 1977 to 3,500 or 3,600, 3,700, in 1978; they have doubled, better than doubled, and they have jumped another 300-and-some odd in the last year. So I think we're having an element of success as far as putting on courses goes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether the Minister misunderstood me. The question I asked him was how many staff were taken on to the Equal Opportunity Employment thing. And I specifically said I didn't want them by their type of handicap. All I wanted from the Minister was how many people have you hired under this program? If you don't want to give it to me by departments, give it to me in total. But don't try and make out that I am trying to single out somebody in particular because he has a particular handicap, that I want him particularly identified. I didn't identify them or try to identify them. I said I wanted to know how many people, what was the success rate of this program.

It's all very well and good to tell us how beautiful this program is going to be or is working, but if we don't know how many people have been taken on then we're operating here at cross purposes. All I've asked the Minister for is how many people. If you don't want to give it to me, to my department, fine and dandy. So we don't identify them in any department. That's fine and dandy and

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

I'll accept that. But surely it's not too much to ask the Minister how many you have hired. If you haven't hired any, say so, then we'll be able to judge how well that program is operating.

MR. MacMASTER: The only figures that I am prepared to deal with are figures on page 20, if the member wishes to look at it. During the course of the year there were 291 males; there were 399 females. 391 came from in-service, 299 came from out-service, and there are numbers in there that certainly fall in that category.

MR. JENKINS: I know I can't make the Minister answer. I think that points out pretty well by his lack of answer just what kind of a success rate we're having in this program. If the Minister is not prepared to answer, fine and dandy. I can draw my own conclusions. The members on this side can draw their own conclusions. I think members of the public can also draw their own conclusions. If the Minister is not prepared to answer . . . I think I have given him every opportunity. I am not going to pursue the item any more. There may be other members on this side that wish to but, as far as I am concerned, the Minister has given his answer. The program is a flop by the very fact that he is not prepared. I scaled down every possible way that I could ask the Minister just what the success rate of this program was. He's not prepared to answer; I'm prepared to accept his non-answer as my own conclusions and I think the conclusions of members on this side of the House and the public at large here in Manitoba will be that it has been a flop.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in his way before, continually wants to attempt to get himself out of some difficult positions by trying to hark back to abuses and contract positions and the like. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to leave him off the hook and leave the statements that he has made on the record with respect to the abuse of people.

If ever there was an abuse of people, Mr. Chairman, it has been since the election of the Conservatives in 1977. The Conservatives of this province have attempted to, and quite skillfully, to use the Civil Service as a whipping boy; to tell the people of Manitoba that the Civil Service was bloated; that Civil Service people are lazy; that they are non-productive and if you fire enough of the civil servants in Manitoba we will be able to give you a tax cut. And that was the impression that was given to the people of Manitoba after October of 1977, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Labour has the audacity to get up in this House and say that the position of contract positions was an abuse of people? Mr. Chairman, what gall that Minister has when he, in his own department, went out and fired several hundred people in the Department of Northern Affairs that provided programs to the very people who he purports to represent. He should know what the results of that kind of an action that he had undertaken in October of 1977 have resulted to. Can't he read the writing on the wall? What happened in May? What happened in February?

Mr. Chairman, whether that Minister wants to admit it or not, the abuse, Mr. Chairman, was where? Where did they cut the people, the majority in their statistics on Page 22? In the Department of Mental Health, retardation services, correctional institutions, in areas where people cannot fight back, Mr. Chairman, and in the Northern Affairs area.

You add those totals and roughly you will get 600 people, Mr. Chairman, in areas that this government says there was an abuse of people. Mr. Chairman, they have cut the services deliberately in areas, the Minister of Health can get up here and PR all he wants. but the services to those people have been cut and you talk about abuse. How are those people in those institutions prepared to fight back and be able to bring their case forward, Mr. Chairman? That is the abuse of people if ever there was.

But what do we have in exchange for that, Mr. Chairman? We have a move by this government to move into the area of hiring consultants. We will see more and



more of that kind of hiring in the consultant area, in the giving of contracts, as I mentioned before, for auditing, and that is an abuse, Mr. Chairman.

Talk about the unions, at least they were able to say, "Look, you've hired people; get them into the union. We object to the way you're hiring them but if you're hiring people we want them into the bargaining process and into the collective agreement". But no, Mr. Chairman, no, no, no. We will first fire them and create the impression that the civil service is bloated. We will use the civil servants of this province as the whipping boy, because, Mr. Chairman, the public impression is that civil servants in this province, almost any province, are worthless.

And talk about, Mr. Chairman, a deception to gain acceptance, an electoral acceptance in this province by using a group of people as a whipping boy, that is an abuse, Mr. Chairman, and none other. The greatest abuser is who? None other than our First Minister, Mr. Chairman, who went around this province and talked about a bloated civil service; and the Minister of Labour has the gall to get up in this House and say, we abused the service. Mr. Chairman, he ought to be ashamed of himself.

If he is about to get up and say that I retract all the statements that my First Minister made about the civil service and the people in the civil service are very hard working and loyal people, in the main, across the service, I'd be prepared to accept his retraction of the statements that the First Minister made.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that was, I would say, one of the greatest myths that was perpetrated on the people of Manitoba by the Conservatives, who say, "Look, if we fire enough of those damned civil servants we will be able to give you a tax cut", and that was a very popular conception that was brought home to the people of Manitoba. Little do they realize that in order to meet that commitment services had to be cut to the people. And they are being cut where? In areas where people can fight back the least.

This Minister can stand up and say, I'm not going to give figures, or whatever figures to the Member for Logan about how our Equal Opportunities Program worked. It's hogwash, Mr. Chairman. We have defined the target groups in society. No one is talking about that we say that we have done these kinds of things. What areas have you gone into and said, yes, in the Department of Municipal Affairs we had to hire a group of assessors and we used the Equal Opportunities Program, the Affirmative Action Program to zero-in on these target groups. We haven't heard anything like that, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister.

He has talked about and tried to divert attention by throwing out little tidbits to attempt to say, "Well, you fellows were really a bunch of buggers and although we're not doing anything, you were worse than we are".

It isn't good enough today, Mr. Chairman. You have been in government two years. You have opened your second envelope, Mr. Chairman. The third one is there, it's still sitting there. You have a chance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his remarks indicated that the former administration had no commitment to Equal Opportunities. I believe he tried to misrepresent the situation. Does he not recall the Premier of Manitoba, the former Premier, the now Governor-General of this country who was the Premier here then, as a government commitment - and I think the statements are there, I think his staff can provide them for him - that there was a definite commitment on behalf of the government of the day to proceed in this direction.

He talked about quotas and rigid controls, Mr. Chairman. There's no doubt that I would have to say that I tried to influence the departments in as determined a way as I could, because certainly there was nothing but reluctance on behalf of the staff within the personnel branches of the various departments, there was a reluctance, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure that reluctance hasn't changed to this day. So that the Minister, while he says that the quota system is rigid and is inflexible, we did not use the quota system. But certainly there should be able to be, over a period of time, targets developed into various departments as to what may be at least an approach and a plan developed over a couple of years, and that was being proceeded with, I venture to say that that has died, Mr. Chairman.

If it hasn't died I'd like the Minister to tell us that they have proceeded with long-term plans within the departments, not on a quota system, albeit, Mr. Chairman. If you are really sincere about it and you can see over two or three

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

years that it's not working, you may even have to try that kind of a system for a period of time to see whether that can make some difference. But I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that that won't happen while the Conservatives are in.

I will venture to say that they will not want to rock the boat in this area because there's no doubt the record of their dealings with the Civil Service is very clear. And they speak about abuse, Mr. Chairman? I think this Minister, while he wants to divert and throw out little red herrings here and there, his record is pretty clear as to how he is prepared to deal with the civil service in Manitoba and he will have to live with the consequences and his record that his government has in this area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass; (b)--pass; 1.--pass. Resolution No. 25--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,141,900 for Civil Service. Civil Service Commission, \$2,141,900--pass.

Item 2. Civil Service Benefit Plans, Resolution No. 26. (a) Civil Service Superannuation Act--pass. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, in this whole area that we are dealing with, I would want to find out from the Minister whether he contemplates any changes in legislation dealing with the pension plans or any changes that may be incorporated into the pension plans that either have been made or any being contemplated in the program that is in effect in Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: Not at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the funding of the civil service pensions, The Superannuation Act, and the like, could the Minister indicate the nature of the financing of the moneys; how the moneys are being invested through this or is this strictly out of Consolidated Revenues? I'm sorry, I'd like to be better informed on it and my memory on this is not up-to-date.

MR. MacMASTER: It's all done by the Civil Service Superannuation Board. I think the member thought that and he was correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass; (b)--pass; (c)--pass; (d)--pass; (e)--pass; 2.--pass. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: There is one question before we pass the department. The Minister took as notice this afternoon, that was the legal fees for the settlement and I haven't had any answer on that.

I have also, and I'll be asking him in the question period tomorrow, and I'm going to give him notice now, of a question that I asked him also in the Labour Estimates that I didn't get an answer to, dealing with inspection of elevators and I've had nothing from the Minister that anything is being done on the question. I'll give you notice that I'll ask you that question tomorrow dealing with inspection of elevators and certificates being placed in elevators.

But if the Minister could give us the legal fee costs, either that or I'm going to ask him in question period, I'm giving him notice now.

MR. MacMASTER: I gave the member the commitment that I would get the legal fees. I wasn't able to get them during supertime, I shall assure him that I'll have them tomorrow. That's the best I can tell him.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There was one question that I neglected to ask in terms of the training section.

The branch uses outside consultants in terms of development and training. Could the Minister indicate the number of consultants that were used and in what areas were those consultants brought in in addition to those that are brought in from the Faculty of Administrative Studies at the University of Manitoba? Were other consultants utilized other than those from the University? And if there were, how many and in what areas?

Thursday, 20 March, 1980

MR. MacMASTER: I can get that broken down. It was very limited. They're brought in on very seldom occasions for specific things. But I'll get that and document that particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)--pass; 2.--pass. Resolution No. 26--pass.

Resolution No. 26. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,674,500 for Civil Service. Civil Service Benefit Plans, \$12,674,500--pass.

That completes the Estimates of Civil Service.  
Committee rise.