



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

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



**VOL. XXVI No. 66B**

**8:00 p.m. Monday, June 19' 1978**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 19' 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

## SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Gentlemen, we have a quorum now. At 4:30 when we broke off for Private Members' Hour the Member for Transcona was in the process of talking. The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister has been able to. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can the Member for Transcona bring his mike closer to him?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister responsible has been able to get answers to the questions I asked her regarding when was Mr. Duncan terminated as full-time Civil Service Commissioner and when was Mr. Newton appointed full-time Civil Service Commissioner? When was Mr. Schubert terminated as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and when was Mr. Newton appointed as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission? Does she have answers to those questions?

**MRS. PRICE:** I am trying to get the exact date in October with the changeover in the Commissioners, but all I know is that it is October and I haven't been able to get the day. I'll get back to the member with that answer though.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that the department had been advised by Rae Tallin, who is the legal counsel for the Legislative Assembly, that a particular letter of December 16th, 1977, was required in order to ensure that The Labour Employment Standards Act wasn't contravened, and the Minister has indicated that in her statements, and she has indicated what the contents of that letter of December 16th was.

Could she indicate to the Committee whether in fact she has received legal opinions as to whether The Civil Service Act hasn't been violated by the firing of Mr. Duncan in October. I refer to Section 4, Sub-section 4, of The Civil Service Act, which says that, "a Commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may remove him only on an address of the Assembly carried by a vote of two-thirds of the members voting thereon, but the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may suspend him from office or cause."

Then it goes on in Section 4, Subsection 5, regarding suspension. It says, "Where a Commissioner is suspended, unless the suspension is sooner rescinded, the Minister having the administration of this Act shall (a) before the end of the current Session of the Legislature, if it is in session at the time of the suspension, or (b) before the close of the next Session of the Legislature, if it is not in session at the time of the suspension, bring the matter before the Assembly by way of a resolution for its consideration and action thereon."

Now the actions of the government would seem to completely violate those two sections of the Civil Service Act, and I am wondering if the Minister can explain the position of the government with respect to those possible violations.

**MRS. PRICE:** For the Member for Transcona, Mr. Duncan has not been fired nor has he been suspended. He is still on the Commission. His status has changed.

Regarding the question about commissioners and the Chairman of the Commission, I would like to refer him to The Civil Service Act, which reads under Subsection 4, Subsection 1, "There should be a Commission to be called the Civil Service Commission consisting of not less than three or more than seven members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, one of whom shall be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as Chairman of the Commission," and Subsection 2, "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may provide that any one or more of the members of the Commission shall be required to devote to the business of the Commission only such part of his

or their time as is prescribed in the Order."

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could table the letter that was sent Mr. Duncan on December 16th, 1977. We don't have Hansard regarding her statements of this afternoon but I can recall her saying that that letter told Mr. Duncan that here's your paycheque number such-and-such; this is in lieu of two-weeks' notice. Now, that letter, it would strike me, terminates Mr. Duncan and that would appear to be in contravention of Section 4.4 of the Civil Service Act.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Duncan asked that he'd have his pension. He did not want to be offered another job. He asked for his pension and he had to be terminated in order to get his superannuation. That's the only way that he could have it is by a termination and he requested it.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister refusing to table the letter?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I'm not. I'll gladly get it for you. I haven't got it on me. It's just a routine from the accountant in the department but it certainly is the only way that he could get his superannuation as he requested was to be terminated.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that what we've been told is that on October 24th, the Cabinet decided to terminate Mr. Duncan; they terminated him and I gather that possibly in order to get his superannuation after termination, he required a letter and that's what the legal counsel seems to indicate, not because of superannuation but because of The Employment Standards Act. That's what Mr. Tallin's letter seems to deal with, the Employment Standards Act, and it was after the receipt of Mr. Tallin's letter regarding The Employment Standards Act that this formal letter of termination was sent out. Now, I again state that that formal letter of termination contravenes Section 4, subsection 4, of The Civil Service Act.

**MRS. PRICE:** For the Member for Transcona, I have told you repeatedly that he asked to take his pension and the only way he can have his superannuation is by a termination and he requested it.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Did he come to you on October 24th when you were sworn in as Cabinet Minister and say to you, "I wish to quit. I want my superannuation because I wish to quit." You have told us previously that you never talked to Mr. Duncan. You have said that you never met the man, you never dealt with him, and that he was terminated by the Premier and everything had been handled by the Premier. You hadn't been involved. Now you're saying that he asked for superannuation, that he was negotiating with you. I don't think that's true. I think that he had been terminated, he had been terminated by the government and it strikes me that the termination contravenes Section 4, subsection 4, and we've not received an explanation as to whether in fact the Act has been broken or violated. It would appear that the letter that we have in fact asked you to forward, you have repeated is a letter from the accountant saying that this is two weeks' pay in lieu of notice. I've never heard of a more clear termination.

Now, maybe a better letter should have been sent out. I would think that you don't terminate Deputy Ministers like that but I'm not sure of how this department is being administered, but to have, you know, have a low level accountant send out a letter to someone saying, "Here is your pay in lieu of two weeks' notice." The Minister hasn't talked to the Civil Service Commissioner; the Civil Service Commissioner has nowhere to turn to, it would strike me, but the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. The matter we thought was safeguarded by procedures in the Act which required matters like this to be brought before the Legislative Assembly; it has not been brought before the Legislative Assembly and we find now that the Commissioner has in fact been terminated and the Minister has to accept responsibility for his termination. Now, the point is, did the Minister check to determine whether this violated Section 4, Subsection 4 of the Act? Do you have a legal opinion to that effect?

**MRS. PRICE:** The former Commissioner was contacted by the senior officials of the Civil Service. He refused to talk to them; he said to speak to his lawyer, and his lawyer said that he wanted to go on pension and I will read for the Member for Transcona, Section 55 of The Superannuation Act says, "any employee shall be deemed to have retired for the purposes of this Act if he ceases to be an employee." And they have to cease to be an employee in order to get his superannuation, and that is what he requested.

**MR. PARASIUK:** If he is not an employee, and his employment was as a Commissioner, then he

is not a Commissioner. Secondly, you are stating that he was contacted by senior officials of the Civil Service. I thought that the most senior official of the Civil Service was Mr. Duncan himself. So, are you saying that someone below Mr. Duncan fired him?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Duncan was contacted by the senior officials because the Order-in-Council was signed on the 27th of October and Mr. Duncan was contacted at a later date. The memo from the accountant, as I recall, was the beginning of December but in the meantime, Mr. Duncan had expressed wish to be put on his superannuation, and this was all done through his lawyer.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You do not then have legal opinion from the legal counsel who advised you previously that you may have contravened The Employment Standards Act, that possibly you have also contravened The Civil Service Act, Section 4, Subsection 4?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force.

**MR. SPIVAK:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Reference has already been made to the fact that there were legal counsel involved. There were legal counsel representing Mr. Duncan, there were legal counsel representing the Civil Service. I —(Interjection)— It was the Legislature. Well, legal counsel representing the Legislature. —(Interjections)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has recognized the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force.

**MR. BOYCE:** On a matter of privilege, Mr. Chairman, on a matter of privilege . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. SPIVAK:** This is an attempt to build a tempest in a teapot, and you know, realistically, Mr. Chairman, there were legal counsel involved at the time and I would say, Mr. Chairman, if . . .

**MR. BOYCE:** On a matter of privilege, Mr. Chairman . . .

**A MEMBER:** Privilege does not take precedent over order.

**MR. BOYCE:** I beg to differ with you, Sir, and if you read the rule book, you will find out that what I say is correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair will recognize the Member for Winnipeg Centre on a matter of privilege.

**MR. BOYCE:** The terminology, the words that are being used, are very important, and it is not a "tempest in a teapot". The Ombudsman is a servant of the Legislative Assembly, the legislative counsel is a servant of the Assembly, and so was the chief Civil Service Commissioner, and the Provincial Auditor.

These are servants of the Legislature, not the government, and those have to be underlined on a matter of privilege of this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair now recognizes the Minister without Portfolio.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, there was legal counsel representing Mr. Duncan and whatever took place, took place with agreement on his behalf. I think that, at this point, one has to say that if there was any acceptance of any procedure, that was agreed to by his counsel, and as a result whatever agreement was arrived at was arrived at by someone who acted on his behalf and represented his interest. The claims that in some way there would have been violation of any particular Act I think would have occurred, Mr. Chairman, had in fact the legal counsel representing him taken that position. If they came to a resolution, and they obviously did, then I think that is *prima facie* case, Mr. Chairman, that there is no such basis for that, and the resolution of the matter was achieved. That is it.

The Committee obviously can debate the circumstances, I am not questioning that. But I think in terms of a legal opinion or legal advice, or the legality of what took place, the matter was in fact in the hands of those who had access to the courts representing the interests of the person

who was supposed to have been aggrieved and that capacity was there to ensure that those rights were enforced to the maximum.

The fact that there was an agreement or a settlement or what-have-you or some procedure in which they resolved the matter, I think simply indicates that that from a legal point of view has been resolved.

Now that doesn't mean that there cannot be a debate on the circumstances. I am not questioning that. But the question, Mr. Chairman — this is really what I am putting — of the legality or of legal —(Interjection)— Well, the point of order, is the legal opinion, the legal opinions really mean nothing at this point, Mr. Chairman, because in effect the matter was resolved as a result of counsel acting in this case for Mr. Duncan.

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

**MR. FOX:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I heard a lot of verbal foliage, but I didn't hear one expression of what the point of order was, except the debate with the opinions of the Honourable Minister without Portfolio. I didn't hear one particular procedure that he said we were doing wrong and questioning what was going on. So therefore I say he didn't have a point of order.

**MR. SPIVAK:** The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It is simply that the Minister does not have to deal with the question of a legal opinion, the matter having been handled by lawyers and having been resolved by lawyers, that matter has been resolved.

That doesn't mean that there can't be questioning on the circumstances, but the debate on whether in fact the legal opinion was given, what the legal opinion contained, whether a legal opinion should have been obtained, I think is irrelevant. The fact is that a legal resolution of this or a resolution of the legal matters was in fact achieved.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** I would like to speak on that non-point of order. I am sorry that the Minister responsible for the Task Force wasn't here this afternoon when the evidence of Mr. Tallin's letter was put forward, not by me, was put forward by the Minister of responsible for the Civil Service Commission. She raised the matter. She put forward that as evidence and she said we required this letter or Mr. Tallin indicated that we may need this letter, because The Employment Standards Act may be contravened.

Now having said that with respect to The Employment Standards Act, I am asking her if Mr. Tallin also gave an opinion as to whether in fact The Civil Service Act had been contravened as well.

Secondly, the Minister responsible for the Task Force is stating that there is agreement between the government and the fired, terminated Civil Service Commissioner, and that's not true. And he is trying to imply to the House that that in fact is the case, that there is agreement; there is no agreement. Is the Minister aware of agreement that doesn't exist? Do you have some secret agreement that you know of? We don't know the agreement, and we know that the agreement has not been reached. There is disagreement on this matter.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Well, then, Mr. Chairman, on that point of order . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** And since there is disagreement, we are in fact raising whether in fact that person was legally fired, and we find that he was probably not legally fired.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Transcona was not on a point of order, he was just a recognized speaker.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, if in fact there is disagreement, and the matter . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** I said I was not speaking on a point of order. I have the floor.

**MR. SPIVAK:** . . . is still likely to go to the courts, then I would suggest that it's not a proper matter to be discussed at this Committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Transcona on the regular Civil Service Commission item . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'm not going to respond . . .

**MR. SPIVAK:** I'm saying that if it's before the courts . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** It's not before the courts.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Well, if it's possible it will go to the courts . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order before the Committee. The Member for River Heights raised the point of order and I have not recognized it as a point of order.

**A MEMBER:** Well, but how come you ruled when the Member for River Heights ' . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I had to hear him out to see whether it was a point of order and I'll say now, it's not a point of order. I went to the Member for Transcona because he is the recognized questioner.

The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you. Then I'm asking if the Minister will answer my question. Did she obtain a legal opinion from legal counsel to the Legislative Assembly since she obtained it with respect to The Employment Standards Act? Did she obtain it with respect to The Civil Service Act? Is she aware or does she have knowledge of the fact that Section 4, Subsection 4 of The Civil Service Act has apparently been violated by the letter of termination of December 16, 1977?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** To the Member for Transcona. Legal opinion was obtained and it was stated that it was not a contravention of the Act. Firstly, as I mentioned before, he was not fired, he was not suspended, and if he was in such disagreement then I find it hard to believe that he would choose to take his pension. He was in agreement; back last December he asked for his pension, and that is why he got the memo from the accountant, so that he would have to be terminated in order to qualify for his superannuation.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You are saying that you obtained a legal opinion. Was the legal opinion obtained from the Legislative Counsel, and that you have brought before this Committee evidence that the legal counsel advised you with respect to possible contravention of The Employments Standards Act. Did the legal counsel to the Legislative Assembly, who probably has very good knowledge of The Civil Service Act, since the Civil Service Commissioner is an officer, in a sense, of the Legislative Assembly, was legal opinion obtained from the legal counsel to the Legislative Assembly on this matter?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, the legal opinion was obtained from the Legislative legal department.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'm not sure. Are you saying that Mr. Tallin, the legal counsel . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Legislative Counsel, yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** . . . Legislative Assembly, did provide that legal opinion?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Would you be willing to table that document?

**MRS. PRICE:** His department did.

**MR. PARASIUK:** His department?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, it did.

**MR. PARASIUK:** So previously you have quoted from a letter written by himself, but now, with respect to this other legal opinion you are saying that it's the Department of the Legislative Counsel that provided the opinion?

Monday, June 19' 1978

**MRS. PRICE:** The memo I read to you was from Mr. Tallin to Jim Goodison dated December 1, 1977.

**MR. PARASIUK:** It does not relate, however, to The Civil Service Act. It just relates to The Employment Standards Act.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** You do not have any documentation of a legal opinion pertaining to Section 4, 4 of The Civil Service Act?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I don't.

**MEMBERS:** Nor does she need it.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I don't.

**MR. PARASIUK:** But you have said that you have received a legal opinion to the effect that Section 4, 4 of The Civil Service Act was not violated.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Could you table the legal opinion that tells you that Section 4, 4 of The Civil Service Act was not violated by the December 16, 1977 letter of termination from your department to Mr. Doug Duncan.

**MRS. PRICE:** It was a verbal discussion. There was nothing on paper.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Then I presume that it would be possible for us to go check with the legislative counsel ourselves. I'm sorry that the Minister does not have something as firm as she had with respect to the Employment Standards Act. I'll pass now to some of my colleagues who are more versed in specifics of the law with respect to this matter.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister with respect to the Commissioner, you indicated, I believe that there is an agreement between the government and the Commissioner that he has terminated. Is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Could the Minister indicate what the terms of that agreement are and when that agreement was reached?

**MRS. PRICE:** It was in December when he was contacted through his lawyer that he asked for his pension. He was offered part time employment and he was not interested and he said to contact his lawyer. The Civil Service did contact his lawyer and he said that his client wanted to go on superannuation, and that was in December.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is there any correspondence to that effect that an offer was made, or was the offer of a verbal nature.?

**MRS. PRICE:** I know of a phone call. I don't know if there's anything on paper. I could check that out.

**MR. URUSKI:** You, yourself did not make any of those calls, I presume.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have a letter from the General Manager of the Superannuation Board here that was written to Mr. Meyers, who is Mr. Duncan's counsel, and it said, — dated November 4, 1977 — "re Mr. D. Duncan. Confirming our telephone conversation, we estimate that Mr. Duncan will be entitled to a lifetime deferred or vested pension of about \$227 per month, commencing at age 65, if Mr. Duncan were to cease employment currently. If Mr. Duncan were to cease employment currently and providing Mr. Duncan subsequently is employed as a teacher in Manitoba, whereby he would contribute to the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund pension plan, and then reinstate

his prior service under the TRAPE Act, Mr. Duncan, on retirement, under the TRAPE pension plan would be entitled to an immediate lifetime pension of about \$325 per month from the Civil Service Superannuation Fund. If Mr. Duncan were to choose an optional pension, one-half or two-thirds to beneficiary, that would continue for his wife's lifetime, the above pension amounts would be reduced.

"In the event that Mr. Duncan ceases to be an employee, he has the right to convert his group life insurance without evidence of insurability to a private policy with Canada Life, providing Mr. Duncan makes application and pays the necessary premium to Canada Life within 31 days of ceasing to be an employee.

"We enclose copies of our employee pension and group life insurance brochure for your information." And it's signed, Mr. Worosz, General Manager of the Superannuation Board.

**MR. URUSKI:** Has the commissioner used the insurance provisions that are offered to him, or has he primarily accepted the pension that was available? Have all aspects of that offer been used?

**MRS. PRICE:** He has taken advantage of both of them.

**MR. URUSKI:** Both of them. With respect to the offer of employment, what type of an offer of employment was made to him?

**MRS. PRICE:** He was asked if he would like to go on the re-employment on a part time basis, and he declined through his lawyer.

**MR. URUSKI:** What kind of part-time basis was offered? You know, surely there must have been something in mind or was he to be put on the re-employment list just as any other employee? What was in mind when that offer was made?!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance on a point of order.

**MR. CRAIK:** My understanding is, and I can be corrected if I am wrong, that there is still a matter of negotiation, in fact legal negotiation, going on between Mr. Duncan and the government and his position. That being the case I don't think there is a court case involved, but there certainly the dealings with Mr. Duncan are through his lawyer, and really I raise the question as to whether it is in his best interests to be carrying out a full-blown discussion on this.

The other matter is that I would think that the letter that has been undertaken for tabling should be done only on the condition that the other party involved in it, namely Mr. Duncan, has agreed to it, because it is after all a personal matter and the usual procedure is that the government does not table correspondence unless the third party, the other party, the second party involved with the government, is in agreement with it, whether it is another government or another individual.

I would think that the most proper way to do it, of course, is by order for return, but since the Minister has indicated an acceptance of tabling the letter from whoever, it is not from the Minister or from the Premier but from someone in the department, that it should be done only on the condition that there is agreement from the other party, because the best interests of that party may not be being served since they are still actively involved on a part-time basis with the government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Selkirk on the same point of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, the Member for Riel has raised a question as to negotiation and settlement. I believe Hansard will indicate that the Minister of Labour has indicated this matter is settled. It was so indicated to us last Thursday and again today the Minister of Labour has indicated that it is settled. So that the Minister of Finance is injecting into the discussion information which certainly is not borne out by the information provided to us by the Minister of Labour. Now it is either one way or the other. Either this matter is settled or not. The information that we have received to date is that there has been a settlement.

Number Two, I would like to suggest to the Minister of Finance that this is a matter involving the Assembly, not just a matter involving the Minister of Labour, responsible for the Civil Service Commission and Mr. Duncan, but is a matter that involves the entire Assembly, because it is our position that a Commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour and he shall not be terminated except by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the Assembly.

I don't believe that the Minister of Finance can claim that this is a matter that is restricted only to the concern of Duncan and the Minister of Labour. It is a matter that involves the Assembly,



the actual dismissal, the circumstances relating to that dismissal are matters that relate to every one of the members of the Assembly.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, to members of the Committee, as Chairman, when the Minister of Labour said that Mr. Duncan had accepted his superannuation, that is the reason I have permitted the debate to carry on. I assumed that it was settled. If it is before the courts or something, then I would agree with the Minister of Finance, we shouldn't be discussing the matter.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, surely on the point of order that we are going to take the word, I would assume, of the Minister of Labour over the word of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance is not the Minister who is responsible for the Civil Service Commissioner and negotiations leading to settlement. The Minister of Labour — are you, Mr. Chairman, indicating to us that you are accepting the Minister of Finance's advice over the Minister of Labour's advice?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** The matter of settlement as far as the statement of the Minister is concerned, as far as the government is concerned the matter is settled, but from the point of view of Mr. Duncan, he may not consider the matter settled, otherwise he wouldn't be acting through his legal counsel at the present time.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, here we have a real fine to-do this evening in Committee, where the members of the Assembly are attempting to seek information and clarification. We have the statement, repeated statement many times of the Minister of Labour, who indicates that there has been a settlement with the full-time Commissioner, that he has resigned, he is no longer a civil servant, he has taken his pension and insurance benefits, and the matter is closed. He is no longer involved.

Now we have the Minister of Finance getting up and saying that this matter is not closed. —(Interjection)— He said the matter is not closed, that there should be no debate on this matter.

*Committee retired to the House.*

### SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE (Cont'd)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee come to order. The Minister of Labour has some answers that were asked by the Member for St. George earlier today. Could she now give that answer? Is that all right with the Committee?

The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** The Member for St. George asked me for a breakdown by departments of those that have been laid off since October 1977. I had mentioned that there was 165 and he requested the breakdowns. The Civil Service — 4; Executive Council — 1; Agriculture — 9; Attorney-General — 4; Co-op Development — 2; Finance — 4; Public Works — 1; Health and Social Development and Corrections — 14; Industry and Commerce — 4; Mines — 3; Municipal Affairs — 6; Tourism — 11; Highways — 1; Continuing Education — 8; Renewable Resources — 30; Urban Affairs — 1; Education — 5; Northern Affairs — 56.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** That is the total, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** You are not able to give me any information with respect to any of the contract employees at all? That's available only through Management Committee, or were you able to get me some information with respect to contracts as to how many actual persons were . . . ?

**MRS. PRICE:** The contract by attrition is 691.

**MR. URUSKI:** That's contracts that were expired?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Or not renewed?

**MRS. PRICE:** Right, yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Were there any contracts that were terminated before expiring?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm informed that there were very few. There were a few, but very few. I don't have the exact number.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate as to how many civil servants in positions, in full positions, were employed as of October of 1977, and now, as of the end of the year? Are those figures available as of March 31?

**MRS. PRICE:** I gave them earlier today, but the closest that I have is as of the year end of 1977, and there was 11,073. 11,073 as of the year end, and I haven't got the figures for to date. It's in the Annual Report.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, as we left the committee to go to the House to vote on the matter in Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources we were in the process of discussion dealing with the statements made by the of Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Labour, as to whether or not the role or the employment of the full-time Civil Service Commissioner had been concluded, whether his employment had been concluded and his settlement had been ended. We had the statements made several times by the Minister of Labour, through the day, indicating that they had settled, he had taken his pension and his insurance fund, utilized both aspects, and as far as she was concerned, the matter was closed and it's been settled.

We have now statements made by the Minister of Finance saying, look, we really can't discuss this matter because there's at least a lawyer involved on behalf of Mr. Duncan, and the matter may be before the Courts and we really should not be discussing this matter here.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that. . . I really don't know whose word we should take in this case. This is certainly a case of contradiction here on behalf of two Ministers of the Crown, one who's responsible for the Civil Service, and another one indicating that there may be court action and this matter should not be discussed.

I believe the Minister who is responsible for the Civil Service Commission, has given a statement saying that this matter has been concluded. She, beforehand, indicated that she had never spoken to, never met, I believe, the Commissioner. I was in conversation — I want to put it on the record — today with the Commissioner, and I asked him, the former Commissioner, whether he had met with the Minister, and he said, immediately following his discussions with the new Premier when he received his marching orders, he was shown into the office of the Minister of Labour. There was a pre-arranged meeting. However, at this point in time, he told me that he spoke to the Minister of Labour and told her that there was not very much point of this meeting because he had just been relieved of his duties.

I will not try and paraphrase what the Minister of Labour had said or whatever. I think she should recall what went on in that meeting. She also indicated that in her presentation to the committee, she did not want to discuss this whole matter of the removal of the full-time Civil Service Commissioner from his post, that she didn't have anything to do with it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Labour did not have anything to do with it, did not know the Civil Service Commissioner, did not have any course of wanting to remove him from his role, then why, Mr. Chairman, did she sign the OC that is there before us removing him from role. If she did not want to play any part in it, in the removal, then that OC should have been signed by who she indicated to the opposition to ask, by the Premier. He could have signed both portions of the OC and that OC would have been, I believe, a legal document, and it would have been a move, as she had indicated, and not by her, she had played no part in it. I believe that the Minister of Labour should come clean, should indicate to this committee and to the House, what is really behind the firing of the full-time Civil Service Commissioner because she indicated she played no part in this. Yet she is the one who signed the OC. authorizing the —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, that OC was signed by a Minister who says that she played no —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member from Selkirk on a point of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** . . . more appropriate that the Member for Sturgeon Creek rather than sarcastically making references to the Member for St. George, refer his remarks to yourself.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** I apologize, it would be better if I did speak with you.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt, for a member who purports to be a Cabinet Minister, speaking about a colleague who indicated that she did not play any part in this role, she had no part in this whatsoever, she did not know the full-time Civil Service Commissioner, she did not have anything to do with him, she had nothing against him, she had no part to play, then why did she sign that OC? Mr. Chairman, an OC would have been legal, by the Leader and the presiding officer and the Chairman of Cabinet, the Premier. And she indicated that the Premier was the one that removed the full-time Civil Service Commissioner from his position, yet, she is the one who signed, she is the one who brought that OC forward, although it was approved by the Premier, he was not the one that was the supporting Minister of that document. She was the one.

Now, I would like to know from her, as to what is her reason for the removal of the Civil Service Commissioner? I don't want to ask the Premier, because the Premier only approved it as the final signature. She is the one that brought that OC forward.

**MRS. PRICE:** Firstly, to the Member for St. George, that OC was signed one day after we took office. The firing was done in the Cabinet. I told you before I have not met the gentlemen. I wouldn't know him if I fell over him in the hall. He came into the office and he spoke to Mr. Goodison, not with me.

Secondly, I don't think that after one day in office that I would know the man. I never saw him before, and as I mentioned to you this afternoon, I would suggest that you bring up the firing of him and the reason for it with the Premier, when his Estimates take place. —(Interjection)— He was not fired, I told you that repeatedly.

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

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister, if there was a Cabinet decision, the Minister of Labour would have taken part in this matter, if it was no doubt . . .

**MR. SPIVAK:** . . . Cabinet decision, it's not really subject to discussion here, other than the fact of the event. —(Interjection)— She's the employing authority.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Although there have been interruptions and the like, I have indicated and I have asked the Minister since that she did sign the OC —(Interjection)— she signed the OC authorizing his dismissal. Surely there must be some reason for the dismissal. She indicated earlier that, I believe, she had not met the gentleman, she didn't know his work record, yet he was dismissed. I would like to know, and I think the Members of the Legislature would like to know. . . The Minister without Portfolio surely was sitting in Cabinet — maybe he knows the reasons why the Commissioner was relieved from his duties.

**MR. SPIVAK:** On a point order. He was not dismissed. That is the first fact. And if the Honourable Member will get his facts straight, maybe we could deal with it.

**MR. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister without Portfolio says that he was not dismissed. The Minister of Labour earlier indicated that he was . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I did not.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour earlier, indicated that the Commissioner was fired by the government. She did not challenge the statements with respect to his removal. And what could you call his removal but a firing, Mr. Chairman? What do you call it? If it's not been a firing then let the Minister explain to this committee, what is that change of position?

**MR. SPIVAK:** On a point of order. If, in fact the opposition alleges it as being a firing and there's no response, that doesn't make it a firing, you know, and let's understand that from a logical point

**Monday, June 19' 1978**

of view. Now, if the honourable member can prove by the Hansard that in effect the Honourable Minister did in fact say it, then I think she would have to explain that. But she's already suggested that she didn't make that statement, and what the honourable members are trying to do is to suggest something that isn't so.

Now, there was a replacement in terms of the Chairmanship, there was not a dismissal from the Civil Service Commission, and if the honourable members would get their facts straight, then we can deal with this.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if there was no dismissal from the Civil Service Commission, I would like to know at how many meetings since the termination of Mr. Duncan has he been asked and has sat on the Civil Service Commission. How many meetings have been held by the Civil Service Commission since his removal in October and he many meetings has he attended?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Duncan was telephoned and invited to attend a meeting of the Commission in December, and he said that any discussion was to take place through his lawyer, that he was not interested in discussing it with the civil servant that called him. And I have told you that repeatedly, this afternoon, and again this evening.

**MR. URUSKI:** Are you telling me that he was invited to a meeting of the Civil Service Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes I am, in December.

**MR. URUSKI:** How many other meetings was he invited to?

**MRS. PRICE:** He didn't have to be invited to any more. The first one he said that he wouldn't have any discussion with the person that called him, that they were to deal through his lawyer.

**MR. URUSKI:** I'm sorry I was distracted here by my own colleague. If you say that he wasn't to be notified again, is he not a member of the Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, he is, but he said that he was not interested. He showed no interest in attending a meeting. Last December he was called to be told of a meeting taking place, and he said that any discussions that would be had with regard to his situation, was to be handled through his lawyer, that he was not interested.

**MR. URUSKI:** Was that situation dealing with his removal from the Commission, or was it dealing with future meetings of the Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** That was for a meeting of the Commission.

**MR. URUSKI:** So, what you're telling me is that he also indicated in the conversation with one of your staff that he would have no dealings at all with the Commission with respect to meetings held by the Commission?

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

**MR. URUSKI:** I thank the Minister for her . . . Was he at all. . . Thank you, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, how many vacant full-time positions were in existence as of October 31, 1977?

**MRS. PRICE:** Pardon me?

**MR. PAWLEY:** How many vacant full-time positions in the Civil Service, October 31, 1977?

**MRS. PRICE:** Two. You mean, in the Civil Service?

**MR. PAWLEY:** In the entire Civil Service?

Monday, June 19' 1978

**MRS. PRICE:** Oh, I don't know. I would have to check into that and get back to you with that.

**MR. PAWLEY:** If the Minister is taking that question as notice, could she then also advise how many of those full-time positions within the entire Civil Service, have been eliminated since October 31, 1977?

And thirdly, if the Minister could advise as to how many new positions have been opened up within the Civil Service since October 31, 1977?

**MRS. PRICE:** These are all answers that should be given by the Management Committee.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Are you suggesting that these questions should be directed to the . . . ?

**MRS. PRICE:** Management Committee.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Premier, during his Estimates?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Now, I would like to ask the Minister, because we have unfortunately contradictions which exist, and I think it's important that those contradictions be resolved while we are in the committee. The Minister today, and also on June 15th, in answer to myself with respect to whether or not there was a settlement — my question was ' — on Page 3,801 — "Just one final questions, that is dealing with the Civil Service Commissioner, and the dismissal and the efforts, has there been any settlement yet dealing with the Civil Service Commissioner and his dismissal". Mrs. Price: "Yes, there was a settlement. When the former Commissioner was contacted back last October, he said that he preferred to take his retirement and have it looked into and as of the 1st of April, I believe it is — it was April, and I think it was the 1st — he has been on the superannuation."

Then, from myself, "So, you think there has been a settlement arrived at." "I believe so."

Now, we have the Minister of Finance interrupting earlier this evening to suggest that, in fact, there has not been a settlement, and that these matters are presently involving the lawyers, the lawyer for Mr. Duncan and the lawyer for the government. I think . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes. The Member for Selkirk says that I say the matter's not settled. What I said was that as far as the Minister's statement was, it's settled as far as the government is concerned, but I wasn't sure that it was settled in terms of Mr. Duncan, the second party involved. Because my understanding is, that they there's still some dealings through his legal counsel. In which case, I wondered if his best interests was being served, but I didn't suggest that the matter was not settled from the government's point of view.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, it's ludicrous, the statement of the Minister of Finance, because if there is a dispute, and if it is stated that there is a settlement, then it is that, it's a settlement between the two parties. It can't be a settlement short of agreement between the two parties.

**MR. CRAIK:** I didn't say there was a court case.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I'm not talking about a court case, I'm talking about dispute between the two parties and the information that we have from the Minister is that there was a settlement. Now either there has been a settlement as the Minister indicated last Thursday, or matters are still in the hands of the lawyers, as the Minister of Finance is inferring. There is no settlement, Mr. Chairman, simply because one party has in its mind that there's a settlement and the other party does not have it within his or her mind that there is a settlement. That's not a settlement.

**MR. CRAIK:** Now, if that's the case then we shouldn't be talking about it. I mean if that . . .

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

**MR. CRAIK:** If the Member for Selkirk is correct in trying to pursue the point that the matter is not . . .

**MR. PAWLEY:** I'm trying to pursue who is correct, you or the Minister of Labour.

**MR. CRAIK:** He's defeating his own argument, Mr. Chairman. What he's trying to do is to create the case.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, to the point of order. The Minister of Finance has made a statement earlier this evening which is in contradiction to the statement made by his own colleague earlier as of last Thursday and again this afternoon. I think before we proceed any further on the entire Duncan matter, we should know whether: "The Minister of Labour, Yes there was a settlement," or (b) "The Minister of Finance, There is no settlement." Surely before we proceed further, we ought to have clarification from the Minister of Labour whether there is a settlement or there is no settlement. If the Minister of Labour is incorrect in her statement of June 15, 1978, Page 3,801 then let her say so, but if the Minister of Finance is wrong in his intervention, then let us know that as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** To my knowledge there has been a settlement with Mr. Duncan and furthermore with all the pros and cons that are concerning it right now, I mentioned this afternoon that it would be best brought forth in the Premier's Estimates and I'm not going to discuss it any more. I've answered all the questions that I feel that I should on it and you can ask the Premier the rest.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well I appreciate the fact that — and I want to say this to the Minister of Labour — I thank her at least for making it clear because the Minister of Finance through his intervention was attempting to blur the question as to whether there was a settlement or not and I don't know for . . . what reason the Minister of Finance

**MR. CRAIK:** Trying to protect your client's interest.

**MR. PAWLEY:** . . . interrupted to contradict the Minister of Labour's earlier statement in respect to a settlement. I would appreciate the Minister of Finance's explanation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** It seems to have happened again in this committee, if the honourable member would read his own words out of Hansard, the Minister I believe the very last party read said, "I believe so", the Minister of Finance said that he believed it was so because as far as the government concerned and possibly because maybe the previous Commissioner doesn't think it's so. The Minister just answered said, "As I understand it, there is a settlement." Now if the other person wants to pursue it, it's entirely up to them and if it's going to be pursued, then I don't think we're doing that other person any favour.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I still don't know what the point of order is of the Minister without Portfolio, because the fact is very very clear, there is no settlement. Settlement cannot be defined unless both parties are at a consensus and certainly for the Minister without Portfolio to suggest that settlement can be interpreted by one party simply because one party has in mind that there's been a resolution, that that is not settlement. It's not settlement until both parties concur.

I'd like to proceed beyond that point to ask the Minister as to how many civil servants have been redeployed by her Redeployment Committee which she established?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** 29.

**MR. PAWLEY:** How many of the employees who had received their termination notices had applied to be redeployed through the Redeployment Committee?

**MRS. PRICE:** To date there's been 165. They automatically went on the redeployment and there's approximately 115 still to be redeployed.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could the Minister indicate insofar as that redeployment of 29 staff, how many positions would have been filled during that period of time which the Redeployment Committee was in existence in total?

**MRS. PRICE:** We haven't got the exact figures, I'm told that it could be an guesstimate of around 50.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like the Minister as well to advise us as to the settlement, the amount of settlement which has been paid out to the some 400 government employees that had received their pink slips. Does she have the amount of money which has been paid out in settlement by the Province of Manitoba to those who had received their pink slips?

**MRS. PRICE:** I can take it as notice, I don't have those figures.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like also for the Minister to clarify for me — her First Minister had in an earlier statement indicated that there were 373 staff cuts in Information Service Release, March 10, 1978. In the figure which she is using of 160-some, could she define for me the 160. That consists of term and regular employees, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Term over a year and regular civil servants.

**MR. PAWLEY:** And the balance to make up the 373 would be contract employees?

**MRS. PRICE:** Contract or terms at less than a year.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Less than a year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre, can we go on to him? The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** First of all, my argument is not with the Minister of Labour because I think that she has done a very good job of an almost impossible situation. When she says that she was asked to sign an Order in Council *pro forma* in her first day in Cabinet, I will understand that circumstance. But nevertheless we have before us an item for approval, the expenditures relative to the operation of the Civil Service Commission and comes to mind whether we have as a result of the actions taken by the government, not by the Minister of Labour per se but by the government whether at this point in time we have a legally constituted Civil Service Commission.

If I may be allowed to continue, Mr. Chairman. Executive Councils in their wisdom take actions that they think that they can take. We had a case in point where five of the Justices said that the government didn't have the authority to act and four of the Justices of the Supreme Court said that the Executive Council did have authority to act, including the Chief Justice of the land. The question in my mind, and I don't intend to take the full 20 minutes to make my case, I have really no question to the Minister of Labour because I think she has tried as best as she can with the information available to answer the questions put to her by my colleagues.

Nevertheless we have a case where the government decided on a policy and they intended to implement it come heaven, hell or high water. In fact prior to the assuming of office before there was any legal authority to do so, they dismissed two Deputies. Now somebody who earlier I'm trying to raise a tempest in a tea pot. Well sometimes we have to pay attention to the semantics of words and the chain of events as they take place. Insurance policies are quite specific in that this policy will take effect as of 12:01, if you have a fire at 12:00 o'clock, tough. But nevertheless this present government before they had any legal authority whatsoever to act, until the time that they actually took their oath of office they were not in office, dismissed two deputies. We had that given to us that this was what the government was going to do.

Now we have a case and it involves semantics this is true, but in a situation a person is either terminated or they resign, it's one t'other. Now as the Minister related the course of events — and it was on advice provided to her, I'm sure, that this was the procedure to be followed. The government in my view followed termination proceedings. Now it's well within the Civil Service Act and the government have been advised that the procedure to terminate the Commissioner was by way of motion during the present session, but the government knows full well that such action would not prevail because they haven't got the votes in the House to carry such a motion. I'm not in a position to know, while I have had conversations with Mr. Duncan the last of which was some six weeks ago, so I don't know where Mr. Duncan stands relative to this particular point, but we are being asked to approve Estimates for something that we're not too sure of. There's two points and I'm

in somewhat of a quandry.

If the government has in fact and in law circumvented the provisions of The Civil Service Act, then it is a matter of privilege of the House and perhaps should be referred to the Speaker as a matter of privilege of the House because this man was an officer of the Legislative Assembly, not of the government, Mr. Chairman.

But then we're put in somewhat more of a complex situation, that if this case proceeds judicially to the Supreme Court and the government is adjudged to have acted illegally, that they did not have the authority to proceed in the manner in which they have proceeded, then the man has to be reinstated in my judgment.

This would complicate the matter in that all the decisions taken by this Commission in the interim would be nul and void. It would necessitate at that time, once again in my view, a motion for the Legislature to make effective retroactively all of those decisions which were made as we did with the Anti-Inflation Legislation which was found necessary because the administration did not have the authority to act in the opinion of the Supreme Court.

Then if the government is still determined to terminate this individual because nothing the Minister has said has given this committee any evidence that Mr. Duncan has resigned. He is either terminated or he is resigned and perhaps this is a matter for the courts to decide. If he has been terminated, I think the members of the committee can see the complexities which creep into this, so it is more than just a tempest in the teapot, Mr. Chairman, it goes at the whole root of the processes which we establish to try to make things apolitical.

I can remember when we established the office of the Ombudsman. The discussions which took place, inter-party discussions, to try and find someone who could fulfill the role of Ombudsman in this province. These people serve the Legislature, not the government. The same thing is true of the Provincial Auditor where that position is a servant of the Legislature and also Legislative Counsel as we pointed out earlier.

Now my understanding of the situation in retrospect was that the position of the full-time Commissioner became vacant because of the retirement of the individual which the government subsequently brought back. But at the time that the individual under discussion was appointed to this particular case, there was no objections raised to the individual having taken this particular job because he came well qualified to the position. The Act is quite clear in my judgment that the only way he can be removed is for cause and the Minister and the government has presented no evidence whatsoever that there was cause. So I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I'm in somewhat of a quandry as to exactly what we're involved with.

If it is the case that this point has to go through the judicial route to determine whether in fact and in law Mr. Duncan was terminated, then that word is at leave of the Legislative Assembly. And it is the arrogance of this government that they have determined that the rules of the House don't apply to them, that the government majority will be used to ram through anything, including things which were, to most of us who are interested in the Legislative process, and I think the only thing that separates us from apes is our respect for the law, that they can remove an officer of the Legislative Assembly, and this is why I keep emphasizing that, that is what this government has done. Because the Minister has said that they were bound and determined that they were going to do this, not after investigating this man from an administrative standpoint after having been in government some time, one day after they took office.

They offered him transfers. Now, everything that has been put on the record so far gives credibility to the termination intentions of this government. In my opinion, and I'm not a lawyer, but nevertheless elected to see /ses the proces reflect the people not one profession, I think that the intent of the law has definitely been circumvented by this government.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions relative to Mr. Duncan. Since the Minister is not prepared to discuss the question of Mr. Duncan, I move committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Motion has been put that committee rise. All in favour, please indicate. Are there any people opposed to it? We'll have to recess and go into the House and have a vote. Committee recess.

*Committee retired to the House.*

#### **SUPPLY — CIVIL SERVICE (Cont'd)**

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

**MR. USKIW:** During the discussion, the Minister indicated that there was an attet to invite



**Monday, June 19' 1978**

the former Commissioner of the Civil Service to a regular meeting of the Commission. At least that's what I understood her to say, although my impression was that it was really a meeting to discuss the status of the former Commissioner. I'm wondering whether the Minister would want to reflect on what she had stated earlier and clarify for the benefit of the committee.

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm not discussing Mr. Duncan any more this evening — I said any more discussions can take place with the Premier at his Estimates.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with statements that have been made and uttered by this Minister at this committee meeting. This Minister can not be so privileged as to suggest that she can utter statements on which there can not be follow-up discussions. That has never been done in my 13 or 14 Sessions in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman. That's just unheard of. That's absolute nonsense. If a Minister is not prepared to respond to the questionings, the positions that are put forward by Members of the Assembly, then the Minister knows what her responsibilities are. The purpose and the exercise of the Estimates is to go through the department, to consider the policy of the department and the government, and the expenditures that go along with those policies. Now, it's not as if we are introducing something that wasn't introduced by the Minister herself this evening. It was the Minister who volunteered the information on which now she refuses to make further comments.

Now, how can the opposition do its job for the people of Manitoba with a government that has the arrogance to tell us that they are not going to answer any questions whenever they decide that they don't want to answer any questions. I hate to use their exaggerated terms, Mr. Chairman, but this is very akin to a dictatorial position, very akin, Mr. Chairman.

So, I ask the Minister again, if she would care to clarify for us, the purpose of that particular meeting to which she indicated the response from the former Commissioner was that they had to contact his lawyer.

Was it a meeting to discuss the status of the former Commissioner, or was it a meeting, a regular Commission meeting that he was being invited to attend?

**MRS. PRICE:** I am quite aware, for the Member for Lac du Bonnet, of my responsibilities. Your questions are very repetitious. I did already make the statement that he was asked to a regular meeting.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we have a dilemma, because a person has been terminated, another person has been brought in to fill a role, and that has been done outside of the consideration of the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the Civil Service Commission Act. And I think it is incumbent on the Minister to explain to us how the government is able to proceed in that fashion, knowing full well that those provisions are put in there in order to maintain some independence on the part of the Commissioner of the Civil Service, and out of the political arena. The Minister refuses to answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I would then pursue another question.

Was the size of the Commission enlarged?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** From previously you meant?

**MR. USKIW:** Yes. Was the size of the Commission, the numbers, changed from what it was prior to October the 24th?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Commission members went from five to seven.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, when did that decision take place?

**MRS. PRICE:** I think it was December, that's when the addition of Shirley Bradshaw and Mr. R.O. Hunter was added to it.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, all right. Then I ask how it is that we have Mr. Newton there? Whose position did he fill, if a position has now been terminated?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Act reads that there can be a part-time member and a full-time member. I read the provisions of that Act to you. I read the two clauses in the Civil Service

Act that shows why there should be a Commission to be called: The Civil Service Commission, consisting of not less than three or more than seven members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, one of whom shall be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as Chairman of the Commission.

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may provide that any one or more members of the Commission shall be required to devote to the business of the Commission, only such part of his or their time as is prescribed in the order.

Accordingly the Order-in-Council was passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in October, designating Merlin Newton as the Chairman of the Commission, and Douglas Duncan as the part-time member of the Commission.

**MR. USKIW:** Could I ask then, which, or who, was terminated from the Commission? We have now a Commission of seven, that was an enlargement of two, but in addition to that we have introduced Mr. Newton. So, it sounds to me like there are eight, not seven, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** There has just been two added, and Mr. Newton, and the number is seven.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, can I then inquire as to how many Commission members there were as of the date of October the 11th?

**MRS. PRICE:** There was four. Mr. Duncan, Mrs. Allan, Mr. Pankiw, and Mr. SCCHUBERT.

**MR. USKIW:** Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there was one vacancy?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. USKIW:** And that accounts for Mr. Newton?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that 691 people who are on contract were terminated by attrition. Was this due to program terminations or programs that have expired on their own or was this due to cancellation of programs that were under way?

**MRS. PRICE:** It would be some of each.

**MR. USKIW:** Can the Minister indicate whether all or any portion of those contract employees were people who were involved in departments having to do with cost-sharing with the Government of Canada?

**MRS. PRICE:** I would have to take that question as notice, I don't know.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to some questions that I raised with the Minister when she denied that the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission was terminated. Could the Minister explain with respect to the letter that was sent to him, I believe it was in December, with the cheque for two weeks pay, what the statement means? Could the Minister possibly table that letter for convenience so that some members would be able to have a better look at that letter? But there was a statement quoted out of it, out of that letter, saying that in lieu of services, I believe — I'm paraphrasing now, I may not be totally correct — there was two weeks pay. Could the Minister tell me what that statement means if it does not mean termination?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** I'd mentioned that memo from the accountant in the House the other day. I did not mention the word termination. It was mentioned that he had to be terminated from Mr. Tallin, and again from Mr. Scarsbrook, the accountant, to him, in order for him

**Monday, June 19' 1978**

---

to collect his pension. That was the only way that he could get his pension that he said that he wanted.

**MR. URUSKI:** Therefore, he in effect was terminated, Mr. Chairman, am I correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Technically, if only for purposes of getting his pension, that's the only way he could get his pension, and the man requested his pension, and that's the only way that he could get it.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me whether the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission is in receipt of his Civil Service Commission pension.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, he is.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is he also receiving a salary from the Provincial Government?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, he is.

**MR. URUSKI:** Then how could, Mr. Chairman, the new Civil Service Commissioner be in receipt of a pension and a salary, having taken retirement? How is it necessary for the former Commissioner to be terminated in order to receive his pension, that he had to be removed from the Commission? How is that possible ?

**MRS. PRICE:** Because he was a civil servant and Mr. Newton has been brought back in under contract.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if the present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who was a civil servant retired, received his pension, is now in receipt of a pension, and also of a salary, was it necessary for the government to terminate the member of the Commission in order for him to receive his pension?

**MRS. PRICE:** That is correct.

**MR. URUSKI:** What salary would the former Commissioner have received had he attended the meetings of the Commission since he was not terminated by the government?

**MRS. PRICE:** Something around \$33.00.

**MR. URUSKI:** \$33.00, what salary was he receiving prior to being terminated . . . a day if he was . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** It was around \$38,000 a year, I don't know what it would work out to a day.

**MR. URUSKI:** What would the maximum annual salary be as a part-time member of the Commission excluding expenses?

**MRS. PRICE:** Depending on the number of meetings that he would have.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is there not a maximum salary?

**MRS. PRICE:** Around \$2,000 to \$2,100.00.

**MR. URUSKI:** \$2,100.00. Mr. Chairman, how can the Minister rationalize and stand before this committee and indicate that the former Commissioner was not terminated when his salary was reduced from something like \$38,000 to a possible maximum of \$2,100 and she has the gall to stand before this committee and say that he was not terminated. How do you explain an action such as that and how can you sit here in front of this committee, face this committee, and say along with your colleagues here and say, "Well, the man was not terminated." What was he then?

**MRS. PRICE:** I suggest you ask the Premier in his Estimates.

**MR. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we have here this evening and it's before us, we have the O.C. that was signed by the Minister of Labour, Norma L. Price who was the Minister responsible and the Minister recommending the O.C., not the Premier. The Premier was the President of the Executive Council who co-signed the O.C. making it final with the Lieutenant-Governor placing his signature on the 26th day of October, 1977. The Minister repeats and wants members of this committee now to ask the Premier as to the reasons and what the meaning of this matter is as to whether the former full-time Chairman of the Commission was terminated or he wasn't. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, either the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing knows what he sign or he doesn't know what he signs. If he doesn't know what he signs, the Premier should now take notice and remove him from that portfolio if he doesn't know what he signs, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Labour signed this O.C. authorizing the payment and removal of the full-time Commissioner and authorizing the appointment of several new members to the commission as well as the re-appointment to the Commission of a retired Civil Service Commissioner who had retired voluntarily some four or five years previously. That member of that Commission at that time was in receipt of his Civil Service pension, he is now a full-time member of the Commission receiving a commissioner's salary. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that the legality of the move of the former commissioner in order for him to receive his Civil Service pension, he had to resign as a civil servant to receive that pension, but surely, Mr. Chairman, the actions of the government are — well I would be charitable in saying that they are despicable, that would be charitable in terms of dealing with people within the Civil Service. Not only the dealings with the Commissioner, but the actions made by the former government as was indicated by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, not only the firing of several Deputy Ministers prior to being sworn in as Ministers but also the firing of a number of secretaries, I believe four or five days before the Ministers were sworn in, before the new government took office. I would like to know from the Minister under whose authority those firings took place prior to the new administration taking office. Under whose authority were those secretaries who albeit were Ministers' secretaries removed from office? Mr. Chairman, that type of an action by the present government certainly leaves little room for anything but contempt for the legislative and the parliamentary process and The Civil Service Act and Commission as a whole that it is beyond words, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Labour, the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission comes to this committee, does not want to answer questions about the Commissioner, the former Commissioner. She indicates that he was not demoted, he was not terminated although his salary was changed from a full-time civil servant in the order, I think she indicated, of \$38,000 a year to a possible maximum of something like \$2,100 or \$2,200 a year. Now if that isn't the — ination, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister and maybe the Minister of Finance who knows so much about these kinds of transactions — to indicate what really does that mean.

The Minister of Labour should — if she indicates that the former Commissioner was notified of one meeting I'd like her to indicate whether he is being notified of meetings. I accept her words that he indicated at the time that any messages should go through his lawyer. Has he been invited to any subsequent meetings of the commission since now there is a settlement, a settlement that she says has been concluded. There has been a settlement reached with the former Commissioner, so if there has been a settlement, I want to know as to how many meetings he has been invited to since that settlement has been reached. Whether he has been notified by letter, by telephone, what is the normal practice of the Civil Service Commission to date.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment. The Member for St. George implies that there's something unusual about some changes that took place in staff early in change in the government. —(Interjection)— I'm not referring to changes in Deputy Minister positions or who is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, I referring to your comment about a number of other positions. My understanding was that prior to the former government leaving there was something in the order of 20 positions that were actually vacated by cause of the former government which I presume was a voluntary agreement of the people who left although I don't suppose anybody's gone around and asked.

The other point I want to make is that it's not unusual for some changes to take place

shortly following the change in government, in fact I think it's a healthy change that happens in many cases. I know that there was a case when the government changed in 1969, a person who worked for me who lost his job shortly after the government changed and he had, prior to coming to work for me, he had tenure as a civil servant but then became enacted in the role of an executive assistant, but I don't —(Interjection)— That's right, but he had tenure as a civil servant and had had many years tenure, now he felt upset and aggrieved at the time, the same as anybody else —(Interjection)— It's the same as anybody else. Well this case is slightly different because he'd had several years of tenure as a civil servant. I'm not suggesting that there was anything, Mr. Chairman, really wrong with it. There's other cases in this particular case — I'll give you one example where the person was being transferred over to the department I was involved in, or was slated to be transferred and decided that he did not want to continue on and I asked him to continue on. I said, "Your work has been good and I value your work and I value what you can offer to the department." "No," he said, and he gave me his rational reason and I thought that it was very unusual but nevertheless appreciated. His comments was that he said that he thought that at the change of a government that it was logical and rational for there to be a change in government. Now in his particular case he cited the example, and I don't necessarily believe with it, but I understand his argument, he said he had lived in the States for while and he said, "I happen to believe in their system, that when a government changes, it's healthy for the entire government that there be substantial change at the top of the order of a government." So as I say, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say necessarily this was my proposition to him, in fact my proposition was the opposite. I would have preferred that he stay, he preferred that he leave and he gave that as part of his rationale. Now, here you've got exactly the opposite case being presented by the members opposite here.

Just let me reiterate though, that every time the government changes, it's not unusual to get people changing in the government and it happens every time the government changed and there's not necessarily a thing wrong with it, Mr. Chairman. This doesn't necessarily mean wholesale mass changes, but you've got to have enough changes. If you change the Ministers only, my goodness your new government whoever they are, whenever the government changes, are not going to go anywhere or do anything in terms of what they bring to government. So, it's perfectly rational.

Now, if you're going to try and make a case out of four people that change after the government —(Interjection)— The normal and accepted ones are the ones that are Order-in-Council appointments and I think that's understood and everybody knows that. Order-in-Council appointments that are by Order-in-Council, the logic is not a Manitoba logic, it goes back into the parliamentary system that the Deputies are appointed by the Premier and that's always been the case and there's some that are protected within the Civil Service and others whether it's the Director's level or the ADM level — ADM level is Order-in-Council appointment, the dividing line is at the Director's level. It's accepted practice not just in Manitoba but elsewhere.

Now, also, people that are in other boards and appointments are even more subject to those changes, Mr. Chairman, and I think if you went over the Boards and Commissions you may find at this point that there probably has been less than half of the number of people changed even after eight months that are in boards and commissions which are very subject to change and are expected to be changed as a matter of course. So I think the members opposite, to a certain extent here, are trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, and I think in the particular case, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister made the point that in Mr. Duncan's case, it was being referred to the First Minister for discussion under his Executive Council Estimates. If the members want to take it up at that time, let the First Minister deal with it. It's in the same category as some of these others that I've mentioned here.\$

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I thought you were going to put me on your list because the Member for St. George was speaking . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I do have you on the list.

**MR. BOYCE:** He's down twice?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I didn't know whether the Member for St. George was finished or not. I'm giving him the opportunity to conclude, then I go on to the Member for Selkirk, Winnipeg Centre, Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance now enters this debate and wants to cloud the issue somewhat. I want to tell him that I accept his argument dealing with the appointments of Deputy Ministers by Order-in-Council, the Executive Assistants and the like. The matters that I was referring to and the authority which the government, I believe, stepped completely over its bounds is the removal of secretaries, not of civil servants who are involved in policy decisions and the like, which I can see the government usings its prerogative in terms of dealing with those types of appointments, but secretaries who are in offices, to be removed, not after the Minister takes his office and says, look, you and I, I don't think we can get along, and I'm going to appoint my own secretary. I can see that happening. But Mr. Chairman, before the Ministers were even sworn in, four days before the Ministers were sworn in, notices were given — by whom? Someone within the bureaucracy, authorized either by the Minister who was to be designated as the Minister of the Civil Service Commission, or the Premier, to give the authority —(Interjection)— or the Premier elect, that they should be removed from their positions.

I want to ask the Minister whether she was the one that authorized those dismissals from those positions, because that is the type of authority I'm talking about. I'm not talking about the policy positions where the government certainly has the authority in which to make those decisions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I wasn't the one.

**MR. URUSKI:** Do you know who was the one?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I don't.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have the Minister's attitude as to that kind of an action. What does she feel that kind of an action constitutes? How does she react to an action of that nature?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Hearing no answer, and no more questions, the Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to those words that have already been expressed in connection with the matter that's before us. I regret very much that the Minister of Labour is placed in this position. She has been placed in this position by the First Minister, and I say that it's very unfortunate that the Minister of Labour has inherited a situation with which she has really had little, if any, control, even by her own admission. She has acknowledged that the First Minister apparently made certain determinations to the point that she is placed in an embarrassing position, which I regret, of having to indicate that she will not answer questions, but that the First Minister will have to deal with questions that should properly relate to her as it falls within the parameters of her department.

I think that in Manitoba we have developed a tradition and a practice that certain vital and key functions within the democratic structure are considered to be of a non-party, a non-patronage nature, because of the very essence of the responsibilities. The provincial auditor is one, the ombudsman is another, the chief electoral officer, and the commissioner, the Civil Service Commissioner. And because of that, Mr. Chairman, the legislation of the province has enshrined certain safeguards so that these positions can remain of a non-partisan basis, and I believe that members and all parties have, at least up until recently, respected the importance of safe-guarding these essential democratic features within our society.

For that reason, 4 (4) was placed in the present Civil Service Act stating that the commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour, and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may remove him only on address of the Assembly carried by a vote of two-thirds of the members voting thereon, but the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may

suspend him from office for cause. No cause has been shown. There has been a decision, on which apparently there is some debate, and the Minister finds herself in the awkward position of indicating technical termination. What a technical termination and a real termination is, I'm not sure, but there is some question as to the termination.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that the Civil Service Commissioner, like the chief electoral officer, like the ombudsman, like the provincial auditor, cannot be dismissed except for cause, and if this can happen with the Civil Service Commissioner of the Province of Manitoba, that the law can be circumvented, that the law can be twisted and turned in order to suit the particular political objectives of the group that is in power, then, in fact, Mr. Chairman, the essence and the basis of the democratic society in which we live in Manitoba is in fact, jeopardized and threatened.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the next opportunity for — not necessarily this government, but for the next government — would be to, or the government following the next government, sometime down the path of history of the future in the province, would be to appoint an auditor-general, with the present auditor having nothing but the bare bone of responsibility and duty, an auditor-general having the real power. Or a general electoral officer, thus removing from the existing electoral officer, the real fundamental role which he is expected to enjoy, so that a general electoral officer would fulfill the political objectives of the party that is in power.

So Mr. Chairman, I suggest, in fact, I accuse this government of deliberately setting out on a route to undermine the political, non-partisanship that has been cherished and has been respected within the life of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, we have not received answers. We have not received answers, for instance, as to whether or not there has been settlement or not. We have received contradiction, we have received inconsistency, we have seen a dispute between two members of the treasury branch, I suggest — and the Minister without Portfolio says, "nuts," he's very good at speaking from his seat. But Mr. Chairman, I say to you that an impartial, objective reading of Hansard will indicate that there is no certainty as to whether or not, from the words expressed by members of the treasury branch, two members of the treasury branch, whether or not there is settlement or not.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, we should be expected to at least receive the basic elementary answers to the questions that we pose. If there is a settlement, then say there is one. If there is no settlement, then say there is no settlement. But at least let us not have the confusion and uncertainty which is provoked by the difficulties that appear in members of the treasury branch arriving at answers to questions in this committee.

Then, also, Mr. Chairman, we have the evidence of a letter which was forwarded in December, a letter of termination. The Minister states it is only a technical letter of termination. Mr. Chairman, I have to say to you that I think that there is a growing responsibility upon the opposition to seriously consider whether or not this entire matter becomes a point of privilege in the House. Has the House and has the Assembly been circumvented insofar as the issue before us, the actual, de facto, the de facto dismissal of the Civil Service Commissioner.

This government knew that they did not have the means within the framework of the legislation in order to take this matter into the House. They've chosen to proceed in the way that they have. But Mr. Chairman, in so doing, they must then be responsible for the consequences of their action. If those actions are improper or they are illegal, then this government will be required to give answer for their actions.

So Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the answers that we have received have been totally inadequate. They have been contradictory, they have been inconsistent, and I think it's quite understandable, and I conclude by stating that I feel sorry for the Minister of Labour because I do believe that she has been but a puppet in the hands of the First Minister, not only on the question of the Civil Service Commissioner, but in many other areas that we could relate to, and it's unfortunate that a Minister of the Crown has been placed in this position by a First Minister that obviously has no feeling for the basic tradition of this province insofar as the function and role of certain non-political positions within the democratic structure of the province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed listening to the remarks of the Minister of Finance, and I couldn't help but think what a difference a few years make. I'm sorry it hasn't arrived yet, the famous Gordie Howe speech in the House, and I don't want to resurrect this particular debate, but Mr. Chairman, it goes to the root of the problem. We're sitting

here as legislators, not as lawyers or anything else, and I think it's incumbent upon the opposition to get the point across and put it on the record, just exactly what has transpired.

I agreed, primarily, with what the Minister of Finance says relative to my views of what governments can and cannot do. I mentioned earlier in this debate, Mr. Chairman, about the dismissal of the two Deputy Ministers prior to any legal authority so to do. These people accepted it and I don't raise a question relative to those except to show the approach of this particular government. We have in effect, ipso facto, one man rule. The Minister of Labour, somebody says that she's got herself in a little bit of hot water because of trying to answer the questions with candor, and I believe that had she been left alone to operate this department, albeit she was the first to admit that her credentials relative to labour were not that extensive, that she could have intuitively done a better job than she has been directed to do by the martinet who is running Manitoba. Because it isn't the first instance that we have had referred to the First Minister, that if you're told to sign an Order-in-Council by the First Minister, you sign it. And this is true. This is true.

Having only been in Cabinet for three years myself, there was no instance at which it happened to me, but if it had happened, I will be candid and say, I would also, if it was a pro forma and it wasn't a pro forma signature, and it wasn't something which was against my conscience, I would have signed it.

But the question before us is the manner in which this was done. And the case that's made by the Minister of Finance is totally fallacious, because there's absolutely no parallel whatsoever. We're not talking about the dismissal of civil servants, the replacements of the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor of members of boards, we're talking about a servant of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba. We're talking about the freedom of the people of the province of Manitoba, that the current government had doves flying out of TV sets and everything else, —(Interjection)— free Manitoba, and here we have the imposition, by a majority, you see it, just boom, boom, boom, Mr. Chairman, that this will be imposed upon the people.

You know, in recent history, we had a case where a leader of a country had the establishment and the powers that be impose their will upon a country, that the man committed suicide by shooting himself in the back of the head 13 times, and this one man rule is the kind of government that I suggest we do not need in this country. If the Minister of Labour had come into this debate and said that she had made a judgment and she was in error, that would be one thing, but this is not what the Minister of Labour is saying. She's saying that this is the decision of the First Minister and the First Minister should be held accountable and I fully agree with the Minister but the Minister should not only be held accountable to this committee, Mr. Chairman, he should be held to the Legislative Assembly as a whole and the people of the Province of Manitoba. The people of the province have a right to know that this is the kind of government that they have voted for.

The Legislative Assembly Act is quite clear. The procedures to be followed should the government choose to remove a Commissioner are quite specific. It's spelled out and all the jiggery-pokery, fancy games, offer him another job, terminate him. Now I don't want to be repetitive, Mr. Chairman, but I really don't know how much farther we can go except to come up with as many points as we can so that it is a matter of record in Hansard, that we in opposition see it albeit it stupid in some people's minds, that we see this a circumvention of the intent of The Civil Service Act which says that to remove a Commissioner, certain procedures have to be followed; that a motion has to be introduced in the House and it has to be passed with a two-thirds majority. From the evidence which was provided by the Minister herself, the man has been terminated.

It is the Minister's prerogative not to answer questions and she has to be able to answer those questions politically. This is what the process is all about and if she refuses to answer them and in her refusal I can gain political advantage, that is what it's all about. So, you have said that you don't want to answer any more questions. I will ask you one further question and you can answer it or not.

The statement was made that Mr. Duncan has been receiving superannuation cheques. Has Mr. Duncan deposited these superannuation cheques in trust, or has he signed them as an endorsement that these are to be cashed without prejudice, or has moneys actually flowed from the Crown to Mr. Duncan personally relative to this particular situation?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.



**MRS. PRICE:** I will have to check with the Superannuation.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I've had an opportunity to underline some of the responsibilities of the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps it's worthwhile reading for the benefit of the people who haven't bothered to read it. It says, "Provide central recruiting service for departments. Supervises the selection process for initial appointments, transfers and promotions. Provides advice regarding employment opportunities to the public. Acts as an appeal body to hear appeals of employees and provides consulting service to departments in matters related to personnel management and human resource development. The Commission also provides an occupational health program and a manpower training program in the form of recruitment and selection workshops for line managers. The Commission is responsible for supervising equal employment opportunity principles in the Manitoba Civil Service."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have here all of these flowery statements about the responsibilities of this commission which would lead us to believe that ethics are of utmost importance in the process of delivery of these responsibilities, but we witness at the same time a government without any ethics whatever with respect to its relationship to the civil servants, to members of the Civil Service past and present, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's fair to ask the Minister of Labour just how she views ethically speaking, the dismissal of people in the way that they were dismissed, by the First Minister as she alleges and where she claims that she had no input even though she is Minister of Labour, Minister in charge of the Civil Service with all of the flowery ethical provisions and the Minister who signed an Order-in-Council of dismissal. Just what are we supposed to expect when we have that kind of blatant disregard for very basic fundamental ethical procedures that have been laid down over the decades, Mr. Chairman, by governments, past governments, not by just the most recent past government but by governments many many years ago.

We have here a Minister of Labour and the Minister in charge of the Civil Service who apparently is condoning these procedures and if she isn't condoning them then she wants to be silent. She says, "Talk to my Premier, he made the decision." Now, this is one hell of a demonstration of responsibility, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that the Premier has so brow-beaten his Cabinet that they have been forced to keep quiet because the Minister has indicated not only this evening but on the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Labour, that she was going to refuse to answer questions then too. Every time she gets herself into some difficulty on cross-examination by the opposition or whatever it is, and that's fair game, Mr. Chairman, that's what this process is all about, is to score points and they're political points, every time this Minister is in some difficulty, she says, "I'm refusing to answer any more questions." Now if the Premier has so brow-beaten his Ministry that they are unable to speak their mind, fine, that will stand on the record. We understand the kind of government we have and that's what it appears to be, but we also understand what kind of Ministers we have, Mr. Chairman, because I don't believe that anyone has any sense of decency and ethics where that kind of power is displayed, that it isn't challenged even if it is the First Minister, Mr. Chairman. And one of the duties of the Minister of Labour and the Minister in charge of the Civil Service, is to protect those ethics on behalf of all of those people involved some 18,000 or more, or whatever the numbers are including Crown corporations, Mr. Chairman. Those are the ethics that have to be preserved because they are there for a purpose and they were put there over a period of time based on a lot of previous experience.

"Supervising the selection process for initial appointments", what does that mean? What does that mean, does that mean that you have to search out, Mr. Chairman, the political credentials of the applicants? Is that what it means, because that's what it seems to mean in terms of the actions of this government to date. Is that the way we are to read that section, Mr. Chairman, that in supervising the selection process for initial appointments, transfers and promotions, we are now to the position where we need to identify our candidates for appointment and promotion on the basis of who they know, whether they're tied politically or not.

And then of course, this same body is an appeal body hearing appeals of employees relative to applications or promotions or increments or whatever the jurisdiction is, Mr. Chairman. What kind of a body is that? Is the Civil Service Commission now nothing more but a hatchet group for the First Minister. Is this what we are really led to believe? This is what it looks like given the actions of the government to date and given the statements

**Monday, June 19' 1978**

of this Minister in this committee, Mr. Chairman. This is essentially what it looks like. It says, "The commission is responsible for supervising equal employment opportunities principles in the Manitoba Civil Service. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed the application of this principle by this government. We have witnessed that if you're a known figure, member of another political party, that you will not be acceptable under these rules. That's what we have witnessed since this government has been in power. Mr. Chairman, that is one hell of an indictment and I can't believe that this Minister can sit there, be brow-beaten by the First Minister and have no ethics of her own to take a responsible position with respect to her policies that will govern the Department of Labour and the Civil Service Commission.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister could give us an organizational chart of the Civil Service Commission, that area which is her responsibility as Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission? She's given us one before for the Department of Labour.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess you wouldn't have an opportunity to give that to us today, but she will be giving us that material. Also, I understand that she will be tabling that material which she referred to this afternoon but which she didn't have at her disposal this evening to table so that we could take a look at it and some of that documentation did pertain to the case of Mr. Duncan. Since that material will be tabled and we'll get a chance to look at it tomorrow, I'd like to move to some other areas and I'd like to ask the Minister what the affirmative action thrust of the Civil Service Commission will be and what will the affirmative action thrust of the government be first and secondly, how will the Civil Service Commission carry that thrust out?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we have formed a committee, the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee that has had numerous meetings. There's six people on the committee and this is one of their goals, to see that there is affirmative action, that there is equal employment opportunities.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You said there are six people on the Equal Opportunity Committee, is this a committee of Cabinet or is this a committee of civil servants?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's a mixed committee. Bob Best the Director of Personnel, Terry Edgeworth from Management Committee, Shirley Bradshaw from Development and Training, Bill Renaud from the Civil Service Commission, Lil McIlwain from the Women's Bureau and Frank Rogodzinski from the Physically Handicapped.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Does this committee report to you or advise you, is that its function?

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Is this the committee then that in a sense has replaced the Equal Opportunity Cabinet committee that used to exist under the past administration that was serviced by an inter-departmental staff group? Does the Minister feel that a group reporting just to her as a Minister will be more effective in carrying forward an affirmative action thrust within the government, than one which reported to a Cabinet committee chaired by the Premier?

**MRS. PRICE:** The way we have it set up . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't mind hearing the comment of the Minister responsible for Housing because it's one of the stupidest comments I've ever heard and I'd like to have it tabled.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** I said it's less political.

Monday, June 19' 1978

**MR. PARASIUK:** That's nonsense you know. When we have statements like that it shows that the person has no conception of how a government operates. We've had a number of Cabinet committees set up by this government. No one's ever accused the Cabinet committees of being political. You know, no one has ever accused the Land Claims Committee, sub-committee of Cabinet, as being political, and no one would ever say that affirmative action is an area which is somehow political. It's an area that requires co-ordinated action between departments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour in response to the Member for Transcona.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, the First Minister has been getting chastised here steadily for too much intervention, now I tell them that there isn't any intervention, that they report to the Minister, and now there's fault in that.

**MR. PARASIUK:** No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't chastised her, I just asked her if she thought it would be more effective?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I don't. I think it's quite effective this way, they're doing very . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** Fine. The reason why I asked this, Mr. Chairman, is that I did ask other Ministers in their Estimates, what they were doing with respect to affirmative action. And they said, "I'm sorry, this year we're not doing anything." And that is on record. That is in Hansard. I asked the Minister responsible for Health and Social Development, I was particularly interested in asking the Minister responsible for Health and Social Development because that's the largest employer in the government. That's the department wherein, if affirmative action is going to be pursued in a meaningful way, it'll be pursued. You have a large number of employees, and a large number of those employees are women. A large number of the employees have, in fact, been in positions where the New Careers Program has worked very well, so that it struck me that that would be a particular test department.

We are in the process of reviewing the Department of Northern Affairs Estimates. And again, that's another department where minorities can, in fact, have better employment opportunities. I think there has been some improvements in the past when there has been a Cabinet committee, because, frankly, it's a matter of procedures and attitude, and in my opinion, it probably would be best served if there was a co-ordinating committee just as there has been a co-ordinating Cabinet committee set up for land claims, and is seen as an area that cuts across a lot of departments. But if the Minister is taking the position that she thinks that this is an effective way of pursuing it, that's her judgment and I appreciate her judgment. I think that in that respect, now that we have ascertained that there is a six-person committee which is reporting to her, it is now a valid question to ask her; What has that committee done so far, and what is the affirmative action program of the department, and does she see any progress being made in particular line departments of the government? And I ask this because it is especially important since the Career Planning Office has been eliminated from this year's Estimates. So, I'm asking her what her program is?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, at this point, they have been making deliberations. They've had meetings on quite a regular basis, and I am just awaiting a report from them. They will embrace the Career Planning that has been done, that's part and parcel of it, to include the women, the handicapped, the native people, are all part and parcel of their department.

**MR. PARASIUK:** There used to be a New Careers Program that had targets established for different departments. Is that true this year? Are there targets for new career opportunities within the Civil Service generally, not the Civil Service Commission, or its staff, but within the Civil Service generally?

**MRS. PRICE:** This committee that I just referred to are examining the career planning to see what they have done and what can be done and that will be part of the report I'll be getting from them.

**MR. PARASIUK:** But so far you've not received a report from them, so you're not in

a position to say whether there are any substantial targets at all?

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Okay. Do you expect to receive a report sometime this year, in sufficient time that it might be possible to implement some of the recommendations of this report when it's tabled? Do you expect the presentation of this report to yourself in the near future or sometime in the next fiscal year?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I do expect it . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** Soon.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** So that although you're not in the position to advise us with too much details about what will be done, this would constitute a very definite line of questioning, next Estimates, in terms of what the progress of affirmative action is as carried out by the Civil Service Commission in this fiscal year, without utilizing the Career Planning office.

The reason why I raise this is that I think the whole area of affirmative action is a very difficult area. I think that in some senses it could be a motherhood thing and people can pay lip-service to it and not really get down to the hard work involved in establishing, I think, marginal, but at the same time progressive starts within departments to change procedures, to change some of the procedures involved in interviewing people. I know that in the past there has been some horrible examples of people, when being interviewed, I think, being asked some unfair questions. I think sexist questions. I don't know if they've always been the best. I think a lot of that attitude has changed. I think that there are some advances that have been made with respect to minority groups being given a fairer chance of at least gaining entry into the Civil Service, and I think there is some progress being made with respect to people moving up the ladder to management positions. I think the Minister herself would probably appreciate that sometimes there are road blocks, often unintentioned road blocks to the advancement of people of a particular sex, or a particular racial group or ethnic group to higher positions.

Sometimes these road blocks relate to educational barriers, which, although possibly very good in the southern part of Manitoba, possibly aren't the best types of qualifications for someone, oh, providing the Child Welfare Counselling Service in Churchill, Manitoba. And I raise that particular example because my experience in checking out some of the new careerists was that the best Child Welfare Officer that Churchill has ever had was a woman in her forties, who didn't have a master's degree in social work, but had taken an intensive two-year new career program, had come from northern Manitoba, had wanted to stay in northern Manitoba, and had performed excellently in that particular position. And unfortunately I can recall that when that program was being developed there was a lot of hesitancy among civil servants to proceed with it, and yet the experience has shown that in many respects the New Careers Program can provide some very excellent dedicated people who more than make up for a lack of formal educational background with very intensive work doing their on-the-job training procedures.

So, I'm hoping that the Minister will undertake, in a very systematic manner, those small piecemeal changes that are required to really provide some substance to the concept of equal opportunity. I think that a lot of people have concerns that because the Career Planning Office has been abolished, because something in the order of four staff, who were working full time in this very difficult area, in relation to 11,500 civil service positions and 11,500 opportunities conceivably for people, that because there has been this termination of those four positions, this thrust really has been shelved. The Minister is assuring us that it hasn't and I'm pointing out to her, that if you take four people away from it, out of a staff complement that isn't that large, there is some substantive grounds for concern that this thrust isn't being shelved. And the Minister has told us that we've got six people on an advisory group to the Minister and so, therefore, I'm going to take her word for it now, and expect some very definite concrete programs and projects that she can report on when we come back to the House next year.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the Minister . . . I recall asking her a number of questions in the House dealing with the closing of the Career Planning Office, the elimination of it, and the Minister indicated that she would be prepared to answer questions about the program and the thrust of the program when her Estimates came forward.

She has indicated to the Member for Transcona that the new thrust in the program will be a committee of civil servants who will be reporting to her with respect to the administration of the program.

I understand the Minister has indicated that on this committee a representative from the Manitoba League for the Handicapped, has been appointed. Have there been any other appointments of any other of the groups, like from the Status of Women, or any of the other minority groups within the province of Manitoba, to this committee? Or is there any intent to appoint any of these people to this committee?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we have Lil McIlwain who is the Acting Director of the Women's Bureau on that committee, and Shirley Bradshaw who is in development and training. We have two women out of the six who are on it.

**MR. URUSKI:** I'm not asking about women, Mr. Chairman. You have a representative from the outside of government, from the Manitoba League for the Handicapped, I believe you gave the name of John Rogodzinski . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Frank Rogodzinski.

**MR. URUSKI:** I don't believe he's a civil servant, he's from an outside group. Is there consideration being given to the appointing of representatives of other groups in society in addition to someone from the League of the Handicapped, of the minority groups in society?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, it's possible, but we feel at this time that we have quite a good mix of people. Frank Rogodzinski is the Chairman of the employment, I believe, in the physically handicapped. He's a very active member of their organization, and they were quite happy to have him on the committee and we haven't considered any further. If you get too many, they get a little unwieldy too. It's been working quite well at this stage, and we'll try it first.

**MR. URUSKI:** Has your government accepted the statements as contained within the guidelines for affirmative action within the Manitoba Civil Service? In general terms, has your government accepted the policy direction of the previous administration?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we're still reviewing it, we have a very positive attitude towards it, I can assure the Member for St. George.

A number of seminars have taken place in our line departments with a view to bringing affirmative action to the first and foremost in the minds of the people in the line departments, and so we are concentrating on it.

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes, I realize that the change in attitudes is one of the biggest tasks that has to be undertaken. You're fighting really history, and procedure of long standing, in order to try and change the procedures and habits and attitudes of people in the line departments, in addition to the personnel officers within the Civil Service.

I recall that the Career Planning Office in handling the Affirmative Action Program, was approved by the Human Rights Commission as being exempt under Section 9 to handle the Affirmative Action Program, as being the responsible agency on behalf of the government, rather than every line department being the responsible agency and having to apply to the Human Rights Commission for approval of their plans. Now that there is no Career Planning Office, what mechanism or what agency is being designated, or has been designated between the government and the Human Rights Commission? Who is to take over this function, because it was a definite agreement between the Career Planning Office and the government in terms of who the responsible agency was rather than every line department being on its own?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, this is one of the parts of the investigation that this equal employment opportunity is doing. It's really an extension of what the Career Planning was. They are

doing the same work that the Career Planning has done, and at this point, this is one of things they are studying to see which programs are going to be continued and how they are going to be, and this will be all part of the report that I will be getting.

**MR. URUSKI:** The Minister has indicated that they are certainly supportive of the policy and the thrust behind equal employment opportunities and affirmative action within the Civil Service.

There was a number of departmental plans which had been approved; not all the departments had been approved; it certainly was a slow process. But there were a number of departmental plans which were approved, prior to the Career Planning office being eliminated. What has happened to these plans? Have there been funds allocated by those respective departments to pursue the thrusts that they had planned on, or what has happened in the process?

**MRS. PRICE:** This committee that I have just referred to is reviewing these plans, and as you are well aware, with the restraint program that we have been carrying on, they are checking into the different programs that were contemplated to see the importance of them, or the necessity of them, and this is what this committee is doing at the present time.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we certainly view the restraint, the comments of the Minister of Labour with respect to the restraint program, yet she assured me in the House on a number of occasions that the program is being continued even though the office of Career Planning has been eliminated. There were a number of plans that had been approved by the Career Planning office, and they were in the process of being implemented by the respective departments. Now she is telling me that, as a result of the restraint program, there really is nothing. There's a bit of a difference in the statements that she is making now to me. We have, for example, the Department of Northern Affairs. Although they did not have their affirmative action program approved, they, in effect, as part of their whole northern thrust, were having a continuous affirmative action program by the economic development and the programs that they had set up in northern Manitoba to employ northerners, to have northerners trained in jobs which they could advance, both in construction, both in health and social development, many of the economic development programs that the Department of Northern Affairs had were a thrust of affirmative action.

Now, these economic development programs have either been sold by tender or have been closed up or eliminated. Now we have no affirmative action, or even a total regressing of an affirmative action program within the entire northern Manitoba, where the minority groups in that area, the employment ratio of those minority groups is probably the highest anywhere if you take that group by itself, in isolation of the other groups in society, it is probably having the highest social upheavals and unemployment rates that any group can have anywhere in this country. And yet we have this government, and you, Madam Minister, indicating that while you support the concept of affirmative action, there have been no thrusts, in fact a retrenchment of the approval of the plans that had been approved, because there have been no funds, because of restraint. That restraint, I suggest, is certainly a contradiction to your earlier comments that you made that you support this program.

How can you support this program by saying what you have said? And yet there certainly is no evidence that at least the program has maintained itself at a level that was previously at least holding its own and it's not being held on its own. The entire office has been cut back, and I will take the Minister at her word, that this new group will perform the function that the Career Planning office will do, so that will save some money. But the fact of the matter is, the program has not even been maintained at its level, because the departments have cut back, not only the Department of Health and Social Development, but programs in Northern Affairs.

So I want to know, could the Minister tell me whether there are funds in their budget? I gather from her that there is not. Is there an intent to transfer some funds into the respective budgets of those departments, or what is the intent of the government?

**MRS. PRICE:** There has been \$13,000 that has been transferred from the Career Planning to the operating expenditures of the Civil Service and that is to carry on the program.

**MR. URUSKI:** How much money?

**MRS. PRICE:** \$13,000.00.

**MR. URUSKI:** \$13,000 has been transferred over to the Civil Service Commission. What thrust is hoped to be accomplished by the transferring of those funds? What areas do you hope to touch upon with that amount of money?

**MRS. PRICE:** First of all, the purpose of this committee has been to do a thorough investigation and to study it. There have been numerous seminars, as I mentioned earlier, in all the different line departments, and this money will partly be used to carry on seminars to educate the people.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the process is not only of educating the staff and the people in the line departments. Are there any procedures in terms of changing the hiring practices of line departments to facilitate the affirmative action thrust of this government? I believe that what will happen is that the government will find itself in a very — and especially the staffing officers will find themselves, excuse the expression, in a hell of a position, when they are to follow their traditional practices of attempting to deal as efficiently as possible, and yet, on the other hand, try and implement new procedures, new concepts, dealing with affirmative action. We know the traditional role of staffing officers throughout the years has been one of a fairly rigid line in terms of the hiring practices, but what affirmative action has to bring in is flexibility, new concepts in terms of the hiring procedures, outreach programs in terms of even looking for clientele if you are really doing an effective affirmative action program. You will find that your staffing officers will be put in a very difficult position, and I would hope that the Minister realizes this and is able to make that change. I don't know whether the staffing officers will be able to play that dual role, because they will find themselves in a very difficult position. I would hope that the Minister reviews that and analyzes that and is able to come back to see whether there has been, by combining those two roles together, whether any move in the affirmative action area will be able to be accomplished, because I believe you will be putting your staffing officers in a very difficult position.

**MRS. PRICE:** To the Member for St. George, the Career Planning did a very fine job, I am not disputing that, in the handling of the seminars, etc., but we feel that their mission was pretty well accomplished, and then it reached the stage of coming back into the hiring and the personnel of the Civil Service. We do recognize that there could be some problems that might have to be reviewed, and we are quite prepared to do so if we feel it isn't workable as it is. As I mentioned to the Member for Transcona, I will have a report before not too many months that I will be prepared and will look forward to discussing with you.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to be in on some of the Northern Affairs Estimates so I was absent for part of the proceedings. I hope I'm not going to go over completely old ground, but I want a bit of clarification with respect to some of the numbers put forward by the Ministers with respect to terminations. I understand that she indicated that a total of 165 people were terminated since October 24th, and 691 positions and contracts abolished. Is that correct? Did I understand her correctly?

**MRS. PRICE:** The 691 was through attrition. That consisted of contracts and terms of less than a year.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Okay. So you're talking about — I'm not sure what you mean by attrition. You see, if in fact you had a ten percent vacancy rate, which exists in many departments, what you've then done is abolish those positions which were vacant. Is that what is meant when you say that there were 691 positions eliminated through attrition? There was no one in them at the time of their elimination.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, some of them, the contracts ran out.

**MR. PARASIUK:** With some there might have been some contracts which

had expired.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You see, I have some difficulty in reconciling that number, 847, of which possibly four or five hundred positions may in fact have been vacant, with the numbers given out by the Minister responsible for the Task Force on efficiency when he says some 1,300 people were let go, and I'm wondering whether in fact the Civil Service Commission provided the documentation, the numbers, the data, to the Minister responsible for the Task Force when he made the public statements that 1,300 people, civil servants, were let go by the new Conservative Government. Did the Civil Service Commission provide the Minister with that documentation?

**MRS. PRICE:** I think 1,300 embraces not only the civil servants, but the term and contract workers were also included in that figure.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, you see, I have 846 or 856 positions that the Minister has told us have been eliminated. You can't clarify exactly how many of those were actually people let go and how many were paper positions being abolished because of the ten percent vacancy rate that existed in many positions. I think you further indicated that some 29 people had been re-hired.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, the numbers just don't add up. I get 856 being let go, 29 or 30 being re-hired, that brings it down to 827. The Minister responsible for the Task Force, who is also a Minister, and presumably people assumed that he had access to some documentation, and I would think that that documentation would have to come from the Civil Service Commission, he came out with a figure of 1,300. All we're doing in Estimates, and that is I think the proper place for us to ask, especially since we didn't get a good enough opportunity, I feel, to discuss the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force. We didn't get a good enough opportunity to discuss his Estimates. But now that we're in your Estimates and you are the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, not he, that it should be possible to get from you correct, accurate information as to the number of positions that have been abolished since October 24th, and the actual number of civil servants who have been let go since October 24th. I would like to point out to the Minister that there is a very distinct difference between the two categories.

**MRS. PRICE:** The figures that I have given you from the Commission were the 165. The other figures that the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Task Force would have given you were from Management Committee and I can't account for those.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, the difficulty that we as members of the committee have, Mr. Chairman, is that you know, we have to somehow ask someone to give us the accurate information, and I would have thought that if I look at the Estimates correctly, it says, "Provides central recruiting services for departments; supervises the selection process for initial appointments, transfers and promotions." And I assume that given The Employment Standards Act, the Minister is informed as to which people are being let go and under what circumstances, and I would think then that if any body in government would have the accurate information on this particular subject, it would be the Civil Service Commission. Am I incorrect in assuming that?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. It's from the Management Committee and I understand they are coming up shortly for their Estimates and I think maybe that's where you can get the figures that you are looking for. They are not part of the Civil Service figures.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.



**Monday, June 19' 1978**

**MR. CRAIK:** If you want to get the exact figures, the best way to do it is to get the payroll to payroll, from date to date, and that would give it to you exactly. That would then give you the permanent, term, contract and casual, the whole shooting match. I think it would give you the combined totals.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I appreciate the Minister's interjection in this particular respect. How could I do that though because I know for that type of information in respect to another committee you had indicated that we should contact the Minister of Finance to get that particular information, how would I then pursue that to find out specifically? I wouldn't mind getting the October, say, 24th payroll, and comparing it with the April 30th payroll.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** The usual way is to file an order for return and specify exactly your dates. I don't think it's that big a job to get it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)—pass — the Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I would like to just pursue that then. I will pursue that with respect to the number of people actually let go, and the number of paper positions, I would call it, abolished, in that I do think it's quite important to communicate correctly to the public the actual number of civil servants that have been let go and the actual number of paper positions that have been abolished without any consequent reduction in the actual number of civil servants which are employed. I would think that if one looks at the numbers fairly carefully, we are going to find that very few civil servants have actually been let go. That seems to be the inference that I can draw from the numbers given to us by the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

I would like to ask a couple of question as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour has got an answer for your last point.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, out of those 165 I mentioned this afternoon, 81 were civil servants and 84 were term.

**MR. PASIUK:** 84 were term?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** There were actual people in those positions?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. URUSKI:** And of the contracts, of the 691, how many people . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** How many which?

**MR. URUSKI:** How many people were in those positions because, are you telling me that there were 691 employees or were some of those staff man year positions with nobody in those positions. While there were vacancies of positions, they were not filled. That's what I was getting at.

**MRS. PRICE:** I will have to take that as notice and give it to you. I don't have that broken down in that, here.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You see, there was something approaching a 10 percent vacancy in the Civil Service as of October 12th or the 24th, and if you had a 10 percent vacancy, you'd have something in the order of almost 1,200 vacant Civil Service positions, either permanent, term or contract, or term contract, in those, you know, you could quite easily possibly abolish 600 or 700 of them and not let go any civil servants who were drawing a salary. I think it's quite important for the public of Manitoba to realize that clearly and specifically. So, I will be asking questions of the Executive Council, when Executive Council comes forward, and prior to that I'll try to get an Order-in-Return into the Minister of

Finance, so that perhaps he would undertake to provide that information quickly so that we could have the documentation in place for us when we look at the Management Committee Estimates.

I'd like to turn to the question of redeployment. I know that the Minister has indicated that there are four people on a redeployment committee. When was this redeployment committee set up? Was this two months ago or something like that, I can't quite remember?

**MRS. PRICE:** At least two months, or longer.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, two or three months ago then. Could she tell me what existed last November, what type of redeployment system existed last October and November and how what she has right now differs from what she set up or what was set up last October and November.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, prior to this committee being set up, the Civil Service Commission were actively engaged in redeploying right from the beginning in October.

**MR. PARASIUK:** So that means that the Civil Service staff set up a redeployment committee internally, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Did they draw up a redeployment list? Does that mean that people who were let go because the functions were being abolished, that those people who were let go, were they put on the redeployment list?

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Can she tell me whether in fact the Civil Service criteria were followed in the placing of people on the redeployment list?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, it was.

**MR. PARASIUK:** People were not discriminated against then in being put on that list or not being put on that list?

**MRS. PRICE:** No.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Would she table that list?

**MRS. PRICE:** I will have to check that out.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Would you, because there has been some concern expressed to me, and I think, you know, this is a valid concern, that some people may in fact be blackballed from that list and aren't being put on it for possible reasons that aren't associated with the merit principle of the Civil Service.

**MRS. PRICE:** If there is any specifics that you're referring to, if you would tell us, we would be only too glad to look them up, but they haven't been discriminating or blackballing as the member has said.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Well, can I ask her specifically then, if Joy Cooper was on the redeployment list, and if she is on the redeployment list at present? And if a Grant Wichenko was on the redeployment list and is on the redeployment list at present?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'll have to check. I'll take them as notice.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I wish you would, because I've sat on boards, and other people have sat on boards pertaining to those two people. They passed those boards, they passed every objective, criteria of merit for the Civil Service. Civil Service staff officers sat on those boards, concurred with the recommendations. I think those people both had technical ability, and were good civil servants. The government is claiming that the

filled by those two people somehow were redundant, so, therefore these two people found themselves out of work. I'm asking whether in fact these two highly qualified people haven't been put on the redeployment committee and I think it's especially pertinent with respect to Miss Cooper, whose only apparent reason for dismissal to myself, seems to be that after she became a civil servant she made the mistake of marrying someone who later entered politics, and her husband is an MLA.

Now I know of people who are related to MLAs, related to people on both sides of the House who are civil servants, and who were never ever discriminated against because of that tie. I would think and hope that those practices haven't been changed, that indeed a person is judged on his or her technical capability, and people don't take into account who you've ended up being related to for one reason or another, when you decide who will be kept and who won't be. I'd like the Minister very seriously to look at this case, the two cases that I mentioned. I believe there are others as well. I won't mention those who are deputy ministers, because I do think frankly, that it is the prerogative of the government to make those decisions with respect to deputy ministers. I might question the way in which it was done, but I don't question the government's prerogative to do that. I think that the government has to have full confidence with respect to deputies as part objective and part subjective. So I can accept government decisions with respect to deputies. I will question the way in which they are done.

However, when it comes to civil servants themselves who do go through the process of answering bulletins, of applying, of being considered amongst 10 or 20 or 30 applicants, of being boarded, of being boarded by an objective board of representatives from the Civil Service Commission, staff representatives, representatives from the hiring department, representatives from other departments to ensure that there isn't any type of incestuous relationship in the board itself, that when people do go through that process and prove themselves, then I think they should be protected as civil servants, and I think it's incumbent upon the staff of the Civil Service, the Civil Service Commission and above all the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission to ensure that the rights of civil servants are not somehow violated.

I think that if the Minister would undertake to investigate those two particular cases, I'd appreciate it very much.

We have been told by other Ministers unfortunately, that we did have something that was functional and operational last fall with respect to redeployment. I'm wondering why we had to then set up this four person committee some two or three months ago, if, in fact, we had a very effective procedure and mechanism for redeployment last fall. I would like to get an answer from the Minister as to how the operations of this four person redeployment committee established two or three months ago, differ from that established last October or November, and what the success rates of the two respective committees have been. Because if you have something in the order of 165 people terminated, and a number who would be terminated from that other number of 691, you've got obviously a lot of people concerned about their future, and I think they're hoping for a fair and efficient system of redeployment. So I'd appreciate if the Minister could give us a short description of how the two respective redeployment committees operated.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, the original one, as I said that originated in the Civil Service Commission, they are the ones that are the active members. The other redeployment committee which consists of two MGEA members and two members from the government, they are more in an advisory capacity. They see the problems and they report and discuss these with the Civil Service Redeployment Committee.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Do people who are on the redeployment committee in a sense, have first opportunities to bid on positions that are being bulletined by the Civil Service Commission.

**MRS. PRICE:** If it doesn't interfere with their collective bargaining. That enters into it. Other than that, they are given first.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Otherwise they are given a first opportunity of doing so. How many positions have been bulletined since October 24th?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm informed approximately 150.

**MR. PARASIUK:** 150 positions have been bulletined and the Minister is saying that out

of 847 staff — staff or positions eliminated, only 29 have been able to fill the 150 positions bulletined? Is that a correct conclusion on my part?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it isn't correct. There were only 165 that were seriously considered. The other numbers that you have, 691 of them were contract people that their contracts had either run out or were lessened by attrition.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I think you're a bit incorrect with respect to the latter group. From what you said before, I thought that a number of that 691 were people who were in positions, either term or permanent positions, who hadn't filled those positions for a year or more.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, the 691 were contract people.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Were they all contract?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I thought you said that a number of them were term people of less than one year, and a number of these, for example, could be secretarial or clerical people.

**MRS. PRICE:** No. The 691 were contract, 228 were term.

**MR. PARASIUK:** My colleague informs me, and I wasn't here for that part of the discussion, that you indicated that there were 942 competitions, there were 18,000 applications, 36 appeals, and 29 were placed from the redeployment committee, out of the 942 competitions. Now, I don't have Hansard so I have some difficulty in raising

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I believe, to the Member for Transcona, that was in last year, the whole calendar year.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Okay. That clarifies it. I appreciate that. So that means that out of 150 positions bulletined since October 24, only 29 have come from the redeployment group. That makes me wonder whether in fact the redeployment group is operating correctly, because when the redeployment group was announced, people had the expectation that you would be able to redeploy most of the people through the positions that came up because people were leaving for one reason or another, and so people had a fair presumption that they would have an equal and fair chance under the Civil Service criteria and under the merit principle of retaining employment with the Government of Manitoba. Are all 165 people who were terminated on the redeployment committee?

**MRS. PRICE:** The only reason that some of these jobs were bulletined was because we couldn't find people to take the jobs. There was geographical problems, amongst others, family problems, and that's why they were bulletined.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Could the Minister indicate whether all 165 permanent people terminated were and are on the redeployment list?

**MRS. PRICE:** There weren't 165 permanent employees, there was only 81 of them, 84 of them were term. 115 out of the 165 are remaining on the list.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'm getting a bit confused with my numbers here. You say that there were 81 civil servants, 84 term.

**MRS. PRICE:** Right.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I assume that all of these were put on the redeployment ' list.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** 29 of the 165 were placed.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. 21 have resigned.

**MR. PARASIUK:** 21 have resigned, and that leaves 115 on the redeployment list.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** So your answers then would lead me to conclude that none of the people terminated have been taken off the redeployment list unless they have resigned. That means that there are no people in a sense being blackballed. I've given you a couple of examples, I hope you could tell me whether in fact these people are on the redeployment list.

**MRS. PRICE:** If they've been placed, they've been taken off that number, too, of course.

**MR. PARASIUK:** But if they haven't, they would still be on the redeployment list.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Do you have any idea of when you might be able to provide that information to us? I think you probably have it at hand.

**MRS. PRICE:** Which are you referring to?

**MR. PARASIUK:** The redeployment list and those two people that I raised.

**MRS. PRICE:** I can find out about the two people. I'm going to check before I say that I'm going to table a report on the employment.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Fair enough.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** I'm just wondering if the members of the opposition have a number of other topics they want to pursue and so on, whether maybe we shouldn't consider rising.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.

#### SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** I would direct the honourable members to Page 64 in the Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. We are on Resolution No. 95, Clause 1.(b)(1) Salaries and Wages—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, before we left off at 4:30, there was some discussion of the Provincial Auditor, and I am not positive that the Honourable Minister understands fully what he was quoting from. The way the system has worked in the past, and I assume that it still works that way, is that the Provincial Auditor has one of his staff review departments, attempting to find anything they can where the administration and the accounting could be improved and some steps that the department might consider making in many areas. The Provincial Auditor, as I understand it, then reviews these memorandums to himself from the staff person and then sends a letter to the Minister outlining how he sees his department and the function of his department and if in fact there are serious items, or if in fact there are items which have not been corrected or have not been dealt with by Minister's department, then in fact the Provincial Auditor puts this in his general report to the Legislative Assembly and I understand that is the procedure.

In order to try and defend his own mismanagement in eight short months in office, the present Minister quoted from the memorandum that the Auditor makes available to the Ministers. I think this is a bit of a precedent, Mr. Chairman, in this Legislature, and I think that since the Minister is setting that precedent, that he should probably be prepared to follow that precedent himself.

In the case, Mr. Chairman, of the Department of Northern Affairs, when we were out of Committee,

I did rise on a point of personal privilege, and tabled in the House a copy of the last correspondence that I had as Minister of Northern Affairs with the Provincial Auditor, which was received in my office on October 6, 1977, and I also quoted one sentence from that covering letter and this is the letter from the Provincial Auditor, not the memorandum to the Provincial Auditor. The Provincial Auditor said in regard to the Department of Northern Affairs on October 6th, a report that was received October 6th, "All the matters which require attention have been or are in the process of receiving appropriate attention."

Mr. Chairman, the auditor had seen fit in his general report to refer to the Churchill Pre-fab Housing Plant in the accounts thereto and to the northern trust account in past reports, and those concerns raised by the auditor were immediately dealt with by the administration under the direction of myself as Minister and under the direction of the Deputy Minister to make sure everything was done according to process and procedures as recommended by the auditor. In the last General Report that I can recall the Provincial Auditor at that time said that the matters previously brought up have been corrected satisfactorily and in the final communication I have with the Provincial Auditor he says the very same thing.

But, Mr. Chairman, the reports that Ministers do get from the auditor that are not Provincial Auditor's reports but memorandums from the Provincial Auditor do pick out every single detail of a department, and I think that if you look at every department of government you'll find a number of criticisms of that department, and I'm sure that the Ministers opposite that have received anything during their term in office would find a number of comments there on things that could be changed, could be done differently or could be improved within their particular departments.

Before we adjourned I had asked the Minister if he would be willing to table the auditor's report to him, which is not a public document but a report to the Minister which only becomes a public document if it's not dealt with appropriately or if there are extremely serious matters within that report. I asked the Minister if he would be willing to table that document when he receives it and the Minister — I'm not positive what his reply was — he seemed to imply that if there were some references to personnel within that he couldn't very well table it, but obviously the Minister, although he's picked out some things from that memorandum that he hoped would make the previous administration look bad, he obviously didn't read those memorandum because I have none that have any reports on specific personnel within any department. They're in regard to accounting procedures and no personnel are covered or mentioned by name within those Provincial Auditor's report. So maybe in light of that, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister would like to indicate that he is quite willing now, having established a precedent in this House, that he is quite willing to table the first audit of the department under his administration and the memorandum in the covering letter from the Provincial Auditor in that regard. I wonder if the Minister would care to reply to that question now.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the Member for The Pas would have taken what I said more seriously when I say that internal audits do in fact refer specifically to areas and titles of particular civil servants that do not leave very much to the imagination. I'm a little disappointed that he wouldn't choose to take that for what it's worth. The previous administrations and I suppose many others and myself, after reviewing a couple during the course of the evening, certainly would not be prepared to file them. I'm not prepared to put the good name or jeopardize the future of individuals when they're earmarked, title-wise or otherwise, in an internal report, and I'm a little surprised with the alleged experience of the Member for The Pas that he would repeatedly ask me to do that.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the memorandum to the Provincial Auditor that I have on file, do not in fact mention people by name, but Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is surprised then he should be surprised at himself. He's the one that quoted from these internal documents, and if you're going to quote from an internal document, then the requirement of this Legislature is that you table that document, and that document then becomes public information.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is an example of more bungling on the part of the Minister that he just doesn't know that, although he has been in the House long enough now to be aware of that fact, but he quoted from a document this afternoon, that was received some time in November, that is in fact a letter from the Provincial Auditor including a memorandum from one of his staff, that the Minister of the day of that time, had never seen, because it was not received until November. So this Minister is the only one who has access to that document, this Minister and the Provincial Auditor. The former Minister doesn't have access to that document, the Member for Rupertsland didn't even know what was contained in that document, and yet the Minister stood up in this House and read from that document, and, Mr. Chairman, unless he was prepared to

table that government, should have been ruled out of order by yourself. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin is getting into the act, but obviously, Mr. Chairman, he wasn't listening to . . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Point of Order?

**MR. McBRYDE:** I'm sorry, I've not completed my comments unless the Minister has a question or a point of order. —(Interjection)—

**gmr. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** . . . just to clarify something, I was not reading from a document, and we can all summarize items out of various documents, and that's what I did, and that's a summary of some of things, there's many more. I could have itemized and wrote for a great length of time about the other inadequacies of the period of time in which you were Minister, but I chose to just pick out a handful that I thought was evident.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's one of the problems. Did the Minister say that he did table his summary? —(Interjection)— The Minister did not table his summary, which is a summary of a document that we have not seen on this side, and how are we to know then the context from which the Minister draws his summary, because as I mentioned before, Mr. Chairman, when I was the Minister, a member of the opposition read from the Provincial Auditor's General Report, and they read one paragraph but they didn't read the next paragraph, and the next paragraph said, "The matters referred to above have been corrected by the department."

And, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, because of the Minister's past performance, I cannot accept it that he has somehow prepared an objective summary of a document. I would think rather that he has prepared a summary that meets his particular needs and that is to try and detract or to throw light away from his management of the department and back into some previous date. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will have to in fact deal with his management of the department but I believe that he is also under an obligation of this House to table documents from which he reads. I think on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like your ruling on that matter.

### CHAIRMAN'S RULING

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable members on a point of order, I believe that the Member for The Pas has made reference to a document that there was some information made reference to on the document rather than reading the document. In that case, I don't believe that the document has to be tabled and therefore the honourable member does not have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, if you will look at Hansard when it comes out, the Minister said that I am quoting from the Provincial Auditor. That was his statement when he read the document. Mr. Chairman, he was quoting from an internal document, and not of the Provincial Auditor but of the Auditor's staff, a memorandum to the Auditor. He quoted from that document, he used that document to discredit the previous Minister. We have not yet seen that document. We have never seen that document and therefore I think that the Minister is under an obligation to table that document and I think that your ruling is incorrect and I'll have to challenge it, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** I don't think the member is wanting to listen to what I was saying. I said I took a summary and that's what it was, a summary of a variety of previous documents you have, or have had, in your hands most of those particular documents. They are internal audit reports which I'm not prepared to . . .

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** The point of privilege is, Mr. Chairman, that previously today and right now, the Minister is saying that I had my hands on a particular document which he was summarizing earlier today and I did not have my hands on that document. I have never seen that document and he himself admitted this afternoon that he received that document on November 14th. Now the Minister either should retract that statement or clarify his statement to this House because it certainly is

incorrect.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** I will clarify it to this extent, that you were aware of the contents of my summary. You had to be because some of them were taken from days gone by when you were Minister. Now someday we can sit down and look at them, you and I, if you wish but they're all there.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Member for The Pas has raised a point of order with regard to a document that the Honourable Minister was reading from. I believe if the Minister relies on a document that he should present it. Now perhaps what he was reading from is a summary of material which is taken from other documents. If so, then he should table the document from which the summary is taken because the Minister is having the House rely on a document and once he does that I think that the Member for The Pas is quite correct in saying that the document should be tabled.

Now perhaps the summary contains material which the Minister was not relying on and which may be internal to him and I'm not arguing that but the material from which he is reading, if it's part of another document, I think that the Member for The Pas is entitled to have that document. The Minister says that it was available to the Member for The Pas when he was the Minister. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that you can make rulings on that basis. The document should be available to any member of the House whether he was previously in the administration or not, and I think that the Member for The Pas would probably be satisfied if he could have a copy of the document from which the summary is taken, because that's the document that the Minister was referring to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would ask the Honourable Minister if he would table this document, or would he withdraw his remarks?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, it's an unusual sort of a situation where I made a summary of documents that were in place over the course of the previous many months, in fact a year or two, documents that had been in the hands of the people, that they were aware of. It's a summary of the condition of the department as I found it and those conclusions I have drawn, and I wrote them as a summary, period. That's my opinions and I am not prepared to file internal auditor's documents, as the previous administration wouldn't, for what I think is good cause, because it's very clear where they detail and they specifically point to, an area where there can be no question left in the eyesight of the general public who that person was and I am not prepared to get involved in it.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** The Honourable Minister, in his earlier remarks today, made reference to myself with respect to those documents, somehow making it sound as though I were somehow responsible for the problems in the administration of that department that the Auditor or the Auditor's staff are referring to in a confidential memo to himself. Now if there are individuals within the department who are slipping up who he referred to in this document as having had some administrative problems internal to the department, normally these things are handled within the department and the three and a half years that I was Minister of this department there was never a mention in the Auditor's report, the published Auditor's report that was tabled in this Legislature, never. The Honourable Minister this afternoon I believe, and he may correct my statement, but I believe he said in his remarks this afternoon that I had access to these documents and that I could look in the Auditor's report of the year ending 1977 and read these reports on the department. Well, in the three and half years that I was Minister of this department there was never any comments in the Auditor's report on my administration. If there were problems within the department the Auditor or his staff would bring them to the attention of my department and they were normally handled through the department, the situations cleared up and corrected to the satisfaction of the Auditors, so there was never any need to mention anything in the Auditor's formal report.

And in this case, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there was some report given to the new Minister of this department after the government changed hands referring to certain administrative problems within the department. If I were still the Minister of this department I would have corrected those problems. In this case it's the responsibility of this Minister to deal with that memo, but if he is referring to that memo, and somehow implicating me directly with the contents of that memo, I say he should table that document or withdraw his statements.



**MR. MacMASTER:** I think what might simplify the thing is, we'll go back to we'll get some of your internal documents our records, refer them to the provincial tabled document today. and you'll see the statements I've made are correct

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of privilege, I must say that the Minister in his remarks this afternoon stated that I had access to those documents and I knew what the auditor's concerns were, and the document that he read or summarized from this afternoon I did not have access to it. It's never been forwarded to my office — never. The last correspondence that I had from the auditor's office while I was Minister was January of 1977. There were five points that he brought to my attention which were administrative matters which were forwarded to the administrators within his department for their action to clear up those problems. As far as I understood, the senior administrators of the department, the two associate Deputy Ministers and the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of administration, were dealing with the auditor to rectify those problems. I believe that that memo that he has in his possession now which is the most recent memo on problems which the auditor would have been pointing out in the department would have referred to certain actions taken with respect to those five problems that he brought to my attention in January of 1977, and with reference to any future or further problems that were brought to light in this new information that he read this afternoon, I say I have never seen that information. The auditor never brought it to my attention. No one in my department brought it to my attention and if the Minister is referring to that information in a reference to me I say he should withdraw that remark because I never did see that information. I believe this afternoon the Minister made that remark that I had access to that information and I think he's implying that even tonight.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, I guess we can talk about words all evening, Mr. Chairman. "Access to it" may have been incorrect; "aware of the condition of the department" certainly I don't think that was incorrect. You were aware of the situations.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. The only way that I was able to correct on a matter of privilege what the Minister said this afternoon in regard to my term as Minister was by finding within my own files the covering letter from the Provincial Auditor, but the former Minister of Resources is unable to do that because he has never seen the documents. If I did not happen to have this particular document that the Minister quoted from then I would be insisting and demanding right now that that document be tabled. But, Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Rupertsland — if I were him I would be asking that that document be tabled. The Minister quoted from a document. Whether it was in a summary or whatever, he was quoting from a document and attributing the authority to that document' And we have never seen that document which he gives so much authority to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable members, I have a precedent on my ruling on the point of privilege. Madam Speaker Forbes ruled as follows: "In view of the statement made by the honourable member, the Minister," and we're making reference to a previous ruling of Municipal Affairs whereby documents referred to in his address are, in his opinion, classified as confidential, "in the opinion of the Speaker, the honourable member is not bound to table these documents."

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Minister is setting a very important precedent here, which I intend to take full advantage of in the future and that is that information which is contained within the files of the Provincial Auditor's office with reference to the daily and monthly investigations that the Provincial Auditor does of the various departments in government should, in the future, be available to the members of this Legislature and I intend to request that information of the Provincial Auditor. I intend to go and look at the files in his office and look at every single department of this government from now on and see the day to day, weekly, monthly investigations that are going on within the department in those matters which are brought to the Minister's attention for correction which are normally corrected by the administration in the department.

Before this date, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the members used that information to any great extent but I intend to go to those files and see that information; I intend to use it. And I serve notice right now that I will be doing that.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, the ruling that you read from said that when the Minister referred

to a document which the Minister felt was confidential that he didn't have to table it. I am not so sure that I would have even agreed with mmadam Speaker's ruling with respect to that, but in this case the Minister was quoting from a document. He was quoting excerpts from a document which the Member for The Pas asked to be tabled.

We respect your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but we can't merely accept it and therefore, with great respect, we appeal the ruling.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** May I read the rest of the ruling? "In support of my ruling, I would like to quote Page 249, Beauharnois Parliamentary Procedure, Fourth Edition. Occasions may arise when government will feel constrained to refuse certain papers on the ground that their production would be inconvenient or injurious to the public interests. A high authority writes on this point: Considerations of public policy and due regard to the interests of the state occasionally demand that information sought by members of the Legislature should be withheld at the discretion and upon the general responsibility of the Ministers. This principle is systematically recognized in all parliamentary transactions where otherwise it would be impossible to carry on the government with safety and honour.

"Further, Page 251 in Beauharnois Parliamentary Procedure, Fourth Edition, The practice of asking for reports from officers addressed to particular departments of the executive government is considered to be open to serious objections. As to confidential documents passing between officers of a department, Mr. Speaker Peel observes that they are not necessarily laid on the table of the House, especially if the Minister declares that they are of a confidential character. He adds that if a Minister stated in his place that a document was of that class, the House should take his word and that he is not bound to lay it on the table."

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, what you have quoted with respect is whether a document will be tabled. And we have argued that question in the House on the Freedom of Information bill, and if a Minister accepts the responsibility that he is not going to fill an Order for Return for a document on the basis of its confidentiality, that would be one ruling. This Minister has decided to make unconfidential the document by reading it. Once he does so, Mr. Chairman, he is subject to the rule of laying the document on the table.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with great respect — and I'm meaning no offense whatsoever — we respectfully challenge your ruling.

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

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** On the point of order, historically over the years, as I recall debate such as this, during the presentation of a memo or words, if you are quoting somebody else, it is generally indicated that members opposite ask whoever is making the presentation of who are you commenting, or who was the author, and what was the date of the document, etc., etc. I can't recall in the debates that this question was raised. I think we may have to go back and look at Hansard to . . . Well, I recall words of the Honourable Minister saying that some of the remarks were his own that he had put into the memo, and some were the words of the Auditor. I can't recall — and I may be wrong — that it was ever told to the House that it was the Auditor's Report. In fact, I have the Auditor's Report in front of me and I don't see the words of the Honourable Minister. I see something here about \$500,000, "we're concerned with the department making commitments of approximately \$500,000, March 31st, 1977, excess of funds voted by the Legislature," and that's a pretty damning statement. —(Interjection)— Well, it's still basically the same type of information that we're trying to get from the former Minister so I think the Minister is in order.

**MR. McBRIDE:** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order and on the challenge which I don't know if it is debatable from the House Leader, the Member for Roblin is talking about documents that are publicly available. When I questioned the Minister I asked the Minister, in fact, I said that if that document is available, just let us know which one it is but the Minister was quoting from a confidential internal memorandum and he said, "Here's what the Provincial Auditor has to say about you when you were the Minister," and then he read out certain statements.

Mr. Chairman, he has quoted from an internal confidential document. Since he has done that he is required to table that document and that's why we feel necessary to challenge your ruling.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. GREEN:** Recorded vote, Mr. Chairman. I believe you have to call in the Speaker.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs the Honourable Minister cited extracts from certain documents relating to the Provincial Auditor's Report on the documents and stated that the former Minister was in possession of the information contained in the report. The Honourable Member for The Pas subsequently tabled the letter from the Provincial Auditor which stated that all matters which require attention have been, or are, in the process of receiving appropriate attention. The Honourable Member for The Pas asked that the Minister table the documents to which he referred. The Minister refused on the grounds of confidentiality. I have ruled that the Minister is not required to table the documents based on a previous Speaker's ruling. My ruling has been challenged by the House Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chairman be sustained?

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. GREEN:** Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

**YEAS:** *Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Spivak, Steen.*

**NAYS:** *Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding.*

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 27; Nays 17.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Government House Leader. The next order of business.  
The Honourable Member for Radisson.

### SUPPLY— NORTHERN AFFAIRS (CONT'D)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 64 in the Estimates, Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. We are on Resolution No. 95, (b)(1) Salaries and Wages. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, previously when I was speaking on this item, I was mentioning Minago Contractors and the closedown of that operation, and I think it might relate somewhat to what we've been discussing very recently in this committee and on this item. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a document from the Canadian Native News Service, Canada's weekly update on Indian, Metis, and Inuit affairs, which is a news service which sends out their information to all the various newspaper and media that relate to native people in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mitchell Bear, the staff reporter in this case, interviewed myself by telephone and the Minister of Northern Affairs by telephone, and in this story that was filed, I would like to take the following quote: "The Minister said," and that's the present Minister of Northern Affairs,

"the Minister said Minago never showed a profit at all." That's a quote, Mr. Chairman. "The Minister said Minago never showed a profit at all." Just before the present Minister of Northern Affairs made that statement to the press and a quote that he has not said is an inaccurate quote, he has not denied that quote which is in the Canadian Native News Service story, the Minister had tabled before this House the annual report from Minago Contractors Limited for the year ended March 31, 1977, and in there, Mr. Chairman, the retained earnings, Exhibit B for 1977 for Minago Contractors showed a profit of \$84,865.00. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister never saw fit to correct that statement, which was obviously an inaccurate statement, an incorrect statement, a misleading statement, or a lie, because the Minister had tabled the very document that showed that that was an incorrect statement.

Mr. Chairman, the other item where the Minister of Northern Affairs gave a story to the Thompson Citizen, and in that story he said, in relation to the Inter-Universities North Program, the Minister said, "The Minister of Education and I have spoken to the Universities Grants Commission, and the Grants Commission has agreed that Inter-Universities North Program will continue next year." Upon questioning of the Minister of Education, he said that they had never met with the Grants Commission, and I asked the Minister of Northern Affairs in the House if he'd ever met with the Grants Commission, and he said, "no." The second example, Mr. Chairman, of a direct misleading, inaccurate, incorrect statement on the part of the Minister of Northern Affairs.

But in the area of the administration function, the item that we are dealing with, there was another situation, Mr. Chairman, where the Minister was asked by the press if in fact he was in the process of reorganizing the Department of Northern Affairs, and he told the press, "No, we're not in the process of reorganizing the Department of Northern Affairs." And that was a joke, Mr. Chairman, to all the staff in the Department of Northern Affairs who were in the process of being reorganized, who had been told where they fit within the new scheme of things, new people had been assigned to specific jobs, and yet the Minister said, "No, we are not in the process of reorganizing the Department of Northern Affairs."

But it's just as well he said that to the press, Mr. Chairman, because when he did take the reorganization proposal to Cabinet, originally Cabinet turned them down and did not accept his reorganizational proposal, even though the process was already in effect, was ongoing within the department, and this, Mr. Chairman, is another ongoing, administrative bungle. This Minister of Northern Affairs and the Department of Northern Affairs and Resources have had more mismanagement, more administrative bungles in eight months in office than we had in the full eight years of having the opportunity to guide those two departments in the province of Manitoba. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue my comments if the meers opposite would quieten down a bit. I know they don't like to hear the examples of the bungling and of the incorrect statements by their own Minister. It's very difficult for them to believe that is the situation but the facts are all there and all they have to do is check the facts, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister then, Mr. Chairman, wrote a column in the Thompson Citizen, The Pas Herald, and issued a press release — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that the members feel it necessary to call me names just because I'm putting the facts on the record here, but I guess that's their prerogative; if the only way they can deal with the facts is by calling people names, well, we'll let them deal with the facts. The Minister then made a statement, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the winter roads in the province of Manitoba, and the Minister said, "for the first time, we are involving communities in the construction of winter roads." Mr. Chairman, anyone who had any connection with winter roads in the past in the communities, had to laugh at the Minister for that statement. That had been the policy of our government when we were in office; it had been the policy of myself as Minister of Northern Affairs and a successfully implemented policy to increase the involvement of communities in the construction of winter roads and to increase the direct management by them in the construction of winter roads.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no example where the new Minister changed that policy or program. There's only one case, Mr. Chairman, perhaps you could say in the Berens River road; in the past we had contracted with Channel Area Loggers for the construction of that road. In this case, the Minister contracted with one individual in the community of Berens River, as opposed to a company in that community. Mr. Chairman, even then they had to send in extra equipment that didn't show up on the records to help that individual complete the road. So, Mr. Chairman, there was another incorrect and misleading statement by the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the other area that I have real concern on in the administrative section, and I hope to get some detailed information from the Minister. I'm assuming that he still has some responsibility in terms of the Northlands Agreement, at least insofar as many of the programs of this department are funded under that agreement and 60 percent of the funds are recovered from the Federal Government, from the government in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, it appears that by some sleight-of-hand the figures are very hard to pin down now. How much, how many 60-cent dollars

did we lose? How much are we not recovering from the Federal Government this year? And does the Department of Northern Affairs still have some direct input into the administration of the Manitoba-Northlands Agreement.

This also relates, Mr. Chairman, to the BUNTEP program, which comes under and 60 percent of the cost of that program were recovered from the Federal Government. Do they have any say in the administration of that program, or has that been taken away from the Minister of Northern Affairs, and does that authority now rest somewhere else?

The other decisions that have been made, the administrative decisions, policy program decisions that have been made by the Minister, include a considerable number of other closedown of small local community companies, putting people out of work and putting people then in receipt of social assistance, or increasing the social problems in the communities which those operations worked. And some of the ones that I didn't already mention in speaking to this item, Mr. Chairman, were the Athapap Builders, the Mistik Creek Loggers, the Young Point Cabin Operation and I already mentioned previously a number of other operations that have been closed down or sold out by the present Minister. The fact that most of these programs employed a majority of native people, many people who would otherwise have difficulty obtaining permanent and regular employment and the result of that as I said is increased social problems and increased cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba because of all the other things that happen when people are out of work, such as jail costs, such as hospital costs, police costs, all these things increase very rapidly when people don't have the opportunity to be productive and to contribute to society through their employment.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could explain the present situation in the northlands and as we go through the budget, I'd like to be able to break out what items are reduced, what programs have been totally eliminated. Mr. Chairman, the Minister implied in his opening remarks that there were no programs that were done away with, that there was just some administrative changes and yet —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, maybe I shouldn't get distracted by the Member for Roblin who is always talking from his seat and usually incorrectly, but when he completely talks incorrectly it gets to be kind of irritating or bothering after awhile.

Mr. Chairman, another area that I would like some elaboration from the Minister on is the overall use of DREE funds within the province of Manitoba. It is my fairly clear recollection in our negotiations with the Federal Government that there was an overall amount generally available from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for the province of Manitoba and so if you took some for the administration or for Northlands Agreement, then there would be less available for other aspects. The Minister of Industry and Commerce has been very pleased to announce a new industrial agreement, a new industrial agreement with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and I'm wondering if that new industrial agreement explains the reduction in the Manitoba Northlands Program and I would like to get the figures from the Minister but I estimate somewhere between \$5 million and \$6 million has been cut from the Northlands Program in the estimates that now appear before us. Mr. Chairman, as I started to say and didn't complete because I was interrupted by the Member for ROOBLIN, THE Minister had mentioned there were no cuts of programs and yet, Mr. Speaker, it's pretty difficult to go up north and find the extension program. I don't know if my colleagues have been able to find it lately. I found a lot of unemployed native people up north who used to work for the program, but I think that that program has been completely eliminated' Mr. Chairman, and the Minister should acknowledge that that program has been completely eliminated and he can explain his reasons for it, but not to stand before us and say there was no reduction or no cuts in programs.

The other situation I would like to Minister to explain when trying to justify his management and administration of the department, is the relationship and the discussions and the negotiations with the Manitoba Mtis Federation. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister was cutting programs, when the Minister was firing staff he had some negotiations with the Manitoba Metis Federation and he had some negotiations that some of those programs that were cut would in fact not be eliminated but that some responsibility and some funds would be transferred to the Manitoba Metis Federation. And, Mr. Chairman, that was the discussions that went on with the Department of Northern Affairs and the Metis Federation and I'd like the Minister to explain those discussions and negotiations that went on with the Metis Federation and explain why the Metis Federation never ever heard from the department again. That there were certain commitments made by the Minister or by his staff on his behalf, that were never followed up, never completed. Did he get turned down in Cabinet, or did he just not keep his word in those discussions in those negotiations? That is another problem of mismanagement and bungling that the Minister will have to deal with and explain to the House.

Another problem, Mr. Chairman, that is going on, it's been touched upon by my colleague the Member for Rupertsland but there is within the Departments of Northern Affairs and Resources very serious administrative problems, very serious management problems, very serious morale problems and, Mr. Chairman, that's not all the fault of the Minister. Certainly the Task Force caused some

of that problem within the administration generally, but there is a quote that I was going to get when I went home for supper, Mr. Chairman, and I forgot. It was from 500 BC or something, where a person was quoted as saying that: We keep restructuring things around here and we think that we're making progress and we think that we're making them better, but now I'm finally coming to the realization that restructuring just makes us think we're doing something when in fact we're not accomplishing anything at all. And that was the basic paraphrase from that quote and I'm sorry I couldn't find it, I'll dig it up and send it over to the honourable member, although I don't think I should be required to table it since the Minister of Northern Affairs is not required to table documents he quotes from that are supposedly confidential.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's what takes place. The Minister thinks that he has done something because he has done some restructuring and I think that if you study bureaucracy, if you study organizations, if you study changes in organizations, restructuring very seldom helps the situation, in fact what restructuring does is set things back for six months or a year while people fight about where their new position is, where their new level is. And in fact the production goes down, the production does not go up. Mr. Chairman, this get especially strong if you restructure and then do not give direction as to where the department is going to move and what the departments going to do, and that's what has happened under this administration; that there is no direction, there is restructuring but with no clear direction of where they're going to go. No understanding of where they're going to go.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we have people that are on salary, civil servants, high paid ones probably in a \$25,000 a year range, whose responsibility it was to administer certain economic development projects and programs. That's what they were hired for. That's why funds were put in the appropriation of the Department of Northern Affairs for them to deliver those programs. We have those people on staff, they have no money for those programs and so they're sitting on their hands. There are high paid bureaucrats sitting on their hands because of the way that the reductions have taken place within the department. They are people that have special abilities, special capabilities in terms of economic development, that have no funds and no commitment, no direction from the Minister to pursue economic development, so they are just sitting around in the offices talking to each other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, maybe those are the positions that should have been cut. Instead of the people that are out in the field, the majority of those positions being native people that were cut by the Minister, instead of cutting those people who were field workers, maybe they should have cut those specialists in terms of economic development because if you're not going to give them any money to carry out their job you might as well not have them on staff. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that most of them will eventually leave as soon as they find other employment available because they're not the kind of people who like to sit around and talk to each other without being able to get out and get the job done.

I think another clear example of this relates to the Youth Corps of the Department of Northern Affairs. The Minister, or his staff, made a decision: Cut the Youth Corps out of the Department of Northern Affairs, cut the extension services out of the Department of Northern Affairs. Then a few months after that decision and, Mr. Chairman, the Minister did make a decision on that, unlike the Pakwagan operation where he was unable to make a decision, he did make a decision to eliminate most of the people in that program that delivers a Youth Program in the summer. But then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister announces a Youth Program for this summer.

You should have seen his staff scramble around to find the people who had been dismissed because there was going to be no Youth Program. So there's another clear example of no direction, just going from crisis to crisis, not being able to plan ahead and therefore wasting the taxpayers' money in terms of the management of this department. And, Mr. Chairman, that is a serious situation in terms of having services available, having economic development and employment available to the remote communities of northern Manitoba.

Those services are not there and yet the taxpayers are still paying for staff and the taxpayers are paying for the bungling and the mismanagement and the misadministration that has happened under this Minister and under this government, Mr. Chairman. That is the serious situation we're facing and the Member for Rupertsland hit it on the head when he said, "It was a real problem of no direction," because if the Minister had any idea of where he was going then he wouldn't have cut a program and then reintroduced it a few months later without the staff and then have to find the staff to implement the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have outlined a number of items which very clearly shows that the Minister of Northern Affairs has sold out northern Manitoba; that the Minister of Northern Affairs has misled the people of Manitoba; and that the Minister of Northern Affairs has completely mismanaged his department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm really still waiting for somebody from the opposition to

me on the General Administration of the particular department. The areas that the Member for The Pas has been referring to come under the Development Resource Division that I hope we'll get to sometime in the next week or so.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. What I've been doing is telling the Minister, telling the members of this House, telling the people of Manitoba what I do know has been happening in the Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I would also like to find out some of the things I don't know, so I do have a number of questions for the Minister of Northern Affairs and hopefully he will be able to give more accurate answers than some of the ones that I have quoted already that are on the record.

I would like to know in terms of the Administrative Support Services the number of staff person years for last year, staff person years for this year. I'd like the Minister to break it out in terms of Northern Affairs, in terms of resources.

I would like the Minister, I believe it would be in this administrative section where the Minister could tell us in terms of the decentralization, under the previous administration the Department of Northern Affairs — and not quite successfully so the Department of Resources — were relocated, decentralized out of Winnipeg into northern Manitoba, and the previous Estimates announced the figures of the number of staff outside of the City of Winnipeg and the location of various staffs throughout the Province of Manitoba.

In the Administrative Support I assume is probably where the personnel section lies if it still lies within that section of the department, and one of our clear and distinct personnel policies, Mr. Chairman, was to try and increase the number of native people on the staff of the Department of Northern Affairs so that it would at least reflect the population served; and since the majority of population served were native residents in northern Manitoba, that the department would somehow reflect that in the composition of the department. And, Mr. Chairman, this was a long-term program, a long-term process and the last figure I recall was 38-something percent of our staff were native people and that we expected 40 percent at least by the end of this fiscal year. With the jobs that have been eliminated by the Minister, most of those jobs affect the native people in the department and I wonder if he has any idea of how far that figure has been reduced and how far away they are from that goal of trying to reflect the population served within the administrative structure of the department.

Maybe also the Minister could briefly explain the new structure, who's who and who's where, while he's doing that, and also to explain the other — when we get to it — the other expenditure section of that appropriation.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, in the Administrative Support Services the 1977-78 was 93.42; the 1978-79 is 80.42; and for the information of the Member for The Pas I'll break that down as follows:

The Divisional Director, there was 6 in that particular area in 1977-78; and now in 1978-79 there is 3. In Personnel in 1977-78 there was 13; now there's 12. In Finance, previously there was 36; presently we have 28. Systems, there was 7 in 1977-78; and in 1978-79 there'll be 7. Internal Audit, previously in 1977-78 there was 5; in the year 1978-79 we'll have 5. In the Thompson office, 1977-78 there was 16; in 1978-79 there'll be 16. In Public Information in the Library Section there was 10.42 in the year 1977-78; and the year 1978-79 there'll be 9.42. So there's a reduction, Mr. Chairman, of 13.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, maybe if I ask my next question slowly the information that I requested in my previous questions can also be dug out from the officials.

The other question would be, of these positions, these staff person years, how many of those were vacant last year? I think the Minister is well aware that there was a freeze and there was a limitation on hiring, and that most departments operated on about 10 percent vacancy. And I believe that Northern Affairs was up to about 14 percent vacancy overall. I'm not sure what the Resources Department was at in terms of vacancies.

So that how many of these are actual people no longer employed and how many of these are vacant positions that just no longer exist?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, just so we understand exactly what we're talking about, you're

saying of the 93.42 that was in the previous budget, you're wanting to know how many of them were vacant at some given time? Okay.

All I can give you on just a moment's notice is, of the 13 positions that were deleted, 7 of them were vacant and 6 were filled. I think that's what you wanted; if it's not, you can rephrase it and I will try and answer it.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** No, Mr. Chairman. Those are the figures that I wanted and I just warn the Minister's staff that I would like to ask the same question on each appropriation in terms of staff so they might want to prepare that information.

I wonder if the Minister does have the information in terms of the decentralization geographical breakdown, what percentage of the staff in this section and what percentage in the overall department would be in Winnipeg, and what percentage would be located outside of Winnipeg?

Maybe the Minister could just give his indication in terms of policy direction. Did he agree with the policy that I had, as Minister, in terms of increasing the native people on staff, and is he carrying out that policy? And if so, does he have any figures to measure his success or lack of success in that policy?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I should say that there hasn't been any major exodus from the outlying areas into the City of Winnipeg since I have taken the position.

To break it down and try and get what was in Dauphin before and Winnipeg now, and The Pas before and Winnipeg now, would be extremely difficult.

I have suggested that the Winnipeg area have greater control over the Thompson trust account, for example. So there is more work being done here. But your Thompson office still has 16, as was the case in the 1977-78 Estimates. There were 16 in both.

I think what the member is asking is, are we trying to congest everything, pull everything back into Winnipeg? And that certainly is 't the general direction that I have given or that my staff is in fact doing. There has been some movement within the province but not as a general rule have we established that great hordes of people come back into Winnipeg.

Now on the philosophy that you had that northern people be employed, I haven't said no to that. There are new positions coming up — not on a daily basis but certainly in the last two or three weeks there has been — and I'm guessing — I would think 20, 22, 24 and I think there are some more on their way. And people will be applying for them. And I am not saying, as maybe you did, that native people must be hired. I am not specifically saying that. We are looking for people to fill specific positions and people that apply for them and bid on them, and we hope to get the best people available for those particular cases.

Now, as for your question, I would like to give you my word that some time when the positions are all filled within our departments, I will give you a count and compare it with your best time, we will say with the number of native people that you had. And it may be substantially less; it may be very close to it. But I ask that we wait until we fill the positions that we are now attempting to fill. And I think that you, as a northerner, and myself as one, that you will be satisfied that there is still — that's the terminology you have been using, as if I have been doing away with them all. I think you will be pleased that there still is and will be, and there is more to come of northern native people and northerners, generally, involved in the Department of Northern Affairs. But at this particular moment I do not have that figure. I would ask that you wait for another three or four weeks until we get the positions filled and, whether the House sits or not, I give you my word that I will forward that to you. It possibly will be less than what yours was. You can use that document as you choose, at that particular time.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, maybe one way to answer that question a little more quickly would be to take a look at the positions eliminated by the Minister. Of those positions eliminated by the Minister, I wonder if he could give a geographical breakdown on those positions. Like my general impression is — and I would like to be corrected if I am incorrect — is that most of the people that were fired were fired in Thompson or The Pas, the majority in Thompson and a lesser extent The Pas, and a lesser extent in Winnipeg. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that assumption on my part.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Your assumption may have some validity as we get into other sections of the Estimates, but not under this particular section on the administration, finance and personnel, which is really what we are dealing with now.

There were ten contract people right within the Winnipeg operation and that is in addition to the SMYs that we were talking about, and there were four additional Winnipeg-based people that



equalled two SMYs. All the positions in the administration in this particular section were from the Winnipeg area. Now, there might be one other but I don't really believe so. Later on, we can discuss the other programs that were trimmed down, or whatever.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, maybe you could assist us here. I am making an assumption that these figures would be most likely logged in this section, having the personnel section and the administrative section in here, and I thought it would be the most appropriate place to get the overall breakdown for all staffs, since this is your personnel section. I suppose the other option is to do each section as we go along, but it gets a little bit more cumbersome that way, in terms of getting a general picture of the present situation.

I know that when I was Minister under the personnel section that's when I talked about staff and how many, and where, and our policy in terms of attempting to employ native people, and I answered questions in that regard.

I wonder if the Minister had that information under this section or whether he is suggesting the only way to proceed is to ask the same question each section.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'll relieve the member of the obligation of asking the question. As we go section to section, I will spell out the differences in employees. I really think that that is the most appropriate way to deal with it. As we come to the other sections of our departments, we will talk about the numbers less, or if there are additions, or whatever at that particular time. I think we can really zero in on the thing a heck of a lot better that way rather than talk about an overall picture.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister then could justify the 12 people in personnel with the reduction in staff and the reduction in information and statistics, from the time when the previous government was in office, in relation to the overall personnel situation. Of those persons that were fired by this administration, I wonder how many of those people are now placed in other jobs. And of those persons fired by this administration, how many of their positions were covered by The Manitoba Northlands Agreement, and therefore the saving to the province was 40 cents on a dollar as opposed to some of the figures that have been announced?

I wonder also under this section in personnel if there still is a native employment officer as one of the personnel officers. And, Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask that is that we found it necessary to make a special Outreach Recruiting Program to ensure that well-qualified and experienced native people would apply to the department. We had to change considerably our advertising and the places we advertised. We had to get considerable more information into the communities, in terms of positions.

And as I explained in the past, as more native people got into a section of the department, then more native people would apply to that section. So, since the northern Manpower core and the Extension Services already had a considerable number of native people, we found that . . . I remember one of the last reports that I got, one vacancy, one position open and 40 applications for that one position, and 38 of those applications being from northern Manitoba. That is the kind of effort that we got into to try to ensure this.

The other aspect that comes under Administrative Support Services — at least it used to come under the Administrative Support Services — is the training. There was a need for extra training input in the department. When you hired people that had not previously been in government employment, although they had considerable experience in terms of the communities up north, there was an extra effort made in terms of training. I wonder if there still is that internal training program especially aimed at field staff, or whether that particular program has been eliminated.

**MR. MacMASTER:** I see we are going to have some difficulties, and I blame no one for it, except that I am trying to keep to the administration end of what I consider are administrative functions, being finance and personnel and really the administrative ends of things.

Maybe I could read a couple of comments that I have made to give you some ideas of what we are really talking about.

"The Divisional Director's Office — Administration, finance and support staff is responsible for providing overall direction and management to the division, advice to the Minister, Deputy Minister and other divisions, and participates as a member of the department executive in reviewing departmental procedures, policy and operations.

"The Financial Services provides all centralized financial service for combined Departments of Northern Affairs, Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, including voucher processing, revenue accounting, financial reporting, including commitment accounting, payrolls, budget co-ordination and control. It provides direct service to Winnipeg-based operations and supervision, and quality control to remote administration operations in Dauphin, The Pas and Thompson.

"Now, your Personnel Services provides all centralized personnel services for the combined departments, again the same two, including personnel documentation, classification, staff training and employees relations. The systems and procedures staff function with responsibility for all areas of administration procedures, special studies, systems reviews and management of specialized resources, vehicles, housing equipment, etc.

Then we have the Internal Audit staff which internally audits our works. The Thompson administration represents administration services staff located in Thompson and providing administration services to department operations in the Thompson area, primarily the Northern Field Services Division which is another section of the Estimates and we'll deal with that later. It includes administration, financial and personnel functions plus the operation of the Thompson Trust Fund. The latter activity provides financial services to 22 community councils and some 40 community committees including property tax statements, assessments, etc.

Well, that's the kind of things that we have under the Administration heading today. Some of the questions you've been asking — and I'm not evading them, I'm trying to gear them into the proper section — some of the questions you've been asking certainly would fall under our Northern Field Services or under the Southern Field Services as we come to them. I'm taking note of them and they will be answered at that particular time.

### DECISION RE MOTION — ROOM 254

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

**MR. STEEN:** Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Committee in Room 254, I'm reporting that the Member for Lac du Bonnet moved that Committee rise and that there wasn't total agreement in having that motion carried, therefore, I'm recessing the Committee and asking you to conduct a vote on that motion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion before the House is that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet moved Committee rise. The Committee was not in unanimous agreement and therefore the Committee has been recessed to allow us to conduct a vote on the motion in the combined House.

**MOTION presented and declared lost.**

**MR. GREEN:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the members. The motion before the House; moved by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that Committee outside the House rise. The Committee not being of unanimous agreement, the Committee be recessed to allow a vote on the motion in the combined House.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 17, Nays 27.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion defeated.

### SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS (CONT'D)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are on Page 64, Estimates, Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources, Resolution No. 95(b)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, you have to learn not to listen to the Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. DOERN:** The steamroller from Inkster.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm having a little trouble with the Minister's comments before we were so rudely interrupted by the other Committee that can't get along without votes all the time.

I asked the Minister a couple of questions specifically about the personnel function within the department and a specific question about the training; and then he said that he wasn't sure that he could deal with it under this section because this section dealt with Financial Administration, Personnel and Training. I wonder if maybe I should repeat those questions to see that he understands

it. I don't know what other section they would come in under as they do relate directly to Personnel and Training. One was whether there is a native employment officer still within the operation. I asked the Minister to justify having 12 people in the personnel section when the staff is reduced and when the information available from that section, by the Minister's answer, appears to be quite substantially reduced as well.

I also explained the special need for training within the Department of Northern Affairs and hopefully within the Department of Resources as well, because there are people who haven't had government experience before, although they've had community experience, a special need for training. There was a special training program going on, it was called Field Worker Training. I wonder if there is still that Field Worker Training going on within the department or if that is one of the programs or one of the aspects of this administrative section that has been cut by the Minister.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, the Personnel Services itself is carrying out the personnel functions and the training programs — what I propose to be some new training programs — will be implemented I believe reasonably shortly when we get a few more people in place. The training of people in the field, part of this will be done by your regional offices which I'll get into when we get into the Southern Field Services and the Northern Field Services.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Is there within the department still a native employment officer? And we're being asked to vote a certain amount of salary and wages for 12 personnel. I assume that that's secretaries, personnel officers, director of personnel or whatever titles they have now, I would like the Minister just to justify 12 people for personnel and to explain what their function is.

**MR. MacMASTER:** In answer to your first question, there is no longer a native employment officer at this particular moment. Now if you could repeat your specific question on — I don't know what the second question was.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, my question was to ask the Minister to justify the personnel section that there is 12 people; that there is less staff for them now to deal with; and that there is less information coming from that section — it appears by the answers by the Minister — so I would like him to do his Minister's job of justifying this expenditure, that section of this appropriation. Why does he have 12 people there? Why doesn't he have six people there?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, we have two professional officer classifications; we have an administration secretary in records; we have an administration officer and three clerks as there was before; we have a recruitment officer; we have a personnel training and development officer and we have a professional officer and a clerk in Thompson. Since April, we have a payroll supervisor and two clerks.

**MR. McBRYDE:** What do they do, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. MacMASTER:** Well, your personnel officer is the head of the personnel department; administers entirely the department and has an administration secretary who assists him. You have an administration officer who looks after the records and documents, which is a fairly massive job. You have a recruitment officer. You have a personnel training and development officer. You have a personnel officer in Thompson, and a clerk. These people are presently handling the normal functions of a personnel department, in recruiting and posting of positions and assisting us in our submissions for new positions, establishing justifications for them, keeping us aware of what happens to the attrition state of our department.

I suppose they're handling grievances and a variety of other things that personnel people handle.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder are all of those positions previous Northern Affairs positions or are some of those Resources positions? Was the one person who has been cut from the personnel, was that the native employment officer or has the title just been changed to another title?

Mr. Chairman, the final question on the personnel section, is this the section that's responsible for firing, for giving notices to people that they're fired? Is this the one that sort of — I was going to use the word, Mr. Chairman, I'd better not — are these the ones that made a mistake on the first notice of firing to the staff, or was that another section of the department?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well to try and answer the first question, there is still a vacancy within the personnel department. I'm not sure what notices you're referring to that the mistakes were made, but I suppose all administration must bear the brunt for any particular mistakes that are made.

You keep referring to some problem that was evident and I suppose this personnel department had something to do with it along with the other administration.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I'm not sure the Minister understood my question, or at least one of them. He reported that last year there were 13 staff in this position; and he missed one question, whether those were all formerly Northern Affairs staff or whether they were a mixture of Northern Affairs and Resources staff. That's one.

**MR. MacMASTER:** It's a mix of both.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, then could he give us the breakdown, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I'll take that as notice and get back to you then.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes. Now what was the other question? The figure for last year was 13 people in this section; the figure the Minister gave us this year was 12. Now, the Minister said one is vacant, I assume that he means there are 11 people in place of the 12 positions he has authority for, but which is the position that was actually cut to get from 13 to 12?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The Director of Personnel has moved on to become a Director within the southern field services, and that's the position that was deleted.

**MR. McORYDE:** Mr. Chairman, in light of the earlier answer of the Minister, I just want to make sure that I don't have my information wrong. In the firing of staff with Northern Affairs, did at least one section, or all of them, get a second notice correcting their first firing notice?

**MR. MacMASTER:** There was a second letter in relationship to some employees making them aware of an additional termination benefit.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would assume that it's this section, and if it's not then the Minister could point out to me which section it now lies in, that deals with the unconditional grants and the special Northern Affairs grant to community councils and to Indian bands in the province of Manitoba. There was some problem last year at the time of the payment of the grants in relation to the 1976 statistics, and on August 4, 1977, Mr. Chairman, just to make it clear to the Minister, the then Minister of Northern Affairs sent out a letter which went: "Enclosed please find Department of Northern Affairs cheque in the amount of . . . representing the special per capita grant paid to the Department of Northern Affairs. As the 1976 Statistics Canada population figures are not yet available the amount of \$3.00 has again been calculated on the basis of the 1971 Statistics Canada population figures." And there was an understanding then that when the accurate figures were available from the Statistics Canada, that there would be, in fact, an addition made sometime last fall, and I believe that it wasn't expected that that would be probably made available until about November.

This is very important, Mr. Chairman, to the northern communities, because there was quite large population increases, and since the 1976 figures were not yet confirmed, although we had some rough figures, they were not yet confirmed. We had to make an adjustment later in the year because the dollar amount was very significant for those communities and for those bands. And I believe the Minister has made some further corrections in the statistics figures, because the Statistics Canada work up north was not very accurate and some other surveys had to be done in particular communities to correct that situation.

I wonder if the Minister could inform us whether the correction over last year's amount has yet been paid out, or will it be included in the calculation for this year, and maybe he could tell us when this year's payments will be sent out.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, if the member would look at 6.(f), that's exactly the area that we will address ourselves to on this particular topic.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Member for The Pas has already requested it, but if he has not taken notice of the question I would like to ask for a detailed outline of the administrative structure of the department as it is presently structured, that is as to the various divisions with names attached, if possible, for the various heads of the sections that have been brought about as a result of the streamlining of administration the Minister has talked about, and his re-organization of the department. Could he supply us with that immediately or does he have to take that question as notice?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I'm prepared to deal with the departments as we go through them as they're outlined within the Estimates, and I think you'll find that, again, in relationship to the questions from the Member for The Pas, Mr. Chairman, when he asked for large numbers. It's my intention to deal with the sections as we come to them in the Estimates, and if I haven't got the answers at hand I'm prepared to dig them up and get them for them. I'm very insistent that that's the way it should be dealt with, unless somebody proves different. We'll deal with them section by section. We're now dealing with (b) Administrative Support Services. If you wish I can read into the records what we feel those particular services are in very short form so that the members who are questioning me would have maybe a better view of it. If that's what they wish, then I'm prepared to read in the particular sections and the numbers of people in those particular areas.

I tried to break it down in numbers a few minutes ago, in fact I did. Your Director's office and the personnel and the finance and the systems and the internal audit and the Thompson office. I broke that down in numbers of people in this particular section, and I've outlined to you the reductions and I'm prepared, to the best of my ability, either now or as notice, explain to you the differences in numbers and how we believe that we can operate with fewer people in these particular areas. I'm prepared to do that as we go, section by section.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Perhaps the Minister did not hear me correctly, Mr. Chairman, but what I was specifically requesting from him is an organizational chart for his department showing the various divisions and the organizational structure of his department. I would think that sort of thing should be readily available if the Minister has finalized the re-organization and the streamlining which he referred to in his opening remarks.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to deal with, again, section by section, and outline the directors of the various sections, and I think you'll find that you can put that in chart form very very easily.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must assume from the Minister's reluctance to supply us with an organizational chart that he does not have one. And if he doesn't have an organizational chart I assume he is not really sure how his department is organized, or re-organized as he has attempted to make it. With respect to this particular section before us, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what changes, if any, have been made within the section of the department as it relates to the administration of the renewable resource section of his department, that is, who has been removed, what senior personnel, at least, have been removed from their positions, and the reasons for that removal if he can supply them, and who has replace those individuals in terms of the administration, the management of this particular section of the department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I have four or five points that I could read out which may clarify what we've done in this particular area.

We have replaced the ADM for Administration and Renewable Resources, and the head of Administration in Northern Affairs. We replaced them with one position, being a director of Finance and Administration for the departments. We have significantly reduced the staff required for voucher processing, and implemented supervisory and procedural changes to improve the quality of performance, to strengthen the revenue accounting area to conform with standard accounting principles, and provide better control over cash handling and accounting. We have eliminated departmental legal services and returned these functions to the Attorney-General's office. We have initiated reviews to establish centralized commitment accounting and inventory control records consistent between the two departments. We have enlarged the staff in the role of the internal audit section. We have revised the operational guidelines of the Thompson Trust Fund to eliminate abuses of the fund and to concentrate on providing service to northern communities, and we've reinforced the control and the accountability aspects of the comptrollership function of the entire division.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know what changes have been made in the accounting services and the financial reporting services that he referred to briefly in his comments. Would he outline what specific changes have been made there in terms of improving the kind of

accounting services this section provides to both sides of the department, and the financial reporting systems that he has discussed briefly? Can he enlarge on that particular aspect as to what is happening there?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, the comptrollership function, this aspect of the administration function represents a significant change in the style of operation in the two departments. The administration division will be assuming a larger responsibility for the monitoring and control of departmental expenditures and will have authority to advise the department executive on problem areas and recommend appropriate actions. This authority will encompass such activity as financial reporting, auditing of operations, identification of anticipated over-expenditures prior to the commitment of funds. Commitment accounting and control re allocation of budgeted funds. The internal audit section of the department will provide a mechanism for reviewing regional operations and to advise on the adherence to procedures, compliance with central directives, performance of staff, etc. The overall intent of this role of the division is to improve the financial control in the division and to provide a mechanism to assess the financial accountability of the division and the program managers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, whether we want to agree between ourselves or otherwise, I wasn't happy, and I'll say that as kindly as I can, with some of the situations that I found as far as accountability and financial control was concerned. And I am intending to clear up that particular situation. We feel that we have a "better handle on it," I think is the expression.

The road that I feel that has to be walked is the road of control and accountability and at the same time not inhibiting the delivery of the programs. And I'm convinced that the staff in place and the procedures that we've established and the controlling aspects that we've put in place and internal audit group that we will have a better control and a better set of procedures than were in place before.

**MR. BOSTROM:** This comes back to the original question I asked, Mr. Chairman, of an organizational chart, and the reason I'm requesting that organizational chart is so that we can see who the various heads of the sections report to. For example, in this section right here, who does the director report to? What is the reporting line of authority?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The Director of Administration reports directly to the Deputy Minister.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, does the department have or not have a structural chart?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I've already pointed out that this particular section has a director, and as we come to the other sections you'll find that they have directors in responsible, bulletined positions.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Does the Department of Northern Affairs and Resources have an organizational structure chart?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, the structure is as you see it in the Estimates book. There are directors and heads of all those particular department, and with any type of imagination I'm sure you can pick that out. They're all headed up by responsible people, that particular area. Have a look at it. It's right in front of you.

**MR. McBRYDE:** To the Minister, does the department have, or not have, an organizational chart?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, it appears, by the response of the Minister, that there is no organizational chart for this department, this department that is now super-organized and now has super management, has gone through Management Committee for approval.

Mr. Chairman, nothing would have gone through Management Committee when we were in government without at least an organizational chart to explain the new structure so that people could understand what the new structure was.

And the Minister is now saying that his super department, where they have amalgamated things to increase the efficiency — or maybe I was right in the first, the deficiency — in the department. The Minister responsible for the Task Force will be shocked to learn that the Minister of Northern Affairs and Resources doesn't even have an organizational chart. He doesn't even know what his

organization looks like. He cannot see in a pictorial way who reports to whom or how. This Estimates Book doesn't tell you who reports to whom and how. There is nothing in here that says where any of these different sections, where the directors of them report and how they report. Is the Minister telling us that he doesn't know how they report? Because if he doesn't have a chart he must know how they report.

Mr. Chairman, if they have gone this far without an organizational chart and he knows what's happening, he could sit down in a couple of minutes and draw out the reporting relationships, or one of his administrative people in front of him could do that in two or three minutes.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to have an organizational chart if we are going to understand how this department operates. And if he doesn't have one then I think we should just adjourn and wait until they produce one so we can see what we're talking about, we can ask who is directing who and how the department functions. He has been bragging about how effectively they now function and he doesn't even have a picture of how it is set up. It's just ridiculous, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I see that we can't read a book. I have said to the members opposite that as we come section-by-section I am prepared to talk about the title of the person that is heading up that section and who he reports to. It's of little concern to me if the members opposite are impatient, that isn't of any concern to me. When I take things to Management Committee I am quite prepared to stand up and I can assure the members opposite, through you, Mr. Chairman, that we do in fact go through Management Committee and do get approval for our expenditures and the shaping of our particular departments.

As far as the member opposite attempting to put words in my mouth, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that he save them for himself. He is going to need a lot of them.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** On this same point, all the Minister is demonstrating to us in his comments and his answers to the questions that we have asked with respect to this organizational chart, all he is demonstrating is that he can read very well from the information that is put in front of him by his staff that is sitting in front of him. He is not demonstrating to us that he knows his department, he knows how his department functions, how his department is organized so that he knows the reporting relationships in that department. And if he cannot produce a departmental organizational chart to us we must assume that he doesn't know how the hell his department is operating.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rupertsland is very concerned about who reports to who farther on down through the Estimates. I can assure him that I know who reports to who, and by the time we are through with the Estimates he will know who reports to who. We are dealing with a particular administration section. I have told him there is a Director of that particular section, and he is talking, and the Member for The Pas is talking about a little piece of paper. Well, they can put a block at the top for Deputy Minister and under that block they can put another little block called Administration Director, and he reports to him. And we go through it, and as we get through, I will give him a lesson in how a particular department is run. But we will have to do it. But, from what I inherited, I think that it would be appropriate if we do it just square by square, block by block, so they will get it quite clearly.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, it wasn't my intention to get involved in the debate or to participate actively, but I find it very strange that this particular Minister is very reluctant to provide an organizational chart when many of his colleagues have done so very willingly and very quickly on request. Not only have they provided organizational charts but they have provided listings of the individual civil servants and their classifications, their rates of pay, and all kinds of detail.

You know, for the Minister to sit there or stand there as he did a few minutes ago —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to stand there a few minutes ago and say, "Well, if we don't understand it that's too bad," but he has gone to Management Committee, the Treasury Board, and they understand it, and everything is okay because they know what they are doing. Well, I would like to remind the Honourable Minister the reason we are in this House, the reason we are in the Legislature, is for the government of the day to obtain Estimates approval, to obtain approval by the representative of the taxpayers. We don't give a damn what the Management Committee thinks of your organizational chart, or how you run your own department. It's the media; it's the people; it's the representative of the taxpayers, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba who

demand this information and are entitled to that information. And that is the reason we are here. This is the main function we are in this Legislature is to get information, and for the Minister to say that he is satisfied that the Management Committee understands, that, Mr. Chairman, indicates to me that he doesn't know how the democratic process works, that he has a mind that to me indicates that it is somewhat autocratic — I won't say arrogant but autocratic — and elitist, that they will look after things within government and they don't give a damn what the opposition thinks. They don't give a damn what the members of the Legislature think, even though we have been elected by the taxpayers to ask these questions, to ask these questions and to find out just how the departments operate.

For any Minister, any member of the Crown, to stand up on his feet and refuse to give information is a denial of the democratic process and I just think it just simply will not wash for a Minister to say the Management Committee is satisfied, so all is right in the world, Jack. The people in Manitoba have confidence in us because the good old Management Committee knows what I am doing, and to hell with the members of the opposition.

Mr. Chairman, that is the demise of democracy. That type of attitude is an attitude that is simply not acceptable to the people of Manitoba.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, when we were all children we read stories about those that huffed and puffed and the House didn't fall down.

I simply made reference to the fact that I had dealt with the appropriate government bodies, which happens to be Management Committee in Cabinet. I have said very honestly and straightforward to the members opposite, as we come to each particular section of the Estimates I am prepared to talk about who is heading it up, the title they have, and where they report. I repeat again: We are underneath the Administration Support Services. It is headed up by an Administrator and he reports directly to the Deputy Minister. And that's as clear as we have to get at this particular moment. As we move on to Lands and Surveys we will talk about that, and as we move on to Fish and Wildlife and Forestry Division it will all become very clear that the Minister has a fair idea about who is reporting to who. And as we get to them, as I said to the Member for The Pas, we will talk about the numbers of people there and the services they are providing; we will talk about the directors of those particular departments. And I happen to feel that is the way it should be done. I see nothing wrong with that. I am not depriving anybody of any information. I am just not, at this particular time, saying what we are going to be talking about four or five days from now.

If other Ministers have documented departmental charts, and put titles on it, that's their business. I am saying that I will not deny the opposition. I appreciate how they are elected and I appreciate why they are elected, and I respect them, and I will give them the information as we go through it.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister was concerned about houses falling down and I'm afraid that his is falling down quite badly at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a department that the Minister introduced as a restructured department that has a new structure. We have not dealt with it then, it's a new system, a new structure that we are dealing with. I, as a member of the Legislative Assembly and a critic on the Department of Northern Affairs, would find it very, very useful in dealing with these Estimates, in passing these Estimates, in discussion and asking questions of the Minister, to have an organizational chart. Now, all the other Ministers have had the courtesy to give an organizational chart. I am requesting an organizational chart from the Minister. To me it would be very useful to understand these Estimates and I request again: Could the Minister give us an organizational chart of this department?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, as a responsible member of the Legislature I am not going to let this section pass until we get an organizational chart. So, we are going to probably be here quite a long time.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister has no courtesy, or he digs himself into a hole and doesn't know how to walk out of it or what his particular problem is. The front of the Estimates Book, if the member, his officials in front of him or the Minister will look, has always in the past contained an organizational chart for Resources and for Northern Affairs. I assume that it's there and that to proceed without that basic information is just silly. If the Minister has that information he could share it with us and then when we get to different sections we could deal with it more thoroughly, and do a better job on behalf of the people of Manitoba that we represent here in this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I hear comments from the members opposite. I gave an organizational chart when



any member of the Legislature asked for an organizational chart. We had an organizational chart. This section of the Department of Northern Affairs, the Administrative Support Services, was the one that put together the organizational chart. So this is the appropriate section to ask for that organizational chart. But the Minister, for some reason unbeknown . . . Is the organization so bad that he doesn't want to let it out? I just can't understand the Minister's reasoning. Either he doesn't have one or things are so bad he doesn't want to let it out. And if he doesn't have one, I still don't understand how he ever got through Management Committee with his reorganization. He has got to have an organizational chart, but maybe he doesn't, Mr. Chairman, I don't know.

I would also like the Minister to give us the 13 positions that he says are less now. Because when he was responding to my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, he mentioned legal services and that that position has been transferred to the Attorney-General's Department. So, in effect, there is not a reduction of 13; there is only a reduction of 12. And then we also asked him the question about the vacancies when he came to office and there were six. So that means only a reduction of six in this section. And if the Minister could give us the rest of those positions that were reduced, because some of them might have been transferred elsewhere, too, and maybe the Minister could explain that.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I am going to risk possibly incurring the wrath of some of my colleagues who probably think that by now they have embarrassed the Minister into not presenting something which is so obvious and so available that I can't understand why there would be an argument about it. Never, Mr. Chairman, has there been so much ado made about so little. I can't believe that there are civil servants in government anywhere that haven't put out the squares on the blocks. I have seen them so many times. And I wonder whether the Minister is making something out of nothing now because he is just being stubborn, because it is requested and he doesn't want to give it. Can he have his civil servants, tomorrow, bring into the House the chart that all of us have seen so many times that we must be sick of looking at them, showing a Minister at the top and a Deputy Minister, and the squares, just as the Minister says exists, if only to get to the next item.

Some people — the former Minister for Northern Affairs and the former Minister of Renewable Resources — would like to see how the organization is put into chart form, probably as distinct from the way it was when they were running the department.

Now, I just can't agree with my existing colleague. I just can't believe that such a chart doesn't exist. It must exist. I can't believe that there isn't in the administration of the Minister's department such a document since we have all had them, and if tomorrow it is brought in and a photostatic copy provided by my friend, the Member for The Pas and my friend the Member for Rupertsland, I'm sure we could save a lot argument which doesn't have a great deal of depth to it and the Minister will overcome what may be a streak of unnecessary stubbornness for no reason at all. There is an organizational chart and it could be given to the honourable member.

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

**MR. McKENZIE:** I think it's very unfair of the members opposite to challenge this new Minister and the way they're attacking him, because —(Interjection)— Let the record be clear and let them laugh all they want. The Honourable Minister said when they were finished with his department you would have it loud and clear, in draft form or in word form, of the procedure of the squares and the blocks and how much clearer do members opposite want it? Are we back in a playground or are we dealing with the matters and the affairs of Her Majesty in the Province of Manitoba? It's unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, that members opposite would piddle around here all night and delay the proceedings of this House and the deliberation of these Estimates on a little bit of squares and blocks, and who's in who. Let's get on with the Estimates. The Minister assured the members opposite when the last item is dealt with they'll have an understanding of the administration and the blocks of who is responsible for what.

I can't believe my ears, the members opposite and the tactics they're using as we deal with the Estimates of this department, Mr. Chairman, it's unbelievable.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would just tell us that he would bring in . . . You know I have a stubborn streak, too, and I would overcome mine if the Minister would tell us tomorrow he'll bring in an organizational chart. So I wonder if the Minister could give us that indication.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, I guess I'll say it clearer than when I said it before. There are several sections within your Estimates that you can see. Each one has a head of that particular division. you have one Deputy Minister; and as you all know there is an Assistant Deputy Minister stationed in northern Manitoba which the Northern Services report to. End of story, simple, you could see it here if you looked at it. What was lacking, I suppose, was the fact that there's a director, the word specifically "director".

**A MEMBER:** It's as clear as a bell.

**MR. MacMASTER:** It's just reasonably that simple and I started off by saying that in this particular division this is a director and he reports to the Deputy; and when we got to the next we'd say the same thing and we'd go through it. It wasn't anything hidden, anything facetious. I just am not going to be wandering off onto the other areas. As we go through our —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Inkster says, we're not going to wander. But a lot of the questions that have been raised and a lot of the points that have been raised are under other sections and I appreciate the fact that when I brought that to the members of the opposition's attention, that they have gone along with me at least, that that's the areas we're going to cover them under.

It's a very simple thing, not complicated, not difficult to understand, there's a director of each section.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I am almost certain, although I can't swear by it, that in the report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, in the annual report, there is a chart showing a Minister, a Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister in one area, directors in other areas, outlining the department.

The Minister says he doesn't have one for his department, I will say that it's probably the first group of civil servants that didn't prepare such a chart. —(Interjection)— Pardon me? That's right, exactly, they are drawn every year. Can't the Minister give this drawing? He may think that the Member for The Pas and the Member for Rupertsland are being over-demanding. But if it's an easy thing to do, can he not give them in a graph form the organizational chart of the department? I mean, he has indicated that it exists, so just give it to them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** This is getting to the point of being awful ridiculous, Mr. Chairman. When I was away I had a couple of organizational charts in my desk I didn't even ask for, I assume that other Ministers had distributed those but they didn't relate to this particular department.

But, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister would understand — or maybe the Member . . . No, the Member for Roblin would never understand. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, for example, I've heard that one of the persons within this Administrative Support Services who used to report directly to the Asssntant Deputy Minister or the head of a section now reports to seven people before he gets to the same level he used to report to, and that is very ineffective structure, very ineffective management. But how are we to know? I mean that might be completely wrong. And what we're requesting is just the Minister to give us the piece of paper. I promise the Minister we won't stray from the section, but we will look at that section when we deal with it. We'll take some pieces of paper on the administrative chart and we'll block out the other sections and we'll just leave the section showing that we're dealing with so that we won't stray and we'll be able to meet the Honourable Minister's concern in that regard.

So I'm sure that if the Minister doesn't have one now, that either of the two gentlemen in front of him can have one ready for tomorrow. I would just ask the Minister if he would give us the benefit of that information as it would help us on this side of the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I find it ridiculous as the Honourable Member for Inkster has said, that this department does not appear to have an organizational chart. They obviously have gone through a period of reorganization where they have a new Deputy Minister. They have changed various positions within the two departments in order to amalgamate the two departments. They have eliminated certain positions. They have combined certain positions, and in order to effectively survey

the kind of changes that this government has made in these two departments, Mr. Chairman, we require an organizational chart just to see what, in fact, this Minister is talking about when he says that he has streamlined the administration and he has reorganized the department.

It's a well-known fact that when a department goes to Management Committee for approval of its reorganization that they must present an organizational chart at that time. Now I believe that the new director of their section here is a former member of Management Committee, and if he hasn't put together an organizational chart for his Minister I think that there's something lacking right there, Mr. Chairman, and I seriously question whether or not this Minister really knows how his department is organized.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to repeat the request because I see that the . . .

**A MEMBER:** Are you going to repeat all night?

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I may. I see that the House Leader is now in the House and sometimes when members opposite make a bad mistake or do something silly the House Leader will correct them and set it right and explain to them the procedures of the House. So maybe the House Leader would be interested to know that what I've asked for and what my colleague has asked for, if the Minister would give us a copy of his organizational chart, because this department has been restructured and has a new structure now. We would find it very helpful if we had that organizational chart to be able to deal with each section — and we committed ourselves to stay on each section. We told the Minister it would be fine if he even waited until tomorrow, as long as he told us he was . . .

**A MEMBER:** You said tonight.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I've mellowed, I've mellowed on the persuasive argument of the Member for Roblin and the logic that he presented and the strong and competent argument that he put forward in his usual forthright manner, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister you know can't meet that very simple request for information, then I'm afraid that I'm going to get stubborn and my colleagues are going to get stubborn and we're just not going to move ahead until the Minister's going to commit that he's going to share with us his organizational chart, and it's a fairly simple problem.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to direct questions to the opposition or try and get them to ask questions, but why don't they try talking about the organization and how it relates within a particular section of the budget that we're talking about right now, to see if we can't satisfy them in that particular area, and see how that works?

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** I can't believe how compromising I am this evening, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if the Minister could give us the organizational chart for Administrative Support Services and who reports to it and then who the director of it reports to; what the relationships are in the form of an organizational chart for this section. And then if we do that each section he can send us over some scotch tape and we can tape it altogether and we will have a full organizational chart.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** That's an excellent way to do it, Mr. Chairman, and then I won't lose any of them that are sitting opposite. If they want we can talk about the Administrative section. You have your Minister and your Deputy and your Administrative Director; and you have your head of your finance; head of your personnel; head of your internal audit and the head of the systems who report straight up. That's the exact section that we're talking about on the Estimates and that gives you, I hope, a view of how that particular area and that particular department operates.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us that chart itself, o

whether he could draw one out and copy it off and send it over, or does he . . .

**MR. MacMASTER:** I'll have that blocked out and in your hands before we start Estimates tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for his dramatic co-operation with the opposition in providing us with the information that we need in order to pursue these Estimates.

**A MEMBER:** He's still only bluffing.

**MR. McBRYDE:** That was my opinion as well. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what the honourable members opposite are shouting from their seats, although I did hear the Honourable Member for Roblin shout from his seat that, "How were you ever Minister?" And he demonstrated why he never was.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, my question that I asked previously and then we were interrupted, I believe, or something happened, was in relation to the 13 positions that are less this year. One of those was Legal Services transferred to the Attorney-General's Department, that position, which leaves 12. Seven of those were vacant last year but they were still positions with designations and I wonder if he could tell us those positions, what they were and which ones were filled and what has now happened to them, if they've been transferred somewhere else or completely eliminated. To make it even further complicated and make his staff get busy, also if any of those were cost-shared under the Northlands Agreement.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I'll take the part, whether they were cost-share as notice. I don't believe they were.

The positions — and I'll give you the title of the positions if you want to take it down — of those that we cut, was an Assistant Deputy Minister, an administration officer, head of administration, an illustrator, a Director of Personnel, a clerk typist. Am I going too fast for you? I didn't mean that to be facetious, I thought I'd be nice once. Accounting clerk . . . Oh, it only happens once a day. Administration secretary — there's two of them — Clerk III, Clerk Typist II, voucher typist, department solicitor, general clerk. That is 14 and we've added one, a mail clerk, which brings it down to 13.01

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the other part of the question was — Okay, of those positions then, which ones were actually occupied when the Minister took over and which ones of them were vacant previously? Also, could the Minister indicate whether they came from Northern Affairs or Resources, originally?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Number four that I read, the Illustrator was vacant, the Director of personnel was in the midst of moving out to other duties, the Clerk Typist was vacant, the Accounting Clerk was vacant. Both Administrative Secretaries were vacant. The Clerk III was vacant.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Of the ones that weren't vacant — to make it simpler — which former department did they come from?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I will take an educated guess at a couple of them and I will attempt to clarify specifically. The Assistant Deputy Minister was Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. The Administration Officer was Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. The Head of Administration was Northern Affairs. The Clerk Typist II was Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. The Voucher Typist was Renewable Resources and Transportation Services, and the other two, the Department Solicitor and the General Clerk, were Northern Affairs.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm making an assumption that the Head of Administration Services . . . I mean you do have a head now so that position must be covered off by one that was in Resources. So, in effect, there is no real change. I would point out that all of those other positions that have been cut all come from Renewable Resources except for the Solicitor position which the Minister said had been transferred to the Attorney-General earlier, or did I misunderstand him? Then I wonder did that General Clerk belong to the Solicitor or was that a general General Clerk. So

did two positions go to the Attorney-General or just one position go to the Attorney-General?

**uR. MacMASTER:** The General Clerk's position was a Northern Affairs and was attached to the finance area, and I've said that the Head of Administration was in Northern Affairs.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I just want to double-check and make sure. Maybe the Minister could just nod his head. There still is a position similar to Head of Administration — I'm not sure what he said it was — Director of Administration? I assume that that's covered off by a similar position from Resources; is that correct?

**MR. MacMASTER:** . . . told that there was a vacant position in Northern Affairs that has been reclassified.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure I have got it clear then, if my figures are correct. Is it correct that in fact there were five people then that have been let go, or is it six people that have in fact been let go in this section?

**MR. MacMASTER:** There was seven positions — seven people — that are no longer with us in that particular section.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Was one of those seven people transferred to the Attorney-General's Department?

**MR. MacMASTER:** No, if I gave that impression previously, I was wrong. The Attorney-General's office had assured us that they could provide the service, so the transfer did not take place.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Under legal services within the Department of Northern Affairs available to council then. Is there someone in the Attorney-General's Department that specializes in that field, because I know that we had to get a person because there was nobody previously? Now, could the Minister reassure us and the community councils that there is someone with that background of community councils that does provide that service and is readily available, as opposed to only doing it when they can?

**MR. MacMASTER:** That was the very question that I asked, Mr. Chairman, whether it would be as you can provide it or as we need it, and I think it's a very good question. And the answer that I received was that . . . I received a great deal of assurance from the Attorney-General's Department that a specific person would be assigned to handle all of the business that we would require done and that that person would be there when required, not when they found time. It's a good question; it was one that I concerned myself with, and we have been given that assurance. I suppose only time will dictate whether that particular decision and the co-operation of the departments will bear out, but I believe it will.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Have they had need of an Attorney yet for the community councils and, if so, has it worked?

**MR. MacMASTER:** There has been occasion when we have needed an Attorney and we have had great success in dealing with them but I can't specifically think of an instance where a community council has requested assistance. But if they do, I would like to assure the members opposite that we will do everything in our power to assure them that they will have it as quickly as possible.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the ADM in Renewable Resources, the position that was eliminated, was a position that was filled. Was that ADM in charge of financial services, or which position was that?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, it was the ADM that was responsible for administration in Renewable Resources and Transportation Services.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us that of these positions here that the Minister says are cut, of which six were filled — have I got it right? — how many of those people are on a severance pay system that is more than a month?

**MR. MacMASTER:** They all receive more than four weeks — and I assume that the Member for The Pas is saying by a month, four weeks — they all receive more severance pay than that.

**MR. McBRYDE:** So the immediate saving, Mr. Chairman, wouldn't be as great as it might appear, since some of these are on a fairly long-term severance in order for them to leave quietly, I guess, would be the word to use.

Changing the subject somewhat, I want to go back to the unconditional grants. This section administered the unconditional grants in the past. Are they still administering . . . ? You know, the funds come from the Municipal Affairs appropriation or from a special appropriation of the Legislature. Are those unconditional grants still being administered by this section?

**MR. MacMASTER:** They are under 6.(f) Grants and Purchased Services on Page 67. The administration, of course, will do the administration of them and your northern field service people will be dealing with the communities direct.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, since the administration is done there, maybe I will ask a couple of questions about the administration. I want to make sure the Minister is sure of that because that would be a new figure, then, if that's the case, in that last year the funds came from Municipal Affairs and were just allocated by Northern Affairs, but the funds appear in the appropriation separate from. This amount doesn't seem enough in terms of the per capita grant, which is in the neighbourhood of \$21.00 per capita, I believe, \$19.40 last year, I'm not sure what it's up to now. It doesn't seem like the correct amount . Maybe the Minister would like to double-check that information.

But on the administration of those grants, there was the problem of the census and the 1976 census for the north not being verified, yet, basically, although the preliminary figures were available and I wonder if that final payment was made last year or how that was handled administratively.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, the Administration section will deal with the processing of the cheques. Your census and your negotiations, etc.' in the field will be done by Northern Field Services. In addition to that, I should probably get an update sort of a statement that I would be prepared to give on where we are exactly at with that. The Member for The Pas has asked several questions that relate around it and probably to pull it together we will prepare some type of statement for him.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, last August, working with this section of the Department of Northern Affairs, the Administrative Support Services, the Deputy Minister signed, on my behalf, a letter to the bands and maybe I will just make sure the Minister has that information, because there is a problem in the department since the senior executive were all released that it is very difficult for the new senior people to know exactly what was taking place. This was to a particular band, but it was a general form letter that went out.

"Enclosed please find a cheque in the amount of . . . which represents the interim payment of \$15.00 per capita towards the \$19.40 per capita grant paid each year by the Manitoba Government under The Unconditional Grants Act."

So it is a legislative requirement, administered by this particular section.

"This grant was calculated on the basis of the 1971 census figures available to us from Statistics Canada, as we have not as yet received the 1976 census figures from Statistics Canada.

"This interim payment actually was taken as we did not wish to delay payment of at least the major portion of the province's annual per capita grant.

"Please be assured that immediately upon the receipt of the official 1976 Statistics Canada population figures, the appropriate adjustment will be forthcoming. We have been advised by Statistics Canada officials that this information will be available during the latter part of 1977 or 1978.

"Sincerely, R.L. CXARTER FOR Ron McBryde, Minister of Northern Affairs."

I am starting now to get letters from these bands addressed to me, since I sent out the letter as Minister at that time. These payments, it was my understanding from the administrative people, should have been made late in 1977 and I am very anxious to know what has happened. I'm sure that the communities that were depending upon that difference for their budget were in serious trouble in the early part of this year trying to balance their budgets without those particular funds.

So it's very important, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister clarify that situation and what was happened in that regard.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Again, Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to get the documentation in relationship to it. But just from memory, I believe there was a dispute in relationship to the 1976 documents

that came in on the statistics. But I will dig those things out and I will have them prepared for tomorrow in the Estimates.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I believe what happened is that Statistics Canada did send to municipal governments their preliminary figures to see if there was any serious dispute and so that the Minister would have some idea which ones were in dispute in terms of the 1976 figures, and which ones were agreed in by the communities, basically. So that would be part of the problem and it would be very important that this matter be dealt with. I am a bit surprised that the director of Administration is here and not completely familiar with this problem, since it is such a key one for the community councils and the Indian bands in the province.

The other problem and why I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the item that the member referred to, 6.(f), is not in fact unconditional grants is because it doesn't show any change and the unconditional grants change by legislation in Manitoba, and therefore it would be impossible to leave the figure the same when there is an automatic legislative change that takes place. So the Minister, tomorrow, could report whether in fact 6.(f), as he thought, is in fact the unconditional grant or whether it is a special Northern Affairs grant and other purchases or other grants that are made by the department, which seems to be more likely, because there are grants totalling about that amount that have normally been made by the department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Just from memory, I believe I have seen a document that claims that there were 29 communities that were at odds with the Statistics Canada findings, and I will attempt to produce that particular document tomorrow to clear up this particular issue — and the question of funding and the amounts that the Member for The Pas has raised.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, because that, I assume that recollection of 29 would include Indian bands and therefore we are probably looking at 60 or so . . . with 43 northern communities we are probably looking at at least 60 or so communities that would be affected by that administrative problem that the department is faced with because of the slowness of the figures from Statistics Canada.

The Minister, I think, took some note of some other questions on this section and was going to get some more detail on that. I don't think I have any more on that particular item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to know from the Minister regarding this section if it provides a support service to the Forestry, Wildlife and Fishery Programs in his department and, if so, what type of support service does it provide?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The headings that are read out, Mr. Chairman, those type of payroll functions, personnel functions, they apply in support of forestry, lands, wildlife, in northern and southern divisions. It is a central administering body.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand as far as the personnel section is concerned that it would relate to all sections of the department, including the Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries. But what other administrative function regarding those sections of the department does this particular section carry out?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to break my own rule of wandering, but when we get into the other sections you are going to find that there is a degree of administrative support within those particular sections. But this administrative section, for example, under the Financial Services, provides all centralized financial services for the combined departments, including the voucher processing and revenue accounting and financial reporting, payrolls, budget co-ordination and control.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, this particular section of the department, as it was structured previous to this Minister's administration, did provide a direct support service to those sections of the department, that is, the fisheries, the forestry and the wildlife sections. It provided a direct administrative service. Has that function been transferred to other sections of this department, or is that function still continuing in some form in this particular part of the department?

**MR. MacMASTER:** It is basically unchanged, Mr. Chairman, it is just a combination of the two departments' administration staff coming together. And, as I have said, the other sections have a degree of administration capability themselves. The interim audit of course is a group that would

work with all the particular departments and all the particular divisions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, to be more specific, does this particular section of the department issue the cutting rights on Crown land' for example? Does it provide that administrative service to the forestry section?

I didn't hear the answer, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

**MR. MacMASTER:** No, it doesn't, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, well the people who used to carry out that task in this particular section of the department, where are they now? Have they been transferred to other sections of the department, if so, where have they been transferred to?

**MR. MacMASTER:** You will find, Mr. Chairman, as we go through that some particular people are working in other divisions of the Estimates, as we go through them, under different directorship.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like a more specific answer. There were people who used to work in this section, as I said, who did the administration for forestry with respect to issuing of cutting rights on Crown land, preparing contracts for timber sales, and so on, maintaining control records for timber quotas and timber sales, issuing land use permits and leases, timber clearances, just to mention a few things that they used to do. I'd like to know where these particular personnel are now located, because the Minister did say he made significant reductions in this section and the previous Minister of Northern Affairs was pursuing this point and trying to find out exactly what the real net reduction was. And here is another area where there may have been reductions in this section but only in the sense that they were transferred to other sections of the department. I'd like to know where those positions are now located that were responsible for carrying out that function within the department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the people that were involved with the forestry administrative end that the Member for Rupertsland is talking about, he will find those particular people within the forestry division of the Estimates. And when we come to them, if he finds that there is a reduction in a particular area, then I will be prepared to explain why there is five instead of six, or 14 instead of 17.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Could the Minister take the question as notice right now, if he can't supply the answer tonight? That I'd like to know how many people were involved in doing the forestry administration in this section, and where exactly those people have been transferred to.

The other question I would ask is with respect to the Wildlife and Fisheries administration, which used to be contained within this section of the department. Can the Minister indicate where that particular support unit is now located, if it is not located in this section, and specifically how many people were involved in providing a support service in the last fiscal year, and where are those positions now located?



**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, we go back to what we said about the administration, that there is in fact 13 less people. We have itemized their particular positions, the ones that are not there, a great number of them being vacant initially. Other people in Fisheries, of course, have gone to Fisheries and the people in Wildlife and the people in Forestry. For example, there were six people now attached to the Forestry Department that were within the Administration heading I guess that the Member for Rupertsland is referring to. In the Wildlife area, there were six here that were within a large administration sort of umbrella that are now attached to the Fish and Wildlife area. But the 13 reduction is as is, and as we go through you will find additional reductions. .

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Minister correctly, there were six positions that related to doing administration work in this section before related to Forestry that have now been transferred out of this section into the Forestry Division. There were additional six people who were attached to this section before, who were doing administrative work with respect to Wildlife and Fisheries that have now been transferred to the Fisheries and Wildlife sections of the department.

So the net effect, if I understand this correctly, is that there has been a reduction of 12 in this particular section of the department but there has been no net reduction in the department of 12, since those same staff man years have now been transferred to other sections of the department and are doing the same type of work as they were doing before, except they are under a different administrative head in the department. Is that correct?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Under this particular section there is a reduction of 13 and I can only repeat to the Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Chairman, that when we come to the Fish and Wildlife any reductions that are evident I will be prepared to explain them at that particular time. But this is the first area of reduction that is evident at this particular time.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about reductions and, as I understand them, they are not reductions, they are transfers. So the net effect is that there have been 12 people moved out of this section of the department and they have been transferred over to other sections of the department. It may appear at first glance as though the Minister has achieved certain economies by having, as he calls it, streamlined the administrative section of the department, but when you scrutinize it as we are scrutinizing it right now, we find that there has not been a reduction in staff but in fact there has been a transfer of staff from this section to other sections and the same staff are there doing the same things except they are reporting in different ways throughout the department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, for the last time, the transfers are not counted within the 13 reduction. There are 13 positions that are vacant — people and vacancies and positions that are now not evident at this particular section, and as we get into the other sections, you can keep seeing the reductions as they take place and as they unfold but the real number in this particular area is minus 13.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I know that last year in this section there were 43 staff man years approved in the Estimates. Seven were approved in the administration section of this Administrative Support Service, 26 in the financial administration area, and 10 in the personnel services area.

Can the Minister tell me specifically which ones of those have been cut and/or transferred to other sections of the department?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I went through the vacancies that are now there and there are 14 titles that I spelled out to the particular member and to others. I can further, if you wish, find out where the vacant positions were located, what department they were in. But the Renewable Resources ones, there are 4 that were there that are not there now in that particular section. There are seven vacancies. If you wish I can break that down and that will give you an idea of how many have actually gone out of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** I can further . . . I've broke it down. There was four positions filled and five vacancies that came out of Renewable Resources.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to know more specifically what those staff were assigned to do previously, who is now assigned to carry out those duties and functions since this administrative section of the department, as I knew it, was I believe lean in terms of its complement of staff and were always experiencing, if anything, problems in keeping up with the workload. I think if the Minister was referring to — if I heard him correctly in the summary he gave from some report which he was referring to earlier in the day, I think he was referring to problems that were in this particular section of the department in terms of being able to keep up with the workload — we maintained a strict control on the staff in this area and I believe that the people who were in here were fully employed in terms of their workload in the accounting administration of the department. If there have been numbers of people cut from this section, there must have been other people brought in from Northern Affairs, or wherever, to cover off that workload. I'd like to know more specifically who or what positions were eliminated, if any, and who is now covering off the work for those positions?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** I can't give you the five vacancies, Mr. Chairman, at this particular time. But I can point out to you that there was an Assistant Deputy Minister, there was an administration officer, and there was a clerk typist and a voucher typist, positions that were filled which are not filled today. And there were five vacancies of the seven which we will endeavour to break out for you and I'll have them for you tomorrow.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, with the questioning of my colleague, I'm a little bit confused now on his figures. There was, the Minister said, 13 positions eliminated which were not 13 people because six of those positions were vacant. They created one new position, a mail clerk, and there were actually six people let go.

One area of confusion is that the ADM that was let go from a former position assigned to Renewable Resources and the head of administration, the former Northern Affairs position, were both done away with. Where did the other position come from for the new director? Is it just a position here called Clerk 10, or something, that he doesn't show as being done away with? Was it transferred in from another section, or approved by Management Committee or where did that other position come from?

**MR. MacMASTER:** We'll try and get the numbers straight, Mr. Chairman. It's seven and seven; there were seven positions and seven vacancies and that made 14 and we moved one position in, that gives us 13. There was a vacant clerical position, just a spot that was there that we recategorized and called Director of Administration for both departments and that's the vacancy, the position that I used to move in the present Director of Administration and there was an overlapping period while he was there and the others were there also.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes. That's I suppose one sort of strangeness in this that there was an ADM responsible for administration in Resources and a head of administration in Northern Affairs and yet both of those positions are shown as being cancelled, and yet a clerk position was made the Director of Administration and Financial Services, or whatever the full title is. Mr. Chairman, that position was transferred in and that means that in fact only five people were actually let go, if my calculations are correct. I might be as confused as the Minister is on that, but it appears that there

has been five positions cut. Is that correct?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The best I can determine to answer your particular question is that there was a vacancy and that we used that position to re-title it and to bring in the present person that is the Administrator of Financial Services and Administration.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to suggest to the Minister, when I was occupying that particular chair there, although I was very satisfied with my Director of Administration, there was another staff person — I don't know what the title is so I'll have to use his name — who appeared to have a photographic memory of this book — his name was Wolf Boehm and he seemed to be able to pick out those names out of the book like that when I was asked questions. So maybe if he's still with the department he could add a third chair and you might get the information fairly quickly.

The administrative section — it appears that three of these although it's hard to say because of this transferring of this clerk position that was vacant, were with Northern Affairs and yet the workload of what used to be the Northern Affairs section has been reduced fairly drastically in this section because previously, besides providing these services to the department, the administrative section used to also deal with the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation who were . . . in terms of the payment out of funds and recollecting from MHRC, they performed an administrative function for MHRC — I'm not sure how much the MHRC program has been reduced now but I assume it's very significantly with the other organizations taking on that workload. They also provided assistance to the Churchill Pre-Fab Housing, to Minago contractors, to Mistik Creek Loggers, and all the other small operations which, as the Minister will use in his argument about those operations, does consume some time, administrative time or at least accounting services time for those particular functions.

So, in effect, we have now in the administrative section, the Minister of Resources saying that perhaps they were under-staffed in this regard. Previously the department was able to function with that number of staff and carry out all these extra functions. I wonder if it's not possible then to make some further reductions since many of these functions have been eliminated by the Minister or by one of his colleagues. Is it not possible to reduce the staff even further?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I think you'll find, Mr. Chairman, as we go through the Estimates that there is further reductions in other particular areas. In the Development Resource Division you'll find that's where we deal with our existing corporate projects, and that is under Section 7.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I was speaking specifically about administrative functions, about this section and not about the other sections of the department which the Minister would prefer to debate later. I mean he was very clear on that point, that he didn't want to discuss any of those other sections until we get there.

I was referring very specifically to the administrative section. There has been a workload reduction because they did perform the administrative backup and in some cases the accounting services for functions that have since been eliminated, and maybe the Minister wants to review, and his staff want to review this. There is probably room for still further reductions in that regard.

In the last Estimates book, this section, Administration Northern Affairs shows the recoverable section from the Manitoba Northlands Agreement. It's not that significant. In this case it was \$14,200 if I read the figures correctly. Is there none of this recoverable any more from the Northlands Agreement? We found it very difficult to get any administrative expenses out of them, but is there none in this year's Estimates that's recoverable under that agreement?

**MR. MacMASTER:** You'll find those particular facts when we are prepared to produce them under No. 7, Development Resources Division.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, does that mean then that another function has been transferred out of administration?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The Development Resources Division handles the corporate projects and the northern agreements and we'll deal with them when we come there; you'll find that they're well looked after in that particular area, I'm sure.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's comments, but they in no way answer the question. Last year the administrative section, the section that we are now dealing with in this year's Estimates, had a recovery under the Recoverable from Canada, \$14,200.00. Now has that function been transferred? Is that why there's no recovery this year? Has that function been

that it was eligible for Northlands funds? Is that why it's not shown in this year's Estimates? Ooooooooooooooooooooo don't intend to claim this year funds that they could claim under the Northlands Agreement? Why is there no Northland recovery, no Recovery from Canada, in the administrative section?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Where recoveries are possible and negotiated, we will attempt to get them but the recovery procedure is somewhat up in the air, I think it always has been, and as we work our way through the year and we recover them, then we will have to display them at the appropriate times.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I'm very confused, Mr. Chairman, with the new effective administration and management of the combined departments. I still don't know what happened to the recoverable amount and why it's not recoverable this year. I don't know if the Minister has the answer to that question or not.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think one of the responsibilities we have on this side of the House is to examine the figures put forward by the government in each department. In each department we found expenditures that they failed to show and in fact that their announcements in terms of expenditures and revenues have not been correct as we pursued in detail the budget, and as I mentioned in my initial remarks, my estimate is that somewhere between \$5 million and \$6 million of Manitoba Northlands funding, 60 percent recoverable from the Government of Canada has been dropped by this government and I'm trying to understand where, how and what has been dropped. If there's a \$14,200 figure here, then that could be only one persons salary, because the other 40 percent isn't shown here, it could have been the salary for one person. Has that person been transferred, deleted, why is there no recover at all this year in administration from the Northlands Agreement?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, we've determined that the general clerk vacancy was a portion of the positions that the former administration applied for and I think he would find that it was a portion of the salaries of two particular people and I can't determine at this particular time how long this general clerk position was vacant. I would assume it was for a portion of the year, it certainly was at the time that we made the deletions in the department. Now as we go through it we will attempt to establish the numbers of people that we can apply to the Northlands and attempt to get the recovery from them as we can best negotiate it.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I think I can understand the Minister's problem in that as I mentioned before he caused lots of problems for himself by firing all the senior executive or pushing them out one way or another of the department, and I think that they were the ones that had the expertise in terms of the negotiation, in terms of understanding how to manipulate the Northlands Agreement to get the maximum funds for the people of Manitoba, and in the process of eliminating those experienced people he now doesn't know where he sits in regard to recoveries from Canada, and when he shows a saving in reduction in staff he will have to show an additional loss of funds from Canada because he no longer knows how to go about recovering those funds from Canada, and it was fairly difficult as I mentioned to get any administrative matters covered. I don't think the Minister understands the situation or is able to answer the question. I think it's a question that's been left up in the air by the Minister and as we go into other sections I'll be asking the same question because the majority of this department, or the old department of Northern Affairs was recoverable from the Government of Canada and as I said the indications are in terms of expenditures that somewhere we're dropping \$5 million to \$6 million from that agreement. I don't know whether that's going to be picked up under the Industrial Agreement or whether that's going to be lost to Manitoba in terms of those additional funds from the Federal Government. But maybe, Mr. Chairman, the Minister could check that further and report back, even after we've passed off this section as to why there is no recoveries under this section from the Northlands Agreement. So maybe I will leave it at that and ask the Minister when he does figure it out, if he could report to us on that.

The other function of this section, Mr. Chairman, has been the local government auditing and reporting. This has been an area that we had to do previously considerable work on and this function defined in this section of the Estimates was combined with training of community clerks so that in fact their records would be reasonably well up to date, so an audit of community council books

was possible, and I'm wondering if there is a reduction or an increase in the ability to audit under this section and what's going to happen now that the training of community clerks, that section of the Estimates has been cut in half or 0, or the number of staff that were doing the training has been cut in half, if the Minister could indicate if this section which needs good records to work from if they're going to do an audit, will still be able to function without that training input. So, I wonder if the Minister could give us a summary of the local government auditing and reporting which has been a problem.

There were some cases, Mr. Chairman, where the local books were not in good enough shape to do a sufficient and full audit and there were some cases discovered of poor administration of funds. This function is a very important one because if it's not done on a regular basis, then you do not know when a community council is running into trouble, when that clerk is running into trouble, unless you perform this function on a regular and consistent a basis. So I would like some reassurance from Minister that this function will still be carried out.

**MR. MacMASTER:** I'd like to assure the Member for The Pas, Mr. Chairman, that the function most certainly will be carried out. We have five people on the interim audit which is a group that will be working on the books and we also have people in the regional services areas that will be assisting and working with the community. So the audit function of the books and the assistance to the people will be there.

**MR. CHAIRN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, under this section, and I'm not sure this section is the best place to raise this matter, but since the personnel section function is in here, there were both at the community level and at the departmental level some new careers positions and I wonder if there are still any new careers positions either available to the communities, and that's where some of the community clerks were trained, or whether there are any new careers positions still available for other functions in the department.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, we took on some of the new career graduates onto staff and the future of the New Careers Program itself was discussed quite thoroughly under the Department of Continuing Education in the Estimates in the House.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I wonder if the Minister then is saying that there are no longer any New Career trainees either working for community councils or for the department, there are zero now?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that there's any new positions being created for New Careers, no.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just on that point to follow up the question asked by the Member for The Pas. The New Careers section as I understand it was initiated by the New Democratic Government and this particular section relating to the Resources was negotiated at my insistence by the Department of Resources with the Department of Education in which we managed to have approved 16 new New Career positions for the conservation officer series. I believe it was a very good step in that out of the 160 or so conservation officers that are employed by this department, that at least 10 percent of them were in that category of New Careers positions where disadvantaged people in the province had an opportunity to take training, to upgrade their skills to get the necessary type of education to fit into the Conservation Officer series. I understand there have been some problems with that program, I think some individuals dropped out and others had to be recruited and so on, but I fully intended if the New Democratic Government had been re-elected to increase the number of positions to push forward for increased positions in that category of new career type of training for the Conservation Officer series. I'd be disappointed to hear if the Minister is now disregarding that kind of potential increase and is putting a cap on the program or in fact even reducing it, because I think this is specifically a type of program where the Minister has to get involved directly because the standard way that the Civil Service operates, it just does not provide the opportunity for the type of individuals we're talking about, to have an opportunity to get the kind of training that is required to fit into a professional series like the Conservation Officer program.

I would like to know what this Minister's impression is of that program and whether or not he's going to seriously undertake as a Minister to take this in hand and try to at least finish off the program that was started, and if possible, increase this series, increase the opportunity for people

to take training right in the Province of Manitoba on the job to fit into these categories of conservation officers.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, there was certain aspects of the New Careers Program that I did not agree with. There was a philosophy to it in part that some consideration certainly could be given to in the future. As far as I'm concerned at the particular moment there is a hold on the particular program and I'm prepared to review our recruiting procedures and the opportunity for those that are less fortunate, I suppose is the term in a variety of ways, within our department . . . I am providing employment and training within our department.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, unless there is some kind of a structured program such as the New Careers Program to undertake the specialized training that's required for individuals who are disadvantaged, as the Honourable Minister recognizes, this simply will not happen and if the Minister is going to just gloss over this and say that he will undertake to see that training is accomplished and that people do have the opportunity to take training to fit into the professional category of a conservation officer, I can tell him right now that it will not happen. It will not happen unless there is a specialized program where the training is organized, where the training is specified as to the type of training that people will receive, that the person has the security of knowing that at the end of his training he will have an opportunity to compete for one of the positions in the department, the program just will not succeed. And if the Minister is saying that he's rejecting the New Careers Program out-of-hand and attempting to supplement or replace it with some kind of ad hoc program within his department, I can tell him right now that simply will not work and I hope that's not what he's saying.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, some of the criteria as I said for the New Careers Program, and I suppose we should talk about it for a moment, certainly created some problems within the communities. I'm sure the Member for Rupertsland travelled around the communities, and if he had his ears really open, he heard a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst a lot of young men and women throughout the communities in northern Manitoba in relationship to the New Careers program.

I don't say here that portions of the concept are not acceptable by myself and certainly could be considered in the future, but there was qualifying judgments that had to be made in relationship to the people that went into the New Careers program that certainly created hard feelings amongst a lot of the young men and women within the communities in northern Manitoba. I say to the Member for Rupertsland that we have put a hold on new entries at this particular time and that our department is certainly prepared and will be preparing to bring people into our departments who are less fortunate, in a variety of positions, and we're prepared to provide them with the opportunity to advance themselves within both departments.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I can see that the northern communities will not have to worry about complaining about this program any more because it simply will not be operating. That's a very easy way for the government not to have complaints about programs. If they don't have any, nobody can complain about them. It appears to be the watchword and the policy that this government will be pursuing in northern Manitoba, in any case. They've cut back so many programs now that there's virtually nothing happening in the remote communities; they're giving no direction to their staff in the Department of Northern Affairs, so even the ones that are still there at the present time don't know what they should be doing and are not providing the necessary services to the northern communities.

I'd like to, before we leave this section, Mr. Chairman, bring up an issue which I think I would be remiss in not bringing up, if I let this section pass without any comment on it, and that relates to the removal of the Assistant Deputy Minister, who was in charge of this section when I was the Minister. This is an individual who had some twenty years plus experience in the Civil Service of Manitoba, in my opinion, a very qualified individual, one who is dedicated to the public service in Manitoba, and I believe over that twenty year period probably served two or three different types of administrations, Liberal, Conservative and NDP, with distinction. I don't know all the details behind his removal, I can only judge from the press reports because I did not undertake to talk to the individual personally, I didn't feel that I should talk to him, I guess, but I did feel badly about the way in which he was removed at that point in his career, so few years away from retirement. I'm not sure what kind of arrangements have been made for this individual in terms of receiving a retirement pension. He's at a point in his life right now which I would think it would be more difficult than at other points in people's lives to find comparable employment within the public service or the private sector.

I really get the impression from the news reports that I have followed with respect to this particular removal, that it was handled in a rather callous and heartless way, and I would like to know if the Minister can give us some rationale or justification for the removal of this gentleman. I would think that given his record of distinction within the public service of Manitoba, that there would have been some effort made to have him continue in the public service of Manitoba in some other capacity, perhaps some other department of the government or its agencies.

I'm not making any special case for him on his behalf. As I said, I have not talked to the individual, but I do have a rather bad feeling about the way in which this happened and the fact that this gentleman was treated in this manner by this new government. It's been a question that's been in the back of my mind for some time now and I thought the best time to bring this issue up and to have it out in the open would be in the Estimates process when we're on this particular section of the department which he served, and I believe he served with distinction, when he was an employee of the public service of Manitoba.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I share some of the feelings of the Member for The Pas when he talks about the many years of service by the particular gentleman in question. The man, himself, had several conversations with me and when he saw the responsibilities of what was taking place and what would take place as the head of administration, we both, I think it's fair to say, we both mutually agreed that it was really not his cup of tea. I then, at his request and quite readily and quickly and gladly approached two other departments within the government. There is absolutely no question that there was a variety of jobs available to the particular man in question.

Two options, we had narrowed it down, were eventually going to be made available, very responsible jobs with somewhat less responsibility than he would have had in the position that he was in. Both positions were being finalized and ready for preparation to present to him where he would have an option, and it was during this period of time that he came back and said that he would choose to take an early retirement, which he will be taking.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, just on that point, and it's one issue that I never fully understood, as to what type of arrangements were made for the individual in terms of his retirement. As I understand it, he was short some years in terms of the specific requirements for a retirement pension, therefore some special arrangement or consideration would have to be made. I'm not sure if it's even administratively possible to do that. I would like to know if it is administratively possible, and if so, what type of arrangement was made that would be satisfactory to the gentleman.

Can the Minister assure the members of this House, myself in particular, that satisfactory arrangements have been made with respect to this individual regarding his retirement benefits?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, it was the gentleman in question's choice to take an early retirement and he will qualify for early retirement this particular month of 1978.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his answers on this. I would hope that the comments he made and I made would be a matter of record and that this individual would be cleared of any sort of implication that may have been left as a result of the kind of press reports that came out at the time of his resignation from the department. It seems to me the implication was left in those press reports that he was being removed from office rather than him discussing the issue with the Minister as the Minister has outlined, and coming to a voluntary consideration regarding his retirement. I thank the Minister for clearing up that issue and I hope that that would become a matter of public record so that the air would be cleared with respect to the individual's qualifications and his future employment possibilities.

To get back to the discussion we had with respect to New Careers, I think a similar type of activity compared to the New Careers was being carried out by the department, and in fact the department received some distinction, I believe, from the people who were responsible for the program, the Affirmative Action program. I remember receiving a letter while I was Minister complimenting the department on its exemplary efforts in putting into practice the Affirmative Action program as outlined by the administration of the day, in which it was a stated policy of the government that every effort would be made through an Affirmative Action program to make opportunities available for employment within the Civil Service for people of disadvantaged status within society. And as I say, the department, when I was Minister, received some distinction in that regard and was progressing very well in that area of recruiting and putting people in place in responsible public service positions that were having difficulty, for one reason or another, in obtaining employment.

It seems to me from press reports I've heard again, that this government is not giving the same

**Monday, June 19' 1978**

emphasis to that Affirmative Action program, and it appears — I believe I read in the Task Force report even, that this government is not really concerned with that Affirmative Action type of approach to employment within the Civil Service, and I'd like to know what the Minister's impression is of this type of program, and what he will be doing during his first year as Minister in bringing about the implementation of an Affirmative Action program within his department to give disadvantaged persons the opportunity to have responsible jobs within the public service.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should know the Task Force report better than I do but I don't know where it says in there that the advice to the government is that they should disregard the Affirmative Action program or that we should disregard the obligation that I believe that governments have, and I suppose I could extend that to industries have, to help the unfortunate. Our department is and will be prepared, as I have said previously, to assist people where at all possible within our departments, to get into the departments and provide them with training so they can advance themselves, and I guess the only gauge of that that we can all look at in all sincerity is the gauge of time, when a year from now you may or may not be able to chastize us for doing nothing, or you may be pleased that we have, in our own way, fulfilled what we feel to be an obligation to society.

**MR. BOSTROM:** The question I would have with respect to the Personnel Services, I believe the Minister said earlier in his statements that the Director of Personnel had been transferred out and is now a director of the southern region in Manitoba under this same department. Could the Minister explain if this is one of the positions that was removed from this section, or has the incumbent merely moved out of that position and he intends to fill the position' or has filled it with another person?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, the Director of Personnel vacancy appears and I believe the person that was No. 2 in Renewable Resource is now the Director of Personnel, who reports to the chief administrator.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I found an answer to my own question, I just inform the Minister so he can report back on that section. The section 6(f) Grants does not cover the unconditional grant, so the Minister will want to ignore that section and find the answer to the unconditional grants under the present section that we are on right now and that we should pass shortly, but he'll report back later after we've passed this item and answer those questions on the unconditional grants situation. I just wanted to point out to the Minister and to his staff that the administration support division has been in fact reducing over the last three years, so that the Minister's efficiency is in fact quite consistent with the pattern that has existed over the last three years, 1975-76 there were 42 staff man years, 1976-77 40 staff man years, 1977-78 37 staff man years. The Minister has reduced three positions I believe out of Northern Affairs, therefore it's quite consistent with the reduction that has been taking place with an effective administrative section and an effective and competent director or head of administration under the old Department of Northern Affairs.

There's one question that I asked before and wasn't dealt with so I want to get double checked and make sure that I get that information. Part of this section dealt with the internal training and especially the training of field workers and native people and I don't see in my notes here any positions that relate to training, and there was one previously, and I wonder if the Minister could just confirm whether there is still that internal training taking place.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** There is money available for training purposes and part of the personnel professional officers duties are to do training.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to explain in a little bit more detail the other expenditures, what are they and what are the reductions and how those reductions work.

**MR. MacMASTER:** gother expenses in 1978 were \$473,700, this year it's \$391,040 and the reduction is in travel \$25,300, office expenses \$4,800, staff training \$38,300, professional fees \$3,900 and computer costs \$10,000.00. I think you'll find that adds up to \$82,300 which is the reduction from



the previous year.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate in terms of the travel section, who's not going to travel, or if they're going to travel differently than they did in the past and I think that the reduction . . . It's a good thing I asked the last question in terms of staff training because basically there is less of a need for staff training now since many of the field workers who were in training have been fired by the Minister, many of the native people in the Extension and Manpower core section of the department have been fired by the Minister and, therefore, that does reduce somewhat the training requirement within the department. I wonder if there's any dollars left at all for staff training or whether this \$38,000 represents the total elimination of internal training within the department? .

**MR. MacMASTER:** First question in relationship to travel, it's just very simply we've put a restriction and a restraint program in effect in relationship to the travelling; and your training, a lot of that \$38,000 is the Quetico Training Programs that the previous administration had out-of-province which we feel we can adequately train our people within province, and there is \$40,000 left for staff training.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the travel item was debated for a number of years and I'm sure that there was pressure upon the Minister to reduce that particular appropriation in one way or another. I wonder if there's any indication of breakdown between the two old departments of how much travel restriction has been put in place' is there any way to break that down in relation to the two previous departments that existed, or is that too difficult?

**MR. MacMASTER:** In relationship to the travel section, Mr. Chairman, the member talks about pressures one way or another to reduce it, part of it came from within myself when I really felt that a lot of the travel was unnecessary. The breakdown of the two departments on the administration end; if we had to break those two down and out, it would be extremely difficult, but if the member is insistent on it, we will endeavour to produce that document, I suppose in the near future, I just don't know how long it would take us to produce that kind of a breakout.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I don't require that, I don't think it's necessary, it's going to be enough for the Minister to have ready by tomorrow the organizational chart and I won't put pressure on him to bring forward this matter at this time, but I think that the reduction in travel reflects not inefficiency but basically a program cutting, a program reduction, and the remote communities are going to be quite severely affected by that, because the firings that the Minister undertook, a lot of the people fired were community-based people, so they are not ones that had to travel on a regular basis. But then you would think that there would be an increased pressure for the other staff to travel because a number of the community based people were in fact let go under the previous program. There were travel restrictions put on and there was some considerable reduction in travel previous to the new administration, but there is a limit to the effectiveness of reducing that budget. You have people on staff who are fairly highly paid who have an expertise that the community needs and the only way things are going to work is if that person goes to the community and shares his expertise with them, but my comments earlier about the elimination of funds for economic development and employment creation I think relate very directly to this section because there are a number of people who had the expertise who had been doing the work, and some new people that had other expertise that were brought into the department in the area of economic development and employment creation, both within the Northern Affairs Department and in the Resources Department, but since the program funds have been cut for those people and many of these people as I mentioned earlier are sitting on their hands because they are being paid a salary but there are no program funds so they have no program to deliver, so they are sitting around talking to each other in their offices, or sitting on their hands or whatever you do when you don't have a job to do any more. I assume some of the travel savings come from those people who instead of flying out to the remote communities assisting them with economic development programs, assisting them to develop their job creation programs, these professional people are now sitting on their hands in some offices in Thompson, or some offices in The Pas, or some offices in Winnipeg and so there's no need for them to travel any more. But I'm not sure that this is an effective or an efficient way to spend taxpayers money to have these people on staff and give them no direction and have no specific function for them to deliver any longer.

So, I assume that's where the Minister is able to get his travel funding from. The other way, Mr. Chairman, that there might be some overall savings in the Travel Budget is in terms of time of staff. If the staff can fly to Community "A" and it will take an hour and a half or an hour, or they can go by boat and take three days, then there is a savings in travel costs, but they are still

**Monday, June 19' 1978**

being paid for the time that they are sitting on the boat, so the savings are lost in another respect. So there is some reduction in travel but it is either program reduction or inefficiencies that will show up somewhere else within this appropriation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** . . . (b)—pass — Committee rise, call in the Speaker.

*The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.*

**IN SESSION**

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

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday.