



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 14A

2:30 P.M. Tuesday, March 6, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 6, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House the report of the Manitoba Department of Public Works for the year 1977-78, and the Annual Report of the Land Value Appraisal Commission for the same period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the period ending December 31st, 1978, and the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year ending March 31st, 1978. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that copies of the University Grants Commission Report were mailed to all honourable members last August.

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

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, this is the occasion when we have to pay sad remembrance to one of our colleagues who has died since the House last met. I refer, of course, to the late Member for Carillon, Leonard A. Barkman, who passed away in the intervening period between sessions.

I was one of those fortunate enough to sit in the House with Mr. Barkman while he was a member of the Legislature for his constituency. He served as well, at the same time, and for a long period of time, as the Mayor of Steinbach, and had previously served on the council of that community for a number of years prior to becoming Mayor. He was a man who knew really no limits to the amount of service that he was prepared to give and devote as an individual to his community and to the people with whom he worked all of his lifetime. He demonstrated, as one of the editorialists wrote at the time of his death, the fact that a man could operate a successful business and, at the same time, be fully occupied, as indeed he was, with a variety of different community and regional interests where he gave unstintingly of his time and of his energy and of his dedication to his country.

Mr. Barkman, members will recall who were here with him at the time, was a man whom I would say was best remembered for his quiet deportment. I know not of anyone who found at any time that Leonard was the kind of a man who was scrappy, or one who wanted to get into some of the more spunky debates of the Legislature, but rather in his quiet way he spoke out on behalf of his constituency. He was not what you would call a strong Party person in that sense, he was a Liberal Member of the Legislature for all of the years that he served here, but I think he would be better remembered and perhaps would prefer to be remembered by the fact that he served all of his constituents, regardless of what their particular political background was.

He thoroughly enjoyed his work, as one of the editorialists have pointed out. He loved people, he loved working with people, and although he was taken from us at a relatively early age, he left a very large mark on his community.

He is survived by his wife, Agnes, by three daughters and two sons-in-law, and I'm sure that all Members of the House would wish to join at this time in paying tribute to one of our number, who is no longer with us; one who has left his mark on the political and public life of this province; and one who will be fondly remembered, not only by his constituents, but by many in this Legislature who were privileged to sit with him.

I therefore move, Sir, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, that this House convey to the family of the late Leonard A. Barkman, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this Resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with a deep sense of sorrow and regret that I second the condolence motion that has been presented to the House here today. Mr. Barkman, and I call him Mr. Barkman because that's what he was known to me as, through the many years that I knew him, growing up in the town of Steinbach. He was known by almost everybody in south-eastern Manitoba. He was a very successful businessman in the town of Steinbach and surrounding area, he was an outstanding politician, he was a farmer at heart, and he was a terrific auctioneer.

He was elected to Steinbach town council in 1952 and served there as a councilman until 1958, and I am informed by the political observers of that day, following the local town politics, that he played a relatively important role at that time smoothing the waters between some of the council members who had a tendency to get tangled up in some pretty heated discussions, and at that time already he was known for his talents of being able to smooth waters and making things run a little more smoothly.

In 1958 to 1970 he was the Mayor of the town of Steinbach — the town of Steinbach's second Mayor — and in 1970 he did not let his name stand for re-election. He served as both the MLA for Carillon and the Mayor for Steinbach for some eight years between the years of 1962 and 1970. He was the first man of Mennonite descent to represent a constituency in the south-eastern part of the province, and he ran in the new constituency of La Verendrye when it was formed in 1969.

His community spirit is evidenced by many things that he did. He was one of the founding members of the very active Kinsmen Club in the south-east, the Steinbach Kinsmen Club. He was made a life honorary member for his contributions and services to that club. While mayor of the town of Steinbach, he saw many of the changes and helped create many of the changes that that small community at that time was going through.

One of the major things that happened in the early part of his political career was his strong support for the sewer and water projects in Steinbach. The members who are familiar with the problems that the small communities were going through at that time, it was a fairly heated debate at that time as far as the referendum was concerned, but he took a very active role in promoting it, and saw it passed and come into fruition. He had a lot of foresight in dealing with public works in the particular town, and we have seen many of the benefits of that in the town, to the point where it's one of the neatest, and I would say, I guess, prettiest towns in Manitoba.

His close association with agriculture also helped him represent his constituency in the Legislature and in his time he saw the farming areas in this rural area of south-eastern Manitoba expand at a very rapid rate.

His other capabilities, such as auctioneering, is one that I think people in the south-east would readily agree with me that he was one of the best auctioneers we've seen in south-eastern Manitoba. I remember serving on a committee with several automobile dealers out in Steinbach of which he was one, and planning a giant car auction one year. This is quite a number of years ago, and we decided to hire an outside auctioneer, some hot-shot from down east, and we held the auction sale and after that we realized that we had somebody that could do a much better job locally, and from that time on, he would handle the auction sales, because, Mr. Speaker, he knew the people, he knew almost all the people in the constituency or in ! southeastern Manitoba by name and recognized them by face and could relate to them very well.

The only thing I'm told by people who were campaigning with him, and that were close to him, the only thing that bothered him during election campaigns and on numerous visits when he went to the farms were the problems that the farm dogs would not particularly like his presence, but those are the only problems that he had when he was going from constituency to constituency,

and farm to farm, and I think many of us as politicians have had certain similar experiences through our political career.

I would also like to say that the gentleman in question was one who did not like red tape. I know from another personal experience of mine that building a fourplex with a friend of mine, just before I got married; we ran into some zoning problems in the town. We went to see Mr. Barkman, and within a matter of day, he had it all squared away to everybody's satisfaction, and I think it was sort of an example of the type of person that he was. He was available for people to go and see him and he would do his utmost to try and straighten matters out to an amiable solution for everyone. The families, I believe, Mr. Speaker, of the people who serve the public life, know the many real problems and pressures that face elected officials, and I would today ask all citizens to remember the dedication, service and sacrifice that Leonard Barkman made for his community and province. To his wife Agnes, his sons and daughters, we extend our deepest sympathy to their great loss.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to associate with the motion of condolences. During my years as Municipal Reeve with the RM of Hanover, I had many occasions to work with him, and get endless advice as to my responsibilities. I had a lot of respect for him and deeply feel the loss of his passing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our group wishes to associate itself with the expressions of regret that have already been voiced. I think it is a fine tradition in this House to recognize the passing of a former member of the House, as a tribute to the fact that we all know that there is sacrifice involved in being a representative of a constituency, and that there is a sincerity involved which is quickly recognized when one finds his place here. So that the tradition as such, is one which is very much worthwhile.

I have had occasion to sit in this House during this motion and the wording is always the same, and to hear many of the speakers, and there aren't that many that do speak on this occasion, but a large number of them would say, "I did not have the privilege of knowing this particular person." And one would, in looking at the obituary, realize that he had given of himself and service to the Province of Manitoba, and lived a long and fruitful life after that, and died at an age where it is more or less expected that one would, out of old age, leave us. It is a sadder occasion when most of us are able to say that we knew the deceased and knew him well, because it is a recognition as in this case, that his death was premature, and that he was denied the opportunity to continue to serve in whatever role he wished to serve for more years than he was able to do.

And that is the case for Len Barkman. I think very many of us knew him, worked with him, and were able to assess his contribution. I came into the Legislature with him; we were both freshmen together, and again there are a few of us that were in that group. I too, shared with him a background in municipal politics when we came in and one, I think, quickly recognizes a person who has some experience and knowledge at the municipal level, and then comes here and adjusts to a different type of forum. Len Barkman proved quickly that he knew very well the background, that he knew very well the municipal problems that people have in Manitoba especially in the smaller centres in Manitoba and that he knew how to cope with those problems at the level at which he worked.

Mention has been made of the family that he left and we certainly wish to express our sincere sympathy with them. But our role here is more to express the sympathy of the people of Manitoba and the appreciation of the people of Manitoba for the services he gave and for his dedication.

The Leader of the Opposition had expected to be here today and to participate and associate himself with this motion and he had a note which is passed on to me to the effect that as Minister of Municipal Affairs for some time and having had occasion to sit in the House with Len Barkman who was the Liberal critic on municipal affairs, that he found him an extremely capable critic who demonstrated a profound and intense interest in municipal affairs. And that is of course, true.

Mr. Speaker, beyond and above that specialized field, he showed a great interest and concern on behalf of people and a warmth in his association with people and a friendship which was quickly recognized. Again I had the opportunity to meet with him on occasions other than in the House itself and found him a very warm human being, a person who did care about others and who had good words to say for all. And therefore it is with a sense of personal loss of a friend, and more so on behalf of our group a sense of loss of a citizen who contributed substantially to the community

of Manitoba that we again express our regrets on his early passing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to associate myself and the Liberal Party with the motion of condolence that has been presented to the House, on behalf and to the family of Leonard Barkman.

While I didn't serve with Len Barkman because he left at the same time I came in, I did know him quite well because he had been very active as a member for the Liberal Party for many years both as a student and as a person involved in the party, we had many occasions to meet with him.

One always remembers certain qualities about people who you associate with in political life and there are always certain special characteristics that people bring to political activity. The ones I recall perhaps most vividly, the ones about Leonard Barkman, he had a very deep rooted sense of community. He was obviously very much part of the town and the municipality in which he lived. He understood it remarkably well, a certain sense of virtues of that town and that community, both in a religious sense and in a family sense are ones which he felt very strongly about and expressed on many occasions.

He also brought to political life really a belief in the wisdom of trying to find just good solutions at times. He was not a particularly partisan man. I don't think that he was what you would call a party fighter in the sense that he believed that the party was right over and above everything else. He was a man who believed that there was a way of coming together and making agreements and working together in the area of finding mutual accommodations. And that was a quality which I think is particularly important for any political party to have, is to have people in it who are able to bring some sense of balance and some sense of tolerance.

I have my own personal appreciation for him, because after I was elected, and he used to spend a great deal of time with us. We were a small caucus, as most of us would know, at the time, and he spent a great deal of time with us and helped me, certainly, in giving advice on the rules of the House and things that went on and people and ideas, it was certainly very much appreciated; so on behalf of the Liberals in this province, who owe a great debt of gratitude and appreciation to Len Barkman, I would warmly endorse and support this motion.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the First Minister to see if he can at this time allay the concerns expressed to me that the government is contemplating a further increase in entry fees to provincial recreational areas in this coming season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion made by the Honourable Member, to the best of my knowledge, is the first I've heard, but as the session progresses, undoubtedly that information will be available. I can't allay his fears or even confirm his suspicions at this stage.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, then, I assume that the First Minister has made it clear he can not assure us that the fees will not be increased, but he has no reason to believe that they / . Is will be that a fair resume of what he has just told us?

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In absence of the Minister of Finance, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm that his government has discontinued the Manitoba tax filing assistance program for pensioners in rural Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are seven weeks before the deadline for filing Income Tax, will the First Minister instruct his Minister of Finance to reconsider providing this much-needed service to rural pensioners?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, again, I'll have to take my honourable friend's suggestion as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. While he is taking those questions as notice, could he also take as notice whether the Department of Finance has estimated how much money the government can save by not providing the service to pensioners so that these pensioners can claim the tax credits that are rightfully theirs.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question is to the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Minister could give us a list broken down by division of the staff man years in his department, that is, the permanent, terms, contract, part-time and vacancies. I requested that last year but we got it only during the Estimates and I think we really scrutinized the department last year. I don't think there is any need to go that far and it would help if we can get the list but have it now and not during the Estimates. I wonder if the Minister can endeavour to get us that. That would be for 1978-79, the list that he gave us last year, up to date in 1978, and what he's asking for in 1979-80 and what is the actual staff right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Well, Mr. Speaker, do I understand my honourable friend correctly in that he is asking for this rather than dealing with it during the Estimates process?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, but I think the Minister must remember that last year I had asked I think two months before we got to the Estimates and it was promised repeatedly, but we finally received it the day we were discussing that. I would like to look at it and prepare for the Estimates. I would like to have it before we start the Estimates to be able to deal with it during the Estimates.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, that's fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can the First Minister indicate whether he has received a brief on behalf of the Manitoba Association of Architects which indicates that unless substantial changes are made in present provincial programs that 20 percent of the architects in this province will have been laid off or will have left the province, and that there will be absolutely no employment whatsoever for almost the entire graduating class of the University of Manitoba Architectural Faculty?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to check my correspondence to see if anything of that nature has come in.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, beyond checking his correspondence, will the First Minister undertake to meet with the representatives of the Manitoba Association of Architects to determine what the state of their profession is and whether in fact this will indicate a substantial loss and drop in one of the more creative professions and useful professions in this province in terms of generating work and activity in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development. Does the Minister intend to take any action concerning the imminent takeover of The

Bay by the Thompson interests which could result in the loss of The Bay's Winnipeg head office to Eastern Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he is not concerned about the possible loss of another head office from Manitoba in relation to jobs or the psychological effect.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister, since his views are contradictory, it's difficult to ascertain what he's doing.

A MEMBER: His next answer will be a maybe.

MR. DOERN: I ask him whether or not he concurs with the view that the takeover, in terms of such a giant merger, would neither be in the national interest or in the provincial interest, or does his belief in the free enterprise system override such concerns.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it would be time for a maybe. Mr. Speaker, when the member starts to speak of the national interests, etc., I don't think that the Province of Manitoba, the government of Manitoba, is going to become involved in whether there's a company wanting to buy the shares of another company or not. There is no indication that the head office would leave Manitoba for that matter of fact, we don't know that. As a matter of fact, the Hudson Bay office came to Manitoba and there's no indication that it will leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a fourth question.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he is aware of the fact that in the last several years there has been a steady erosion of staff losses . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable member's question is out of order. Would he care to rephrase it?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister then whether he is concerned about the fact that at present there are some 200 employees in the head office . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the whole purpose of the Question Period is to elicit information, not to give it.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. I'm asking the Minister whether he intends to do anything because of the fact that there has been a steady erosion of staff from the Winnipeg head office to the Toronto office and that if this merger goes through, it could result in an acceleration of that erosion or in the removal of the remaining head offices of that company.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that dealing in probability makes a question out of order.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: My question is to the Honourable Attorney-General. In the light of a complaint made last year to the Human Rights Commission by a constituent of mine from Transcona, could the Minister tell us what the position of the Manitoba Government is regarding employers forcing employees, or prospective employees, to undergo lie detector tests?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that matter is in the process of being reviewed and a decision should be made very shortly on it.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the press report of March 3, 1979, quotes a Human Rights Commission spokesman as saying that the Human Rights Commission will not look into this matter because it is not a matter of discrimination, would the Minister indicate whether another branch of his department is looking into this matter and whether in fact we can expect legislation to be introduced during this session to deal with this abuse of human rights?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, myself as well as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, have been reviewing this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister if he would also look into what is being done with respect to the information that has already been gathered through lie detector tests. Who has it, how is it being stored, or is it being released to credit rating agencies, or what? I would like the Minister to look into that matter as well when he's looking into the larger matter of lie detector tests.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question in relation to the Education in Manitoba Annual Report of the Minister of Education published by authority of Legislative Assembly, to which I have no recollection of ever having given authority. My question is, there appears a photograph bearing a very strong resemblance to a Minister of the Crown but the caption beneath the photograph reads as the Honourable F.L. Jobin, Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor is not entitled to sit in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. In the light of the statement by his Deputy Minister on January 10th, 1979, in the Tribune, and I quote: "Approximately 1,770 senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba no longer receive free drugs." Can the Honourable Minister advise the House if he or his department will review these cases?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, those cases have all been reviewed. Those are a number of cases that were in that package of holders of social allowances health services cards, and they were reviewed, and they are continually reviewed.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform the House if he or his department will issue a new card to the senior citizens who are in great need?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the matter of need is determined on the same basis as was identified at the time that the cards were reviewed. I would also point out that Pharmacare is available to all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he tell us, Mr. Speaker, with regard to three reports tabled yesterday, namely the Brandon University Report, the University of Manitoba Report, the Brandon University Pension Fund; all of which were audited by the Provincial Auditor, W.K. Ziprick, whether he feels that there is any deficiency or lack of accountability with regard to these three reports?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to look at the reports in question. I am sure that if they were audited by the Provincial Auditor, they were done with his customary care, and I am sure that future reports done by the Provincial Auditor, under the supervision of the Provincial Auditor, with the assistance of outside audit firms, will be done equally with good care and so on, as is the traditional practice in most other provinces of Canada, a practice which was

abandoned by my honourable friends opposite for reasons that I yet don't know.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I repeat to the First Minister, who said that he hasn't had an opportunity of examining the reports; is he intending to reserve his opinion as to the accountability as expressed in these reports pending his examination?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is obviously being facetious. The answer to his question is no.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't being facetious, and if the answer is no, then I wonder why the First Minister threw that in in answer to the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a different question to the Honourable, the Attorney-General. Mr. Speaker, with regard to ads placed at my expense and at the expense of every member of this Assembly, and the expense of all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba, by the federal government, with regard to its nauseous Child Credit Program, based on a needs test; has the Attorney-General examined these television ads from the point of view of determining whether they offend against the law of obscenity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't yet considered it, but as much as the Member for Inkster has raised it, perhaps it should be given some serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, some time ago, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland asked questions relating to the architectural and engineering consultants for Norway House School. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Government Services has forwarded to the Department of Education with a recommendation of Treasury Board, the appointment of GBR Associates as architects, engineers, and mechanical consultants, for the proposed new school in Norway House, with the firm of Penner, Lach, Keeler and Partners to be responsible for structural design, and L.P. Williams and Associates to be responsible for electrical designs.

Mr. Speaker, the department has forwarded as well, with the recommendation of Treasury Board, the appointment of Pratt, Lindgren, Snider, Tomcej, as architectural consultants for the renovation of the existing school at Norway House, and for the supervision of the external water and sewer services in conjunction with both the renovations and the new schools, to be handled by W.L. Wardrop and Associates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister. I appreciate his information, but could the Minister explain why the community recommendation for the appointment of architects was ignored, and this name of GBR Associates was substituted for the group that was selected by the community and recommended by the Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is aware that the community interviewed six of seventeen architectural firms that had applied to them in connection with this project. In turn, the Department of Government Services examined the work that had been completed in the last period of time by the architectural firms, and made recommendations to the Minister of four firms, none of whom were included in the list of the firms recommended by the community.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that of the first three firms recommended by the community, that the firms had received in aggregate approximately \$1.4 million by way of architectural engineering fees for work that is not yet under construction.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister. Can the Minister explain what the connection is between this particular firm, GBR Associates and the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he read Beauchesne with respect to the Question Period. Questions should not be ironical, satirical, or contain innuendo. Would the Honourable Member for Rupertsland care to rephrase his question?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education explain to the House why he has not honoured his commitment to the Community of Norway House, that the locally elected officials would have a say in the appointment of an architect for the new school in Norway House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered this yesterday, but my understanding of the situation was that the school committee of Norway House had been approached by several architects, as soon as there was some mention that a school was going to be built in that area. The official trustee asked if it would be possible for these groups to meet with architects, and he carried forward with that particular action. They did meet with a number of architectural groups, but at no time was there any doubt as to who would make the decision as to what architects would be appointed for this particular school construction. It was the Department of Public Works at that time; now the Department of Government Services.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services. Can the Minister explain why the particular firm was chosen over those that were recommended by the Community of Norway House? Was there a question of professional competence involved, or was some other criteria used in the selection of this firm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered the question, but there is no question of professional competence. It was simply an attempt to try and deal fairly with the architectural firms, recognizing the work, Mr. Speaker, that had already been completed, and paid out by the government, and recognizing the capacity that was required to complete the job. As it happens, Mr. Speaker, there were four firms recommended by the internal document within the Department of Government Services; two of the firms that are now proposed to work on the job made up two of those recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the government now is in the process of completing the second round of negotiations with the Civil Service, and also a second round of negotiations in respect to the fees for the doctors, can he inform the House when he will take pity on the people on minimum wage and allow them to have an increase too.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it's being reviewed. I was faced with a little more difficulty than the previous administration was where they had solid recommendations and refused to act upon them.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was a raise imminent for 1978 of January, does not the Minister think it's time that he really got off his butt and did something now?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the same member was sitting on his butt over here when unanimous recommendations came through for a recommendation for an increase — unanimous, Mr. Speaker, and him and his particular government at that time chose not to act on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Government Services took as Notice a question from the Member for St. Johns, as to whether or not the decision of The Liquor Commission Board to put South African products on the shelves of the Liquor Commission was done with the concurrence of a Member of the Treasury Bench. It was not done with the concurrence of a Member of the Treasury Bench, but it was done with my concurrence, Mr. Speaker. In fact the previous policy of The Liquor Control Commission and the Minister responsible at that time has been referred to by some as a hypocritical position. It was the only province in Canada that maintained the product

in the back rooms and did provide it on request to the public. The decision has been made now to place it back on the shelves with Russian vodka, Cuban rum, Chilean wines and the customer will make the decision as to whether or not he wants to purchase it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the Norway House School, again it's not clear what the Minister of Education is saying, and I want to ask him this, "Did he give verbal permission or written permission to representatives of that School Division to make a recommendation to him concerning the appointment of architects and/or engineers?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: I would have to check back on that matter, Mr. Speaker. My understanding at this point was that they had been approached by architects, and their request was if they could discuss with architects who were interested in this particular school, some of the concerns that they had, some of the requirements that they wished to see inculcated in any plans for the school.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask a supplementary to the Minister of Government Services, and ask him whether it is not the case that the six firms interviewed and selected by the School Division, many of them had done previous work for the division which was satisfactory to the division and that was one of the reasons that they were included on the list.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I tried to indicate to the Honourable Members Opposite that the attempt has been made to try and deal fairly with the architectural firms, recognizing the work that has been completed by some and the work load that will be forthcoming in the next period of time. We have already had some questions asked by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and it wasn't based on the work load that was completed in the past or their capacity, it was based on the recognition that of the first four firms, there was almost — I only mentioned three earlier, but of the first four firms — there was almost \$2 million worth of architectural fees and engineering fees that were paid out for three projects that were not being constructed at this time, and for one project that was being completed. And the attempt was to try and find firms that had not received similar work and to provide the opportunity for them, provided they had the capacity to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister whether it is not standard practice to pay fees for work done, and that the import of his statement simply amounts to the fact that his government has frozen all construction, therefore fees must be paid even though the construction doesn't take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the architect that was selected by the committee as number one had already received some \$350,000 for a project that I do not believe the former government ever intended to build.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill. Order please, order please. Now that everybody has asked their questions all at the same time, I recognize the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister inform the House as to the status of the Construction Industry Review Committee that has been initiated by his Department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: They're working, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of clarification and to clear the air on this issue, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Norway House School, is it correct or is it not correct that a principal of the firm of GBR Associates was election day organizer for the Progressive Conservative Party in the Honourable Member's constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the nine firms that were before the Minister of Government Services for his consideration, of the nine firms there has been an association in one way or the other and a relationship with seven.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Services —(Interjection)— soon, soon, I'll write you a note.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Thank you. Now, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Health and Community Services a question. Last week, in raising the matter with him about the substantial reduction in the work activity projects in the province, he was quoted as saying that the reason for the reduction in expenditure was because the projects weren't working and they only had a 20 percent success rate. Could he reconcile that statement that he made outside the House about the 20 percent success rate with the official report of the Department of Health and Community Services which says that of the 520 placements last year in the work activity programs, 224 were placed in employment or in training programs at community colleges, which is close to a 50 percent success rate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I referred to a 20 percent success rate. I think I said 28 percent. The percentage performance on the total going through the work activity projects in any given year, in terms of those who wind up gainfully employed, or pursuing further training, employment training, has worked out to 28 percent. Now, there may be some specific differences or aberrations in that statistic relative to the persons, the group that the honourable member is referring to and Red River Community College, but overall, the performance did not justify the per person expenditure on the employment programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we will probably have opportunity to debate that issue later on, but I am more concerned about the issuance of incorrect information on the part of the minister, and the fact that it doesn't correspond to the statements made in his own departmental report concerning this information. I'd also like to ask him why it is that in the Estimates Book, where they relate to the financial expenditures, in his departmental report, they indicate a financial revenue \$270,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that his question may more properly fall under the Estimates of the minister and better be discussed then.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I am not raising a question of substance, I'm raising a question of misinformation. I would like to know why it is that the departmental report indicates revenues of \$270,000, which was not reported anywhere in the Estimates Book.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that it's not recorded anywhere in the Estimates Book. That may well be recorded under funds recoverable from Canada either in the departmental estimates specifically, or in the general estimates and recoveries from Canada as they relate to the Consolidated Fund and the Minister of Finance, but in terms of discrepancies, or the mathematical

discrepancies, that the honourable member refers to, I'll take them as notice, and check the Annual Report against the statistics on which we made the decision to re-evaluate and scale down the programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: As a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, considering that the work activity programs are funded on a 50-50 percentage basis with the federal government, was there any discussion with federal authorities, and did they agree to this particular reduction, or was it unilateral initiative on the part of the provincial authorities in his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker, and it's correct that those projects are cost-shared with the federal government, but the budget organization process is such that that expenditure, of course, in total is ascribed to the Department of Health and Community Services, and so, any reductions that we made are reductions that appear in terms of the Health and Community Services budget, rather than the overall provincial budget, but I don't think that there are any specific conversations with federal authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, my question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Health and Social Services. Could the minister advise what guidelines have been established by his department to ensure community safety when juvenile offenders are prematurely released from detention at the Agassiz Juvenile Centre, because of the overcrowding cited in his department's annual report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Correctional Services.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member well knows, releases of that kind are accommodated under the Juvenile Probation Service, and probation officers are in charge of those individuals who are released in those circumstances. I am not sure that I agree with the honourable member's suggestion that there is overcrowding at the present time in either of those juvenile institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour, and ask the minister if he can confirm that the Brandon office of the Workers' Compensation Board has been closed, making it more difficult for applicants in that area of south-western Manitoba, and can he give the reason for the closure of the office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: The only assurance I can give the Member for Brandon East, is that it hasn't been closed on my direction, but I'll check it out, and find out when it was closed, why it was closed, how long it was closed, and what the story on it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, a supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. In looking into it, would he also ascertain whether it's possible to reopen that office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: First things first, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to determine why, in fact, it was ever closed in the first place, if in fact it is closed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services, and ask him whether he can confirm that the firm of Green, Blankstein, Russel received several

hundred thousand dollars worth of work in terms of architectural fees from our administration, and were in the top three or four firms in that period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm really not in a position to confirm that. I'm aware of the fact that they did work in the last eight years, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: And I would ask the minister whether or not the fact that his government himself has had a longstanding association with firm of GBR dating back to the days of the Honourable Maitland Steinkopf, and when the member was the campaign manager for that minister, and I would ask him whether that was not a factor in the selection of another architectural firm overruling the recommendation of local representatives, whether that was a factor in that decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, let the record show that while the community was given the opportunity to review the architects, the decision was that of the Treasury Branch, and of the government of the day. That was very clear and, Mr. Speaker, the decision was based on the factors that I've indicated to this House already. The honourable member can try and impute motives, and that is his opportunity, that is his will, but, Mr. Speaker, I would not impute motives, nor would I suggest that the architects suggested by No. 1, by the community, were in fact selected in the past for \$500,000 worth of work, simply because they were one of the main fund raisers for the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for Honourable Member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Honourable Minister of Health and Community Services. I would ask the minister whether he could confirm that in the report of his department issued yesterday, I believe, under his name and signature, at page 102 thereof, there is in fact a finding that there is an over-population problem at the Agassiz Centre for Youth and did he not suggest that these over-population problems, and I'm quoting from the report tabled, Mr. Speaker, ". . . were overcome during the past year by shortening the average length of stay for juveniles based on criteria developed to ensure the safety of the community."

I asked that, because he suggested that he wasn't sure that was the case, and I draw his attention to his own report in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that, I do confirm that as something that existed in the past and it was met by a particular procedure that is outlined in the report. My reference was to the implication or the inference I drew from the honourable member's question that there was overcrowding at Agassiz and/or Seven Oaks right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for Question Period having expired, we'll proceed with the Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Mines' Natural Resources and Environment and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order, please. Dealing with the Highways and Transportation Estimates, Resolution No. 17, Planning and Design — \$1,273,800.00. (3)(a) Salaries — \$997,300.00 — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the Minister, yesterday he undertook to provide us with the breakdown of the employees, staff man years, as opposed to last year and this year. I would like to know if that information is available to us now.

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be as well to begin this afternoon by keeping several commitments that I made to members of the committee last night. I have, to begin with, the question was asked, some interest was shown by the members of the committee as to a map of the original Highway Strengthening Program and the weights that are permitted thereon. I have nine such maps available which indicate in the legend the gross vehicular weight permitted on these stretches of highway. They also indicate, the ones that are outlined in the yellow, are the ones that were part of the original designated routes that were listed under the agreement that we signed with Ottawa back in 1973 for the Highway Strengthening Program. I'll ask the Clerk to distribute these maps, perhaps several to the Opposition and several to our members and they may be of interest to the members of the committee.

The question just asked by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose having to do with the staffing, I thank Mr. Dyck, Administration Officer, who obviously worked late last night, or this morning, to provide that information as well. I would ask the Clerk to distribute these figures as well.

In addition, I was also asked earlier on in the evening, for an organizational chart of the department, particularly with interest about the new additions to the department. I would ask my assistant to distribute the organizational charts.

I was asked as well by the committee last night to indicate to you the kind of Supplementary Supply or Special Warrants that were raised by the department in the course of the last year. That information is also available to you. There was a Supplementary Supply required for an amount of \$2,696,300.00. Now, that was brought about, as I indicated yesterday, because of the inability to transfer out of certain appropriations over-expenditures, and had to be covered by Supplementary Supply. However, I hasten to point out that there was, in other sections of the department's Estimates, a surplus, an unspent amount of money of \$3,025,300.00. So, in effect, the departmental spending for the year was within, and somewhat below, the overall approved figure. The actual amount we anticipate, and I think when we understand that we use the word anticipate because we are just closing off the books as of this month, but our anticipated surplus or under-expenditure, if you like, for the total year, will be some \$329,000.00. So, the question raised yesterday was, did we have any Supplementary Supply or Special Warrant; yes, we had a \$2,600,000 Supplementary Supply, but that internally is offset with a \$3 million, roughly, surplus amounting in netting it out, a surplus position of the department of some \$329,000.00.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that that pretty well covers the commitments that I made to the committee in terms of additional information that I would supply, with the possible exception of the commitment that I made to the Honourable Member for St. Johns about an Order for Return. I have every reason to believe that I will be able to keep that commitment in the time frame that I mentioned. The department has the information prepared, it has been prepared for some time. It just hasn't been processed in conjunction with all other departments. It was to be returned in that way to the House. Thank you.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for providing us with the information that we requested yesterday and I also commend the department for being able to come up with the actual number of employees on the payroll as of January, 1978, and as of January, 1979. This was probably a tremendous effort on the part of the department. I'm just wondering why we haven't been able to get those figures for the Orders for Return that we filed last year. They're very similar except that the date was in October instead of January.

These figures, if I may question the figures that are before us now, that is people who are also laid off, the numbers that are laid off in the fall after the programs are finished, would that be the difference between 2,753 and 18? Is there layoffs in the fall there that makes that difference?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Ste. Rose, would it be advisable to maybe continue the discussion under the Minister's Salary at a later date, in view of the information you have there, and proceed with the (3) Planning and Design area now?

MR. ADAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, we would have discussed this under Administration if we had had this information before us. It wasn't available to us and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if I may to the Member for Ste. Rose, I think then actually what we have passed in a sense is meaningless. I'm wondering if we could maybe continue in this area and that gives all the opportunity to review the matter under the Minister's Salary. I'm at the desire of the committee.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order here, I think that your comments are well taken. I believe that we were discussing all these matters yesterday under Administration. The Minister undertook to give all this information now to the honourable gentlemen opposite and I think that in order to facilitate carrying on with the Estimates, I think that the Member for Ste. Rose, if he wishes to come back on those figures, having received them, can do so on the Minister's salary. I think this is only in fairness to the members. I think that they've been given reasonable time to discuss what they did yesterday and that we should carry on and resume what we are doing. Because the Minister did indicate he would provide that information and they could certainly question him on his salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the committee as such, it's not that I'm trying to avoid the discussion or questions on this matter. I think it's just a matter of possibly keeping an order and the opportunity is still there to continue with the discussion on these items. Because we have a series of information that was submitted to the committee here and if we go through all that again, I'm wondering if we could possibly, with the agreements of the members here, that we could continue with this under the Minister's Salary.

The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering, in light of the information that was provided, I believe it's probably been raised that the Member for Ste. Rose asked for actual positions filled and people within positions. I'm wondering whether, you know, when we go onto the Minister's Salary, the staff will not be available in terms of answering specific questions dealing with matters raised. It will be on the wide-ranging debate on the performance of the Minister within the department. It could be handled point by point, but then we're going through an item by item description of the staff in every provision, in every division of the Estimates, that we could go through each and every one, but that will probably take up a lot more time of debate and questioning than possibly doing it in one fell swoop and dealing with the whole matter all at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to provide, as well as I can remember, the information requested last night by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and I have no objection to having a general discussion about the staffing matter at this time. I would ask members to refer to the second page of the staffing, the two pages that I distributed. We have, in the 1978-79 Estimates, approved positions of 2,753. Currently 612 positions are vacant, February of 1979. That's not an unnatural phenomena in the department. We don't do a great deal of construction at this time of year so you'll note for instance in our Construction Division, we have a fairly high vacancy rate at this time. Within the Transportation Services, that is that division transferred to us from Northern Affairs: approved staff man years is 242, with 25 vacancies. That's the information that I believed I was requested to furnish; that's the information that we have before you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if we haven't disposed of the point of order yet, may I just point out that these figures were requested when we were under Administration. Had they been available to us at that time, they would have been dealt with by the members here. However, we did move on and take care of other matters. It would have been quite simple for the members to remain on that item until such time as we had these, but it was in an attempt to be reasonable that we moved along. I would like to suggest the committee now be reasonable and allow this matter

to be discussed and dealt with. I'm sure we won't come back and duplicate the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my intention, to the members, that we won't allow discussion on the items based on the information that was received today. Other than that, individually the items, I don't think we want to get into, but based on the information that you received, the Minister has indicated he's prepared to have discussion on that. Proceed. (Agreed)

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, well, I thank the Minister for acquiescing to our request to discuss this. There are members on our side who were not here yesterday and I'm sure would like to make some comments on the records. I believe this clarifies much better than what we had yesterday. There are some things that I would like to point out while we are discussing these particular figures.

Running through the debates last year on the staffing, the number of staff on the payroll, the staff man years, we were using a little different . . . This year we asked for actual numbers instead of staff man years. We did have some breakdowns. I notice that the Minister indicated last year that yes, there was an increase, request for ten additional staff man years that brought it up to 2,753. He gave us a breakdown of the 2,753 staff man years.

For 1977, he gave us a breakdown of 864 permanent positions, 81 vacancies, 49 term positions, and 1 contract, and 1,829 maintenance positions. At that time, the Minister indicated that it was 2,742. I think it was 2,743 in last year's Hansard. But this comes to 2,824 rather than . . . the breakdown that he gave us, what I'm trying to say is the breakdown that he gave us came up to 2,824 rather than 2,743. There's a difference of 80 staff man years, a discrepancy in the figures.

For the 1978 figures, he indicated there was 876 permanent positions, 79 vacant, 49 term, and 1,830 maintenance. This amounts to 2,832, and last year we had the figure of 2,753. There seems to be about an 80 staff man years discrepancy in the figures. I hope the department can give us an explanation of what this really implies.

In addition to that, if we have to go by that, if it's 2,832 and not 2,753 as indicated in his comments last year and as indicated on the sheet that's just been handed to us, and we add another 242 or 243 from the Transportation Services, or the Department of Northern Affairs, we come up with a figure of 3,075. So we're getting more and more confused here on the numbers of employees on the payroll. I wonder if the Minister would be able to comment on that or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I can appreciate the Member's difficulty here. It has been a difficult situation in arriving at the actual staff on salary kind of situation and I don't want to wish to further complicate the matters, but we have this jargon when we're dealing with staff, perm, temporary, SMYs; to that there's been added a new classification, WBs. And I think that's what's before us now, and it's perhaps makes it a little clearer. It's known as Warm Bodies. If people actually — (Interjection) — actually on staff. And I would ask the Members to not . . . the figures before you are the figures that are the approved staff man years, '78-79, and the vacancies shown are the vacancies existing as of February of '79 on the sheet before you. Now, it's not possible for me to correlate them to what the situation was last year. We have the situation as given to you here, what it was last year, but in the various different terms of types of employees, and that really is the problem that we get into this numbers game whether we have contract employees, term employees, permanent employees and approved staff man years. . The Department of Highways has never had a great number of contract employees; we only had one, I believe, in the last few years, and that position was not extended.

I can only add to this conversation, Mr. Chairman, by asking the Members of Committee to accept that information it provided by a staff as being the situation as it stands today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from St. Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, from that point we can accept the figures as presented to us. They just don't jive. That's the only problem we have, and it's our duty as Members of the Opposition to scrutinize these figures to see if they are accurate or not, and I'm just questioning that they don't seem to agree with the figures that were given to us last year, and that's why I raised the matter. On that basis, I'm prepared to continue and leave it on the record that the figures just don't agree. Now whether these are accurate or not will remain to be seen in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, let me just look over this list and see if I understand what has happened. It would seem that last year an additional eleven staff man years were approved, bringing the figure from 2742 up to 2753. Certain changes were made and the number of positions were moved over from Transportation Services, an additional 242 SMYs, which brought it up to 2995, and that is apparently the figure that is being requested for approval by this committee this year. Is that correct so far? — (Interjection) — Fine. My colleague asked last night as for the classification of WBs as of January '79 over '78 and the Minister has given us the figures 2093 for '79 and 1836 for the same month of '78, but the '79 figure includes transportation services 217 out of those 242. Am I correct so far, Mr. Minister?

MR. ENNS: Yes, except for the WB count, you would have to subtract the 637 from 2995. Correct? If we want to try to . . . I want to be as helpful as I can in getting to the bottom line figure. We have along with the 25 vacancies in the Transportation Service Division at the bottom of the page, along with the 612 vacancies in the overall department, a total vacancy of 637 from the approved 2995 that I'm asking for approval for. So that fast calculation would therefore bring that into something like 2358, as the WBs. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if we deduct the number of WBs in '78 from the number for '79, we find the number of 257, which would appear to be the increase. However, 217 of them came over from Transportation Services. If we then deduct the 217 out of the 257, it would appear to be a net gain in Warm Bodies of 40. Am I still correct so far, Mr. Minister?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm inclined to accept everything the Honourable Member from Wellington . . . or St. Vital has suggested as being the true and unvarnished truth.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I think one of my colleagues mentioned yesterday that we would be asking similar questions of all of the Cabinet Ministers. And the Minister has told us that in his department that there are 40 extra working persons as of January '79 over January '78. In Which case, the Minister of Highways has not been a part of that reduction in the civil service that the First Minister claims. So if there has been a general 13 percent or whatever the figure was, this department has not been a part of it, in fact has worked in the opposite direction, an increase, whereas the decrease, if it is there, we will expect to find in other departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think, if I may generalize, and I realize I perhaps shouldn't, but I can certainly make the statement that the Department of HighWays did not experience inordinate growth in staff in the last decade. And as such has not contributed as you say, to the reduction in the staff that has been alluded to. The staff of the Department of Highways has remained fairly constant with few notable changes; the one change that I pointed out last night, the time of the introduction of Autopac, motor vehicles branch or division of the Department had a sizeable increase, which then decreased in ensuing years as some of the functions moved over to the administration of Autopac. But in its initial start-up, the Motor Vehicle Branch experienced 100 or 130, you know, persons increase during those years, '71, '72. But your general summary, speaking to the Honourable Member for St. Vital, is correct, that . . . and I think perhaps we can be satisfied with that conclusion that "ye who seek for the lost and for the wandering will not be found within the pathways and highways of the department".

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

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to match the Minister's quote or to answer the Minister's quote. . .

MR. ENNS: I think you want Isaiah: Chapter 10, Verse 3 and 4.

MR. WALDING: I wouldn't challenge the Minister's knowledge in that regard, but there is a quotation about "Those who seek the truth, and the truth shall set you free." No more questions, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, on the point of the figures we have before us; on the second page we find requests for 2,995 staff man years with a vacancy of 637. That leaves us, the figures that the Minister quoted a while ago, of 2,358. We have, as of January 1979, 2,093 actual employees. Then there would be . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we are asking approval for staff man years of 2,995, but as provided to the committee this afternoon, there are a number of vacancies that are in the process of being filled and likely will be filled very shortly as the construction season and the greater activity with the oncome of spring requires the department to fill these vacancies.

MR. ADAM: Yes, is that hiring process already started, like say from the January figure of 2,093 to the February figure of . . . What I am saying is that we should have 2,358. Have we hired 358, or 250 people since the first of January?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it varies as the projects come onstream, and as different activities heighten in different divisions of the department. We have had, in the last month for instance, had to make every attempt to fill all vacancies in the Motor Vehicle Branch because it is the time of the year where the Motor Vehicle Branch, in the re-registering of all the 600,000 vehicles in the province requires the staff complement to be filled to its upper limit, to provide the service to the public. Similarly, in some of the divisions, whether it's the bridge office, whether it's surveys, titles, where there are one, or two, or three vacancies currently shown on that list that you have; they will be filled as the work demands it.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the figures that were given to us on the vacancies last year, was 81 vacancies, and for 1977-78 the vacancies were 79, which was almost the same, only a difference of three. This is, I believe, in March or April of last year. That's for the number of vacancies. Now, we are almost in that period, and we have a vacancy of 637. I am just wondering why there is such a big wide . . . Is this a normal figure to have vacant — 600 or 700, at this time of the year, or is there just more vacancies than we had last year?

MR. ENNS: You see, there has been an effort throughout all departments of government to approach this matter of staff in a somewhat different way in a sense that the Memeer for St. George will know this, the figures that were used last year were the established SMYs, and departments tend to tell us they guard those positions, you know, once that position is established. There has been a pretty total review of the actual SMYs required for a position, and in some cases positions that have not been required have been allowed to remain vacant. That is why you have a rise in the vacancy positions at this time.

But in the Department of Highways, we have — I don't think it's unique to the Department of Highways — but you have a job, a project, calls for X number of staff man hours of work, and you end up with half staff man years here, half staff many years there within divisions; it's misleading, regrettably, to look at the SMY figure as being interrelated in a very finite way to actual persons employed. A project may call, from our experience, for X number of hours of input, which we put down as representing five staff man years. It may mean the work of half a dozen engineering aides for three months, plus some additional effort on other employees. That gets charged to that project and shows up as SMYs.

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

MR. URUSKI: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister just indicated in his remarks that the government has done a considerable review with respect to the numbers of staff in various positions, and some positions were allowed to be kept at that pace. Is there any area in the Department of Highways in which the Minister can say that they have not allowed, as a result of — and I will use his words in the way I interpret them — allowed to get out of hand in terms of numbers, that you have frozen staff within the department because there was an over abundance of staff in any area?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, those honourable members who are familiar with the Department of Highways, will quickly recognize that there has been no fundamental change within the department. We operate the twelve district offices in precisely the same way as has been the case for the last number of years and staffed in pretty well the same way. There is always some pressure on individual

districts as workload increases in that district, or for some particularly heavy projects that are going through a district for additional aid, in terms of usually in the form of an assistant, assistant engineering aide to the district engineer. But the basic structure of the department, if I understand the question, has remained the same and there has been no revision of that establishment. The one exception that I spoke about last night, which doesn't amount to a great deal in terms of people, but the one division that I want to see an upward revision of staff, and that is in the planning division. One of the problem areas within the department is our incapability of doing sufficient advance planning work which often results in the holding up of other departments of governments in pursuing their paths, for instance, the Department of Municipal Affairs as they try to approve or not approve of say, a subdivision or any number of things, because we do not know far enough in advance as to what our future plans are.

So at a particular intersection or on a particular roadway, we have strengthened the planning division by, I believe, one person this year; it's my hope to strengthen it further. But if I were to look at the department, that is perhaps the one area that we are making an emphasis, or desire to increase staff in order to shorten the lead time, or shorten the time necessary for us in Highways to be able to come up with the answers we are often asked by other disciplines, and including the private sector and just private individuals and citizens, who ask for the permission to build in controlled zones near or at intersections, and who we'd then have to deny because we simply haven't got our planning far enough in advance.

There is the one caveat I also indicated last night, the absorption of the Transportation Services Division from Northern Affairs. We are satisfied that we have managed to carry-on the functions and responsibilities of that division in a satisfactory manner but it is a new division coming into the department that there will be undoubtedly some further reorganization take place as the two divisions — that is, as the Transportation Services Division fits in and moulds into the Department of Highways as it existed.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister specifically whether the Planning Services provided by the Department of Highways — is that being done for the new branch of Transportation Services or do Transportation Services have their own planning capabilities in terms of their workload that they undertake?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are now back on course on the Estimates, we are dealing with Planning and Design, and I'd be quite happy to . . .

MR. URUSKI: Well, all right, I can deal with it but I'm relating it into this, if you wish then I can . . .

MR. ENNS: I think the question is probably more appropriately asked as we come on to Planning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that complete the discussion based on the information that was handed out by the Minister?

MR. URUSKI: Well, in terms of the vacancies of the staff positions that the Minister has provided, he shows a large vacancy rate in the Safety Division of the administration of the MVB. What areas specifically are the vacancies that he shows within the department of 17, what area of the Safety Division?

Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the vacancy rate in the Maintenance and Assistance area, as those being seasonal jobs in nature as well as the Construction Division of the department, but the area of in-highway safety, where there is a vacancy of 17 — of 10 percent to be quite specific, what areas are the nature of the jobs performed?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that the largest single of some some 8 lies within the personnel for the School Driver Education Program, recruitment is in progress. We have had some difficulty in recruiting at the current rate of remuneration, as the former Minister is perhaps aware, but that consists of some 8 of those 17 persons.

MR. URUSKI: Is that Driver Examiners for the department?

MR. ENNS: No — Driver Examiners?

MR. URUSKI: And the remaining 9?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that these 17 vacancies exist in these categories of Driver Records, Driver Testing Branches, Mobile Units, Driver Education, Vehicle Inspection, snowmobile and bicycles and dealers. In general that is the area the 17 vacancies exist in. Many of them are filled on a seasonal basis — the Driver Mobile Inspection Units are operational as the spring comes on. We have the mobile units then move out throughout the province and begin their inspection teams, and that's possibly the area where the 17 come in predominantly.

MR. URUSKI: Has there been any — and I don't believe there have but I would like it specifically with respect to the Boards and Commissions — any change in the staffing over the last couple of years in the Boards?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that there has been no change, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: That's all I have on the specifics as I can ask the remaining questions on safety at the appropriate time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I have a couple more questions, Mr. Chairman, on the vacant positions, the 286 shown on Maintenance, Mechanical, Warehouse, Assistance — that 286 would be primarily on the Maintenance group, is that correct? Or could you give us a breakdown on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that it's a combination and that's why you have the parenthesis there of Maintenance, Mechanical Division, Warehouse and Assistance. All the activity in those areas is somewhat seasonal, and there is an overlapping involved there, the demand say of our warehousing capability to respond increases fairly dramatically as our crews go out on the actual job sites and pick up their general maintenance load in the spring again.

MR. ADAM: Yes, we will move on to the Transportation Services of 242 employees being taken over by the Highways Department. What problems have been surfacing in this transition, and the Minister indicated that there would be further reorganization. I wonder if he could elaborate and tell us exactly what his plans are for the future.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have been reasonably willing to discuss virtually the entire Estimates under this staffing question. There is the specific areas, you know, in the Estimates that will enable us to talk specifically and generally about the problems that a division such as Transportation Division encounters. I'm quite prepared to discuss it now, but I know that we'll discuss it again perhaps an hour from now, and I would wonder if we could then not begin to get back to the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleagues on the Committee.

MR. ADAM: If you could indicate to us where we will be able to discuss it?

MR. ENNS: No. 9 — on Page 57, No. 9 — Transportation Services is those 242 people, and we can then . . .

MR. ADAM: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we then proceed to Planning and Design?

MR. ADAM: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) Salaries — \$997,300 — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to indicate and elaborate on his statements with respect to Planning and Design work, and problem areas that he has encountered in that branch, and in terms of future planning and programming of highway development within the province.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this division of the department has to respond you know on some very significant transportation problems that often have to be worked together with other jurisdictions

such as the city.

Let me name you just a few of the major planning processes that the division is involved with: Winnipeg Rail Relocation Study, which is always an item for concern with or without the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass; Urban Transportation Task Force; the Winnipeg Region Study. We have to dovetail our planning with what the city does with respect to their planning of their major arterial streets, as to how they impact on our provincial highway systems. We can't have the city planning for a major egress from the city into a pasture, onto a wheat field somewhere, it has to tie in with an existing highway structure, No. 2, No. 3, No. 75 South, or No. 6 or 7 or 9 North, and impacts on our responsibility once they reach the perimeter and an expensive traffic interchange is required.

The Manitoba Northlands Agreements, which we negotiate with the Department of Northern Affairs and the federal government, there used to be the FRED Program, the Member for St. George will be familiar with that, that is more or less completed, that phase of that transportation involvement at that time.

We have such things as the Brandon area Grains Study; we have other items of continuing concern, the Highway Strengthening Agreement which regrettably has been deferred. We have to plan to some extent together with the Emergency Measures Organization, their flood fighting efforts. We're involved with public meetings; we're involved with Indian communities, Indian bands, in the always problem area of responding to requests to build public roads on Indian reserves. We have a major problem thrust onto us through metric conversion and that's causing things. These are the areas that this division is involved with and I think just that listing of it can indicate to you that the relatively small staff complement that we have there is well loaded down with work.

Then we have, in addition to that, the very specific requests that come in, for instance, the Manitoba Pool Elevators wants to locate a major grain handling facility just outside of Brandon, and the location of that is very important to us in terms of maintaining and protecting the public cost that we have put into certain roadways in that area. We have the requests from individual and private entrepreneurs, whether it's a hotel or a motel wishing to locate on an intersection that will drastically alter the flow of traffic on our highways. To respond to these many individual requests is, in essence, what this division is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19.2, I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee for the Private Members' Hour, and will return to the Chair at 8 p.m.

SUPPLY — MINES, NATUL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 64, in the Main Estimates, Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment. We are on Resolution No. 83, 3. , Mineral Resources (a) Administration: (1) Salaries — pass — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, last evening we stopped off on this item which I indicated that I felt was of some importance and wanted to deal with it this afternoon rather than at the late hour in view of the fact that we probably wouldn't complete it. And I had, Mr. Chairman, received confirmation from the Minister of Mines and from the Minister of Labour who I am happy to acknowledge his fairness, the Minister of Labour said that the point I had raised was a valid point, one which is causing some concern to the department as it well should, Mr. Chairman.

To review very briefly, we have a mine in the Province of Manitoba employing approximately 3,000 workers in one of what is acknowledged to be the most hazardous fields of occupation, that is of mining. The Minister of Labour being sufficiently concerned with safety in the mining industry so that he set up a Committee to enquire into it, went to the various locations in northern Manitoba where there are mines, to deal with the problem and we have what appears to be a situation whereby no laws with regard to safety are either in existence or being enforced in the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation.

The Minister says, while the company is permitting us to do our inspections and they don't seem to be resisting us, but what we do know is that if they are to be prosecuted, the company has taken the position that they are not responsible, that the laws do not apply to them, that that has been the decision of the Court of Appeal and therefore, the mining safety in Flin Flon exists by the grace of the Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that the situation arose during the previous administration but it arose not through any fault of the previous administration. We were prosecuting our mining laws as if they did exist. We went to the Court of Appeal, found that they did not exist and then we immediately — and I ask the Minister to review his records — we immediately got in touch with

the Government at Ottawa saying that something should be done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the main responsibility is not with this Minister. This Minister should be doing everything in his power to activate the Federal Government. But the fact is, that the Federal Government apparently knows of a situation where it has the jurisdiction where there are 3,000 people employed, where there are no safety inspectors having lawful authority to enforce the regulations and after a lapse of almost two years — there would be some period during the previous administration where we were urging them on — and my recollection Mr. Chairman, is that a letter went to the Prime Minister, that he responded, that he indicated that he agreed with us. But in the meantime we have a period of some two years without adequate rules and regulations with respect to the mining industry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I used the word adequate. I think that is the opposite of an exaggeration, that's an understatement. I'm not sure whether any rules exist. And I think that the Minister, when I posed the question yesterday, acknowledged that he doesn't know whether there are any rules that exist. So the International Nickel Company has to abide by laws, the Sherritt Gordon Mining Company has to abide by laws. The people's company to the extent of 25 percent has to abide by laws. But the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, they will co-operate with us when they feel it is desirable to do so.

But what we do know is that when we prosecuted a foreman or a supervisor for permitting a man to work under unsafe conditions, the defence wasn't not guilty, the defence was your laws do not exist. And the defence succeeded.

And Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to reflect upon the decisions of the Courts. I believe that the decision was wrong. But that's a personal belief. It doesn't make any difference whether I believe that it's wrong or right. That fact is that the Court of Appeal in the Province of Manitoba said that the laws do not exist and since then the Federal Government which has jurisdiction has done nothing.

And Mr. Chairman, I emphasize, the fault is primarily with the Federal Government. They are aware of a situation where these people are working, where ostensibly the courts have said that there are no laws, and where nothing has been done; the Minister may not accede to that. Whatever has been done has not resulted in him being able to get up and say a very simple thing, that if there is a breach of mining regulations, which are designed to maintain safety at the Flin Flon mine, there are laws in place and there can be a prosecution. The Minister is unable to say that. For a period, I was unable to say it, and all I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is we can't have working people in the province of Manitoba operate under that state of affairs.

We prosecuted INCO; I don't know whether we were the ones that started it or you, it really doesn't matter. The Province of Manitoba prosecuted INCO; I don't know, it went at least to the Court of Appeal of the province of Manitoba. Did it go as far as the Supreme Court of Canada? Mr. Hague is shaking his head, so it stayed here in the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba. I'm not going to go into that decision, although I certainly, again, don't agree with it. But, Mr. Chairman, if we have difficulty prosecuting when there are laws, and we can't convict anybody, how much more difficult it is to convict somebody when there are no laws. I think that the Minister has to do something to satisfy the miners at Hudson's Bay, and I thank the Minister of Labour for acknowledging that there is a difficult point here, and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, only what comes out of this debate will be of some value. Can we be of value to the Minister? Or is he able to get a government, ostensibly responsible to do its duty with regard to one of the most basic fundamental types of regulations in what is admittedly one of the most hazardous industries to have people work in? Because it is simply not satisfactory, and I'm sure it's not satisfactory to the Minister, to have to stand up and say the problem is not resolved.

What can be done? Perhaps the First Minister of this province should go and see the Prime Minister of Canada directly and tell him that this situation cannot exist. And if the situation is less difficult than I understand — and the Minister of Labour acknowledged it to then assure us in that respect, because that will certainly be welcome if it is not as much of a problem as I appear to think it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BRIAN RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I don't attempt to make the problem appear to be any less serious than the Honourable Member makes it out and I don't wish to make any excuses for why the situation hasn't been rectified. All I can do is explain the circumstances that exist and that prevail.

There are three governments involved: the Federal Government and the Saskatchewan government and our own. And at the moment the issue is in the hands of the Labour Departments of our government and the government of Saskatchewan, and they will have to take an agreed

position to the Federal Government and attempt to get it resolved.

In the meantime, I can only say that in terms of response to inspections, that sort of thing, that the company continues to comply with the inspections and the recommendations of our inspectors. Now the Honourable Member can say that there's no legal basis for that, I agree, but the fact is that the company continues to comply with the reports of our mines branch inspectors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister and with the greatest of respect to him that it is simply not satisfactory to have a situation in the Province of Manitoba whereby the workers' safety regulations are at the sufferance of the company. As wonderful as my honourable friend or others may think the company is, there is absolutely no precedent for saying that legal requirements with regard to safety regulations are at the sufferance of the company.

Mr. Chairman, what the Minister says disturbs me somewhat; he says Saskatchewan and Manitoba have to get together and agree on something that goes to Ottawa. If that's not what he said, then I would want him to correct me. Mr. Chairman, there is a government of Canada which the court has said has jurisdiction in that area. The government of Canada has jurisdiction with respect to a mine where 3000 men are going into the pits every day — five days a week. They are permitting them to do this without passing a regulation, without authorizing an inspector, without there being an enforcement procedure. Again, if I am exaggerating the problem and it's almost so stark a problem that I would want to believe that I am exaggerating; that the government of Canada is permitting this situation to go on, and they will so permit it to occur until they hear from Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Now, I agree that there should be some rationalization of this problem. But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, we have what is supposed to be a duly responsible government, and they should be urged to act. I would want the law to be changed for reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I don't think that that law was ever intended to go beyond industrial relations. But my position is found wrong by the courts, it says it's intended for everything. Do you know what that means, Mr. Chairman? That means that Hudson Bay could have said, with regard to Medicare and Pharmacare, what the railroad said. The railroad said, "Manitoba can't legislate with respect to us". Now, fortunately, at least that's my recollection, Hudson Bay didn't say so at the time, and Medicare and the remission of premiums was handled by that company the same as other Manitoba companies.

But the Court of Appeal in effect said that Hudsons Bay is the same as the CNR: it's a federal work and undertaking. We have no jurisdiction to pass laws with respect to them, except laws which generally apply in the province of Manitoba, but that we have no power. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of the Court of Appeal's decision, we would not have the power to enforce environmental standards on them. I think that that's the case. We did. There was a Clean Environment Commission order, there was a stack put up at Flin Flon in compliance with that order. But I am now inclined to think that if we followed the Court of Appeals decision, it's a federal worker undertaking. You can not impose standards. You cannot have general laws as you would have with regard to the others.

I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether they will say that our taxation laws can not apply to them. I don't know how Eldorado Mining in Ontario deals with the Province of Ontario with regard to mining. Perhaps they have to pay a tax in any event even though uranium was taken out of the field of provincial jurisdiction.

So the matter has to be resolved and I say that it should be resolved in favour of the normal law that applies to other mining companies. But, by God, until it is resolved surely the Federal Government should enact a series of regulations. Maybe they should adopt the Manitoba regulations, send them a copy, tell them to pass an Order-in-Council and tell them to delegate our inspectors to inspect the mines. And if there is a violation that the violation will be dealt in accordance with those laws. Now I would wish that the Minister would tell me that that's in fact what is happening. But he hasn't said anything that would indicate that that's what is happening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — pass. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this very portant piece of legislation work. I it will hope be legislation. Flin Flon, it's ironic and sometimes its almost funny the way it works with the jurisdiction between Saskatchewan and Manitoba. At one time — it's changed since — the compensation paid by the Saskatchewan government was 75 percent, by the Manitoba government it was 66-2/3 percent. There was line drawn, so if you got hurt, it paid to get hurt in Saskatchewan. They even have a case of where a rock came down the Manitoba

bounced into Saskatchewan and hurt one of the employees and they had one hellava time to establish whether they would pay him 166-2/3 percent or 75 percent. This is not funny, it's a serious thing. But that was remedied so they're both of equal value now. It was ironic there was line drawn so a Saskatchewan inspector had jurisdiction up to a certain point, a foot over that line he didn't. The Manitoba inspector was the same. He had the same jurisdiction over the Manitoba side. It really didn't make a hellava difference lot of difference because the company didn't do much about it anyway. They disregarded both the inspectors.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to talk about and to express the feelings of the people who are most concerned' and I would like to read this into the record — it's from the steel representative of Flin Flon and I'll table this letter if the Minister desires. And he expresses it very well, and I would just like to put it on record' if you don't mind.

"Dear Mr. O'Connell, Minister of Labour, House of Commons: The Manitoba Mines Safety Review Committee has just completed hearings in Flin Flon and heard a lengthy discussion of our jurisdiction problem. The Chairman, Claude Wright, commented 'How can you have an effective safety and health program until you resolve this issue? Even the manager representative on the committee, Donald Munn, formerly of Inco said, 'There just isn't any reason I can see why a mine in Snow Lake should be in the federal jurisdiction.' He was referring to the problem of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting being under a special Act of parliament passed in 1947. As a result, mine workers in one of the most dangerous occupations in the land at Flin Flon and Snow Lake are covered by neither by the Manitoba Workplace Health and Safety Act nor the Saskatchewan Occupational — It Health and Safety Act. makes them an orphan, Mr. Chairman. They are neither fish, nor fowl or good red herring, they're lost—"The Canada Labour code contains no provisions for mining that are helpful to our members at Flin Flon." — It concludes here. — "The code refuses to perform. unsafe work provisions are inferior the provisions of the Saskatchewan and Manitoba laws. There are no federal mines inspectors although they have the jurisdiction. Flin Flon is on the Manitoba Saskatchewan border but the company Snow Lake Mines is 135 miles from that border and we are still up in the air as far as ... There is no agreement between the federal and the provincial governments to license provincial mines inspectors, to enforce any federal safety laws. When the Manitoba Mines Inspection Branch laid charges against the company in 1976 for permitting unsafe conditions, the case was thrown out by the courts when the company lawyers raised a jurisdiction problem. Therefore 1,000 of our members in Flin Flon and 350 in Snow Lake are entirely unprotected.

Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited does not have to follow any safety laws and the Federal Government is letting them get away with it. In light of the support for our position from the Chairman of the Mine Safety and Health Review Committee, and from the Union and management members of this enquiry, I ask what you intend to do to solve the problem and when?

"I would remind you that 14 workers have died in the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company in the past eight years. Six at Snow Lake in the past few years."

Now, Mr. Chairman, imagine if these were mounties or policemen, the media and the publicity would be focused in on this thing. But they are only miners, so it doesn't seem to matter to people. A miner is very low in the totem poles it seems to me.

"There have been many near misses and serious injuries. There are countless hazards in the mines and the surface plants such as dust ... lead, noise, etc. We must have protection and cannot excuse any more stalling by your government."

And this has been sent to different people, politicians, and if the Minister cares to I will table it and hopefully get some answers.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't a recent thing. I've pursued this for some time. I've pursued it with my own Labour Minister, Russ Paulley and we were at the verge . . . he had the meeting arranged, both with Saskatchewan and the Feds and seemingly they were quite willing to pass the jurisdiction to Manitoba. Unfortunately, the honourable member took ill. He was in no condition and it didn't get passed. It didn't materialize. I also pursued it with the former Minister of Labour on your side I asked the question three, four, five times in this House, when she was going to do something about this jurisdiction. It doesn't cost any money, it wouldn't interfere with your restraint programs. It's a simple thing to do and they were all willing, and why didn't she do it? And she had one standard answer, Mr. Minister, one standard answer, and she would say, "I'm looking into it". I hope this Minister does look into it and gets some answers and quickly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I will leave the item. I only want to confirm one matter. I consider it very serious,

I think the Minister considers it very serious. I regard his silence as two things. One, that he has given all the answers he can. And two, that I have not said anything that is wrong. Because I'm worried, Mr. Chairman, I am worried whether I am in some way misconstruing what is happening and I regard the Minister's silence as not challenging what I have said. I don't regard it as being an attempt to ignore the problem. I know that is not what he is doing. I do think there is other things that he can do. I think that it's more serious than saying that the two provinces have to get together.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether anyone in Ottawa has been impressed with the fact of what they are doing. Seldom have you heard this kind of situation; where else does it apply in Canada? And we've got our citizens up there. So I say to you, that I still regard Ottawa as the major culprit but that doesn't mean that I don't think that the Minister should be urged to do something. And I think that if he will look at the previous correspondence we wrote Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Trudeau — my recollection — wrote back that he agrees with us. But that was two years ago' or almost two years ago. It must have been at least 15 months ago because less than that we didn't have the opportunity to write in any capacity. That's right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do have another item which relates to the same area. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that we won't be repetitive, Mr. Chairman, about this issue but we still think that other issues under mining, engineering and inspection should come under (c) — not this issue — so that we have your ruling quite clear that we will discuss mining and engineering and inspection other than this particular one when we get to (c).

I would like to know from the Minister with regard to the potential — I think that that is probably too cautious a word, because the mineral exploration company said that it is a mine — that we have found in conjunction with Granges exploration in the area of Flin Flon, are we maintaining our percentage investment in that particular mine?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, then I gather that that is one, at least one property where we have not abandoned our compulsory participation. I want to make sure that I am being clear because the Minister the other day said that we have abandoned our compulsory participation program but I gather that with regard to that property, we are maintaining our participation at the level to which we were entitled to participate when the discovery was made.

MR. RANSOM: The reference to abandoning compulsory participation Mr. Chairman, to new proposals that exploration companies put forward as a matter of policy since last October, November of 1977, we had not been participating in further agreements or in new agreements submitted, pardon me. And as of last October we announced the change in the regulation which removed the requirement for new programs to be submitted but the programs that the province was already participating in, those interests remain with Manitoba minerals and of the 1979 agreements that the company took over from the province, I'm advised that 14 of them are active, 32 are suspended, 29 further participation is decline and 4 have have been terminated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, participation declined, does that mean on our part?

MR. RANSOM: I would assume so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I again, I want to congratulate the Minister on having some some pragmatic bones in his body. I won't attribute them to any particular Bolshevism, we've been all through that, bu I am glad that the Minister is not going to divest himself of public participation in a mine when it appears to be there. Now my recollection is that the agreement provided that we were, well, between 45 percent to 50 percent of that particular program, and that that particular program proceeded, and I gather that what the Minister is saying is that we will maintain our 45

percent interest, we will not be diluted.

If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, then I will be shorn of much of the ammunition which I thought the Conservative Party would have given me if they were really true to their position because they say that the public should not be involved, that this was a doctrinaire socialist program, that the private sector can do it better, and that we should not be requiring mining companies to carry us as a partner. That's their position, Mr. Chairman. And I thought that what the Minister was going to do was to come into this House and say, "Yes, we have a 45 percent interest in this program; we haven't taken it out, but we're not going to put any more money into it because that's Bolshevism. "That's what my friend, the First Minister, likes to refer to as incompetent socialism. "Therefore, although we won't take the 45 percent out, we are going to permit all further investment to be made by the private sector because that's the only kind of investment that's kosher and very soon, when they go to development, we will be a very very small shareholder because our 45 percent will have been diluted down to a very small amount."

Mr. Chairman, that's the speech I was expecting to hear from the Minister, that's the speech that I spent all last night preparing to attack and the ground has just, Mr. Chairman, been pulled from under my feet because the Minister has shown that the Conservative party, despite the fact that they are not socialists, in this particular respect neither are they fools.

What has happened is that the public — and it gives me time to make another speech — the public along with a private sector firm, have discovered what is very likely a mine. We are presently 45 percent owners of it and because we put business sense over doctrinaire conservatism, we are going to remain 45 percent owners. If there is development on that mine and it requires another \$100,000, we will put up \$45,000; the private company will put up \$55,000 and we will remain 45 percent owners. If there is a reason to develop the mine and it requires an investment of another \$10 million, the mining Granges will put up \$5.5 million, we will put up \$4.5 million and we will remain 45 percent owners of the mine. Under our development agreement, when there are any profits made, which I am optimistic enough to think that there will be — I'm not saying when, but there will be — and we will then not be stuck with the puny royalties which are going to be charged by the Minister by the time he gets through with this session, but we will be entitled to 45 percent of the profits of that mine.

Mr. Chairman, if that applied with respect to some of the other mining properties which have been developed in this province, then, Mr. Chairman, we would have an income of a minimum of \$50 million a year from mining operations — a minimum of \$50 million a year — which is a full one percent of sales tax which the Conservatives apparently prefer to charge to the people of the Province of Manitoba rather than being involved in this type of activity. I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to further comment from the Minister as to how this mine will be developed, what the timetable is, what the further prospects are.

I will repeat, Mr. Chairman, because apparently it needs repeating, that there was a myth developed which had absolutely no foundation, that somehow mineral activity reduced in the Province of Manitoba by virtue of our participation program. The facts are, and they have never been denied, that in the first full year of our participation program, we had a record amount of mineral exploration in terms of dollars spent, roughly \$16 million. I can't say that that is a record with regard to activity because I am not certain, the inflation factor is involved. And that doesn't include what INCO did on its own closely guarded property during the same period, because we don't know.

The year of 1977, the last year that we were in government, I guess we would take it as a fiscal year, those were the figures, Mr. Chairman, that were given to me. Perhaps that was for 1977 calendar, but the figures were given to me earlier in the year by what was then my administration. That didn't occur until the end of the year. But it was \$16 million which was an all-time high. In the current year — these figures were confirmed by the department — in the current year, that's 1977, I made these remarks on September 26, 1977, when I was still the Minister, "Funds expended on mining exploration will be roughly \$16 million. This does not take into account exploration costs by INCO on properties to which the public no longer has access by virtue of commitments of the previous administration." You see, INCO received what they called Order-in-Council leases. Those Order-in-Council leases were different than any other mining leases. They weren't legally much different but they represented a government commitment that they would last for a certain period of time and INCO was not required to accept us as a partner on those O/C leases, nor is Sherritt required to accept us as a partner on some of their leases which were in the vicinity of the Thompson mine. They go quite a distance and there is a big piece of the Province of Manitoba.

But that is the figure that was used, Mr. Chairman, and lest any of my honourable friends think that we did not have respectable partners, let me say that Sherritt Gordon Mines was a partner, that Hudsons Bay Mining and Smelting was a partner with the Manitoba Mineral Resources even before we had the compulsory program, that Acquitain Company of Canada Limited was a partner, that Canadian Occidental Petroleum Limited was a partner, Consolidated Morrison Explorations

Dennison Mines Limited, Dome Exploration Limited, Du-Connects Resources Limited, Dupont of Canada Exploration Limited, Falconbridge Nickel Mines Limited, Granges Exploration, that's the one we made a find with, Gulf Minerals Canada Limited. — I'm not going through them all; I'm going through some of the names which some of the members might find more familiar — McIntyre Mines Limited, Noranda Exploration Company Limited, Shell Canada Resources Limited, Union Oil Company of Canada Limited, United Sisco Mines Limited, and others.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to change our program — well, not if — we are obviously going to change our program. I am merely suggesting that it be changed not on the basis that there was no activity in the Province of Manitoba, but that the existing government feels that private activity, with the absence of government participation, is, in their view, a better means of proceeding. On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I think that the issues are fairly clear cut. I don't think that there is any doubt whatsoever. As a matter of fact I am certainly authorized to say that the New Democratic Party will go to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and say that if we are returned to power, we will see to it that the public has a substantial role in participating in the mineral exploration and the development of future mining properties in the Province of Manitoba.

The attack on this program, Mr. Speaker, and the sense of the program is substantiated by what was said about it. One columnist, who deserves to be kept in obscurity insofar as his name is concerned, suggested that the New Democratic Party program was entitled to 50 percent of all of the minerals developed in the Province of Manitoba by virtue of us merely passing a law. They pretended, Mr. Chairman, that we had a law which said that we are entitled to 50 percent of what is now being produced in the Province of Manitoba. Others pretended that we were getting 50 percent without putting up 50 percent of the money. None of that is so. As a matter of fact, the regulation on which we proceeded was said by the industry at the time, that if the public wants to participate, the method that they have chosen is fair. They didn't agree that we should participate, but nobody said that the method was unfair. They said that the method that has been chosen is fair. We don't agree that they should want to be partners, but there is nothing about the partnership which is unfair to the company as if it had another partner, except that they said, "You are the government and you are not only our partner but you can make the rules."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there will be a clear cut issue on this program. The Minister no longer does what anybody who has mineral properties does. You do not see INCO permitting people to explore on their property without INCO having a share. As a matter of fact, if INCO lets you go on their property, they take an interest without putting on money, because they say it's our property you're on. They, therefore, demand an interest. We don't even have that, Mr. Chairman.

You know, the peculiar thing about our royalty laws which I could see no correction to, is that theoretically the mining companies could remove tons of ore from the ground in the Province of Manitoba and never pay a cent in royalties to our province. Does that sound shocking? It is theoretically true and, in many cases, occurred. Because our royalty was based on profit and if a company showed no profit, despite the fact that they removed tons of concentrate, they paid no royalties. That happened from time to time; it didn't happen all the time. Fortunately, they made profit some years and paid some royalties. But find me one mining company who is going to do what this Minister does, or what this government does. Find me one mining company that says, "We have mineral properties, but you can come on our properties and if you make an exploration, you can take it out, and if you make any profit, we'll take 15 percent. If you don't, we won't take anything." Nobody deals that way. There's only one holder of resources that disposes of them in that fashion; that's the Conservative administration.

So when they say, Mr. Chairman, as part of the heading — and I'm going now on the hope that we didn't use the same heading, although maybe we did — that what the Mineral Resources Department does is consists of activities pertaining to, and then it says various things, "disposition of Crown mineral rights." That's what we are engaged in, disposing of public mineral rights, that's the department's central activity. It's regrettable because, Mr. Minister, whether you like it or not, the people in your department, as I've perceived them, the geologists, had a new lease on life when they were involved in this program. They were not then regarded by their brothers in the industry as people who merely regulate what others were doing. They walked a little taller; they had a little bit more fire in them, and they said, "We are now in the industry with the other geologists." You've taken that away, and more important, you've taken away from the people of this province a real opportunity to engage in the aggressive development of our mineral resources.

And I say with the greatest of respect, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that he has not compensated for this removal with anything which we will gain a benefit from, including more money from our mineral resources or more activity. There will not be more money, there will be less money; there will not be more activity, there will be less activity.

I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, whether the Minister intends to bring legislation

into this House increasing the mineral royalty tax to 23 percent from the present 15 percent at the first tier. He's going to remove the second tier. Is he going to increase the mineral tax to 23 percent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an opportune time for me to deal with some of the questions that the Honourable Member has raised because, as he has pointed out, that this area of development of our mineral resources is certainly one that is fundamental to the differences and the philosophical approach between the Honourable Members opposite and those of us on this side, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons why the honourable gentlemen are on the opposite side, and we are here, is the mineral policy that the previous government had.

It was a factor, a debating point in the election. It will be, as the Honourable Member says, a debating point in future elections. So I think it's particularly important that we outline those basic differences and the advantages and the disadvantages of each approach, Mr. Chairman. I think the basic question that really has to be asked in comparing the two approaches to resource development is which approach best serves the public of Manitoba? And that needs to be looked at in short-term and in the long-term. I think if those divisions are made and we address that question, then one has some hope of understanding which approach is going to be the best.

Now, if I might just briefly outline what is at least my understanding of the New Democratic Party's approach to mineral resources development, and perhaps can give some substantiation for believing that, Mr. Chairman, but I think there were two features of the former government's policy that were particularly outstanding. One was their taxation policy, which assessed along with other taxes, brought the marginal rates of taxation on mining to a level in excess of 73 percent. Now, I'm not saying that that particular level has been applied, it may have been or it may not have been. I'm saying that the potential was there to apply marginal rates of total taxation, royalties and taxation in excess of 73 percent. And this has been substantiated and confirmed by a review of mineral taxation that was undertaken by representatives of the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments during 1978.

Now that feature of high taxation was evidently introduced because the previous government saw that profits existed in the industry and they naturally moved through, I think what is a general motivating force of what amounts to envy, Mr. Chairman, to take away those profits and leave only what they would consider to be a fair return on the investment of the companies without regard to risk and the necessity of having capital for expansion.

The second feature of their policy was basically public ownership, which the Honourable Member has referred to just recently, and that was brought about by the introduction of a regulation 328-74 which said that any company submitting exploration programs in excess of \$10,000, that automatically the government would have the opportunity to participate in those programs at a 50-50 level by providing 50 percent of the financing.

Now, I regard that, from my review of information, the files and published information, that there are a couple of reasons behind that, which perhaps the Honourable Member hasn't referred to, but perhaps he might also acknowledge them. One quotation which I give here is from some material that was prepared by the previous Deputy Minister of the Department, Mr. Cawley, and he said that one of the purposes of their policy really was to assume, or to strengthen control by Manitobans over their own mineral resources and to reduce dependency upon outside of the province institutions. Now, to consider that statement in itself, Mr. Chairman, it didn't say that this would necessarily serve the interests of the people of Manitoba. But this is put forward as an end in itself. The government purpose is to strengthen control by Manitobans over their own mineral resources and to reduce dependency upon outside of the province institutions.

Now that's one of the driving forces, I believe, that was behind the policies that the honourable gentleman brought in, but there's another one that I really have to quote again, and I quoted this one last year, and I apologize for quoting it twice, but it's really such a good one, Mr. Chairman, that I'd like to deal with it once more.

This is from the report on natural resources policy in Manitoba by professor Eric Kierans, and I quote, "It would be completely feasible for Manitoba to change its resource policy to one of development by Crown corporations. The rewards will be substantial in a world of increasing demand and declining supply. Manitoba has resources that are in demand and in addition the people and the skills to develop them. Capital requirements at outset are relatively small, as we have shown, and because of the high profit ratios, the process of capital formation swiftly becomes self-generating. Beyond the initial capital, all that is needed is decision and determination." End of quote, Mr. Chairman.

Now that sounds like one of those theories of perpetual motion, Mr. Chairman, all that was required was feed a few dollars into the system and automatically it's going to generate capital and the people of Manitoba are going to be wealthy as a result of it. So those two thrusts, Mr. Chairman . . . — (Interjection) — The former commissar of Mines there persists in trying to detract me from my line of reasoning here, Mr. Chairman, but I'm sure we'll return to it when next we meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with rule 19(2), I'm interrupting the proceeding for Private Members' Hour, and will return to the Chair at 8:00 this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under Private Members' Hour, the first item is Private Bills, second reading Private Bill No. 10. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

SECOND READING—PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 10—LES REVERENDS PERES

MR. KOVNATS presented Bill No. 10, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I've been asked by the Oblate Fathers to present this bill in the Legislature. It's not an earth-shattering change that's requested; this bill will allow, in addition to the Reverend Fathers, the priests, also the Brothers of the Order, to serve on the executive and be members of the corporation. There are many names that are associated with the Oblate Fathers, and it is an important part of our history, particularly here in Manitoba. And, in investigating prior to presenting this bill, I did discuss with the Oblate Fathers some of the history that they were involved in in this province.

Some of them are quite interesting stories, and I think that the members of the Legislature will see how history came about many, many years ago.

The Oblate Fathers were associated with the Lord Selkirk Settlers, and in 1816, Lord Selkirk asked the Oblate Fathers to come to Manitoba and assist him in his settlement here in the province.

There were many problems here in the province. The fur traders, the Northwest Company and the Hudson Bay Company didn't want the settlers coming into the province, and the Oblate Fathers with their religious order controlled the people who might be involved in uprisings and allowed Lord Selkirk to participate with his settlement here, which was part of our early beginning in this province.

I'm going to mention a couple of names which are quite close to me because of the vicinity in which I live.

Father Provencher, an Oblate Father was appointed the first resident priest in July, 1816 at the Mission of St. Boniface. There are other priests that come up, Father Aubert, Father Tache, did wonderful work among the Indians and Metis here in the province of Manitoba. You can see their namesakes left here to perpetuate their memories and honour them. We have a street in St. Boniface, Provencher Avenue, Tache Street, Tache Nursing Centre, and many other locations named after these well-known fathers.

I didn't really come today to present a history lesson, but one other interesting story that I found out while I was investigating the Oblate Fathers before presenting the bill. There was a Father Lacombe, very interesting person, he was a parish priest at St. Mary's Church here in Winnipeg before being transferred to Alberta to assist with the poor, and the Indians and the Metis in that province. And the interesting story is, Mr. Speaker, is that the Indians were not going to allow the CPR railroad to go across the province of Alberta. They had barricaded the way for them and they weren't going to allow the CPR to go across their lands, and I've heard many discussions here in the Legislature about Indian land claims, but by peaceful discussion, Father Lacombe was able to persuade the Indians to allow the CPR to travel through their lands in Alberta.

The other interesting part, Mr. Speaker, is that for his helping the CPR and the Indians, Father Lacombe was made president of the CPR railroad for one day. And, I would just tell the members

of the Legislature that if you ever want to be president of the CPR, all you have to do is stop an Indian uprising.

Mr. Speaker, this bill or the change in this act is really not that significant. It will allow the Brothers to participate more in the manner in this Order than they have in the past, and take an active interest in their executive. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We now move on to Private Members' Resolutions. The Honourable Member for Wellington. (Stands)

Then Resolution No. 1, moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Churchill has 15 minutes left.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few days ago I stood before the House for a few moment, five I believe, to be exact, and talked about jobs, or rather talked about the lack of jobs — an act that I performed just a few nights previous in my reply to the Throne Speech where we talked about the job situation in northern Manitoba in specific, and the lack of productive work for Manitobans in general. We documented at that time, some of the staggering costs, the staggering costs in human terms, in monetary terms, and in social terms that are resulting from the government's refusal to face a crisis that it has helped to create. And, without going into the type of detail that I outlined in my reply to the Throne, I have to briefly and generally outline the magnitude of the economic costs of the Tory mismanagement of Manitoba's economy. There have been hundreds of thousands of dollars, literally, added to welfare assistance. And remember, we're only talking about the northern region. Millions of tax dollars in increased UIC benefits, millions of dollars lost due to reduced tax revenues, because when people don't work, they don't pay taxes, and when they're on Unemployment Insurance, although they pay taxes at that time, their taxes are far less than they would be if they had been engaged in productive work.

The province has lost tens of millions of dollars in lost wages and salaries. This is money that has effectively been removed from the economy, and scores of million of dollars in lost production, for when we don't produce hydro electric energy, and we don't produce nickel, we are adding to the negative impact to the economy as a whole. And remember who has to pay all these costs; it's the taxpayer that has to pay all these costs. And it is all happening for one reason or another because there aren't enough jobs to go around. One of the many reasons is because the members on the opposite side, the government have turned their backs on the workers of this province. They have defaulted as a government —(Interjections)— and the members opposite are suggesting that it is not true, but I think any perusal of the facts . . .

MR. ENNS: That is not true, that is not true.

MR. COWAN: . . . any perusal of the facts will show that the government has refused to live up to its responsibility as a government in this respect. But in all fairness to the government — I'm not certain I want to be all that fair after some of the comments that have just been slung across the floor — but in all fairness to the government, I must hasten to add that it is not a problem only of their making. It is not their problem alone, it's a national problem, it is even a international problem, but in all fairness to the people of Manitoba, I must also hasten to add that the Tories are doing nothing to alleviate the problem that they find themselves faced with.

A MEMBER: Less than nothing.

MR. COWAN: It is ironic that the most reactionary government in this country today, and in this province for a long, long time refuses to react. During my speech the other night, I specifically recall a number of the members opposite, and during my short, five minute reply to the Honourable Minister of Labour's contribution to this particular debate on this resolution, I remember a number of the members opposite, including at least one minister, shouting across the floor comments such as, "Tell us a solution, sure that's a problem, but tell us a solution. Well, what are the answers?" Well, Mr. Speaker, my heart went out to those members across the floor, sitting there, trapped in the mire of their own ideology, unable or should I say unwilling to do anything positive, and now

the honourable minister wants to draw my attention to the past eight years. It is a government that consistently and constantly wants to look backwards instead of forwards; able only to cut and to slash, or at least to pretend to cut away and slash away, but their cause across the floor, their anguished pleas of helplessness directed at myself, Mr. Speaker, a humble opposition backbencher. "Tell us the answer," they shouted, "Tell us a solution," they shouted.

It reminded me of the anguished wails of a trapped animal who in desperation to escape the predicament that it finds itself in, will chew off a leg, or it will sell off a cruise ship, or sell off an airplane or ten, or cut back on food in hospitals, bed sheets, or deny healthy work places to the people who are lucky enough to have a productive job in this society. But like the lynx, like the fox, it won't work. Once you're trapped, you're trapped, and they are trapped in their own ideology. And that is the way of the world, and they will learn soon enough, as the lynx and the fox, and the beaver have learned throughout the ages that it is better to avoid the trap in the first place. And that is why the fox has come to be called "sly", the wolf has come to be called "cunning", and there are no lions in northern Manitoba.

A MEMBER: No lions.

MR. COWAN: But back to the point, the fact is, that there are no simple answers, no simple answers whatsoever. I don't pretend that I can give them in the five or ten or fifteen minutes left to me any complete solutions. And even the complicated answers, which we will be talking about, even the complicated solutions are not foolproof. But that is not to say, Mr. Speaker, and not to infer, and I don't want the members on the opposite side to infer that there is nothing that can be done. There are solutions, and the government must know that if they are not part of those solutions, to quote an old adage, "They are part of the problem." First, they must acknowledge, if they're asking for solutions, they must do a number of things; and first they must acknowledge the whereases of the resolution and has been put before this House by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

The first whereas, Mr. Speaker, the right to perform productive work, it is essential to enable maximum self-realization of the individual. Now that is a self-evident statement, as the Member for Inkster is prone to make on numerous occasions. It is a truthful statement — we aren't telling anybody anything, we aren't telling the members opposite anything that they shouldn't know, or they shouldn't agree to. We aren't saying anything that hasn't been known and commonly accepted for a long, long time.

And now in deference to my seat-mate, who is sitting one seat over, we can go back to 250 B.C. when ecclesiastics said, "There is nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his own works." And outside of the inherent sexism in that statement, it stands as true today as it did centuries ago. Productive work is a rejoicing situation for most people. We can find the same sentiments throughout history, Mr. Speaker. In 1759, Voltaire wrote in *Candide*, "Work keeps at bay three great evils: boredom, vice and need." Not to mention the bill collector, which is something that Voltaire probably didn't have to deal with at that time.

But they must do more than recognize this historical fact. They must also recognize the value of work, the second whereas, "the economic system under which we live fails to provide adequate opportunity for citizens in our society to perform productive work." And yet, they say, "We'll rely upon the market system, we'll rely upon free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I have an example of a survey that was done by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, I believe, and it's part of their consensus program, which they include in each of their publications. And, this one says, "What does 1979 hold for your business?" And there were four questions that were asked — approximately 400 responders to this question. The questions were: This year do you plan to invest more, about the same, or less capital in your business than in 1978? No. 2, will you hire more, about the same, or fewer employees than in 1978? What are your predictions on your volume of business for 1979, greater than 1978, about the same, or less than last year? And, the fourth question was, do you think your profits will be greater than last year, about the same as in 1978, or less than last year? In a quick computation of the results of that survey that was conducted in this province by the spokesperson for much of the business in this province, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, in nine specific segments of the private sector that were surveyed in this survey, in every instance they expected more profits this year than last year. In every instance. In eight out of the nine specific segments, they expected more volume of business. In eight out of the nine, they expected more capital investment, and in eight out of the nine, they expected no increase in employment. We have more profits, more business, more capital investment, and no increase in employment.

MR. ENNS: 52,000 more jobs in one year.

MR. COWAN: The Member for Lakeside talks about the number of more jobs this year than last year. Using conference board estimates, Mr. Speaker, we find out that there are approximately 4,276 more people unemployed in this province this year than there was last year.

A MEMBER: Shame, shame.

MR. COWAN: They have increased the number of people who cannot find productive work by over 4,000 in the past year. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when we're talking about the system, that it is about the time of the industrial revolution that work became employment, and there is a difference. Yet we don't see the word "unemployment", that specific word, semantically, crop up until decades later, when first the system, the capitalist system started to fail. And the capitalists, and the industrialists of the day, having first robbed the people of their work by creating employment for other people, then stripped them of the employment. Unemployment became a part of the system. It had not existed before the capitalist and the industrialist system. It became, at that time, one of the major failings of the capitalist system.

Mr. Speaker, you indicate that I have four or five minutes left. Rather than go through the next two "whereas's", I will bring us right to the meat of the resolution: "The implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining the same." And they don't have the opportunity of obtaining the same. The statistics are hard to pin down, but I have heard a statistic quoted in northern Manitoba, that for every 2,500 job applicants, there is one job available, so 2,499 of them are going to have to go without productive work. The system is failing the people of northern Manitoba in specific.

And what we are talking about here in this resolution, is a full employment program; a commitment by that government to the people of this province — not only to the northerners because that situation exists throughout the province — but a commitment by that government to the people of the province to provide them with employment. A simple enough commitment. I would suggest that it is an honourable enough commitment. I also would suggest that it is a commitment that the government refuses to make. It sits on its hands, and will go back up to northern Manitoba, while INCO rips apart the northern economy. And why do they rip apart the northern economy, Mr. Speaker?

I am quoting from an article from a magazine that the members on the opposite side should be well familiar with — Forbes. And it's talking about INCO, and it's October 1st, 1977. It says: "Can INCO avoid a production cutback? It has already said it won't replace employees lost by attrition in its Canadian mines. If INCO is forced to cut future production, Carter will probably choose to do so in Canada," and the Carter they are talking about is the executive of INCO, "which on the surface seems illogical because Canadian nickel is cheaper to mine. The problem is that less pure nickel from laterite mines have more consumer appeal, besides", and this is the important point, Mr. Speaker, "besides, governments like Indonesia do not look kindly on cutbacks in their countries." So they are not going to cut back on Indonesia and Guatemala because the government there does not look kindly on those cutbacks.

Are we to assume then, because they chose to cut back in Ontario and Manitoba, that Tory governments, Conservative governments, do choose to look kindly on those cutbacks, because that is the assumption we have to draw from that statement made by the executive, high executive level of INCO Corporation?

So this government turns its back, as I said before, on the workers. It cries crocodile tears, and it comes in here in great joy and says: "INCO is going to produce fifty more jobs in an exploration program over the next year", and they conveniently neglect to tell us about the 800 people who have been laid off at INCO since their government took office, and that results in another 480 service employees being laid off. They neglect to talk about the 1,200 employees that INCO has forced out of the job market in Manitoba, because they must — if we are to listen to INCO — they must look kindly upon those sort of actions by a multi-national in our province.

And if they make that commitment, the commitment to full employment, Mr. Speaker, when they finally come to their senses, which they will have to do because their lack of commitment is costing us millions upon millions of dollars; when they do that, then they will come to the solutions, for they are fairly obvious solutions, and they are fairly evident. They must take a grip on the economy of Manitoba; they must make a commitment to the workers; they must make a commitment to the citizens of the province, and they must do so as soon, as soon, as is possible, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, and I quote from it: "urges the implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have an opportunity of obtaining the same."

Mr. Speaker, I share with the members opposite who have spoken so far, I share a desire to see full employment in our society. I believe that where I differ with the gentlemen across the floor, is that I believe that the policies, the economic policies that are being followed by this government are the best and the surest means of ensuring that we will reach full employment, that we will reach the state in our economy where there will be jobs for everyone. I think that if we continue to follow the policies we are following, we are going to end up creating more jobs. Indeed, the first year and a half of our administration, has seen the creation of more new jobs in Manitoba than in the last three years of the ND administration. Without doubt, those are hard facts, not to be disputed.

Now the way to create jobs, it would seem to me is very simple. You have to provide an economic climate where the private sector will feel at home, where it will prosper, where it will expand, and when the private sector expands, they take on more people, they create more employment — meaningful productive employment — not make-work jobs. I would suggest that an economic climate in which there is less government interference, in which there is less government taxation, where there is less government regulation, means inevitably more jobs and more growth.

Mr. Speaker, I listened when this resolution was introduced by the Member for Inkster, and I listened just recently to the Member for Churchill, and they seemed to be always going back to pick out examples from 1938: Tommy Douglas versus Mr. Dunning; even further back than that the Member for Churchill went to when feudalism was breaking down, and capitalism was just beginning. Mr. Speaker, those are the gentlemen, those gentlemen across who are so fond of calling us the dinosaurs, of suggesting that we are the people who go back to President Hoover and others. Let me suggest to them, that they are the ones who are out of touch. The critiques they are offering are critiques that might have been valid in 1931, or 1911, or 1850, but they are no longer valid. The world is changing. But they seem to have missed the point completely. I some time get the opinion that people such as the Member for Inkster, who is now talking from the seat of his pants, after having been up on his feet all day monopolizing the time of this House, he now wants more time. Let me have my twenty minutes. He is so busy talking, I don't think he has read anything, any new research, anything in the last ten years.

I would like to talk about today, the present, what is being written, what's being talked about in the major universities, in the major circles of the economists. I would like to talk about people like Professor Arthur Laffer, otherwise known as the Wedge Theory. I would like to see somebody address themselves to these sort of arguments: According to Professor Laffer, there are two rates of taxation which will provide exactly the same revenue to a government. One rate is high, and one rate is low. The only difference is, that the high rate of taxation discourages economic growth, it discourages the creation of jobs, whereas the low rate of taxation, encourages economic growth and it encourages productive jobs in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about capitalism, and for a change, Mr. Speaker, I want to praise capitalism, because I suggest that capitalism with all the good points and all the evils, has produced all the wealth that we have today, has provided us with the best living standard in the world, has provided the people who are alive today in Canada and in North America, with some of the highest living standards any human beings have ever known. Mr. Speaker, capitalism promises economic growth. It does not promise economic redistribution of income. Capitalism says that if men are free to pursue their economic self-interest, then we will have economic growth, and everyone will be better off. Not better off for the same amount, but better off. This is an extraordinary promise, and it is a promise that capitalism has consistently kept, where it has been allowed to do it, where it hasn't been hampered and beaten to death with government regulation and over-taxation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't live in a society which has a purely capitalist economy. I am very much aware of that. We live in a mixed economy, Mr. Speaker, and we live in a mixed economy for some very good reasons, because capitalism can't do the job all by itself. There is also need and there is a role for government. At no point would I ever suggest that we want to dismantle the mixed economy. To be exact, I would suggest that members on this side of the House are the true defenders of the mixed economy, and the people over there are the ones who offer the most immediate and direct threat to the mixed economy.

I recognize there is a role for government, there is a role as a manager in certain instances, there is a role in terms of redistributing income which capitalism can't do, there is also a role for government in terms of helping to redistribute the wealth that capitalism produces. And where I find fault with the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not satisfied with the mixed economy. You know, I see the Member for Transcona smiling, and he was a senior bureaucrat in a government that seven out of the eight years they were in power — prosperous years in Canada,

prosperous years basically for the western world — seven of those eight years, they increased the government share of the mixed economy; seven of those eight years the public sector invaded the private sector. And each of those years, government spending went up faster than the gross national product. And now they want to continue to do that, forever and ever. If you just take a look, if you extrapolate that situation, it doesn't lead to defending the mixed economy; it leads to a situation eventually where there is no more mixed economy, where there is only a public economy, where there is no more capitalists, where there is no more production of wealth, no more production of jobs. Their policies and the policies they advocate will destroy the mixed economy.

Mr. Speaker, they are continually advocating, day after day, increased burdens on the capitalists, increased restrictions, increased public spending. They are continually advocating a situation which makes it harder for the capitalists to produce the jobs we need, makes it much more difficult. They would like to further weaken the real productive sector. Now, their motives may be good; I'm not sure. Who am I to look into their hearts, into their minds. I don't pretend to know those things. But let me tell you that regardless of their motives, the implications of what they are doing, the implications of their economic policies are bad. They are going to lead to just the opposite to which they — and I believe them, that their stated objectives are full employment, yet the policies they pursue will lead to less jobs, to less productivity in our society. They will lead to a poorer society all around.

They call for more jobs, they call for full employment, but they don't talk about how they are going to do it. They leave us with the inevitable . . . we have to inevitably come to the conclusion that they are talking about more public spending, more taxation, or if not more taxation, more deficit. And let's remember that deficit spending is simply replacing present taxation with future taxation. Now if they are not going to follow that approach, then the only other alternative to what they're suggesting, which is more government involvement, is more taxation right now.

Just yesterday the Member for Inkster waxed eloquent, he went on and on about the reasons for the Conservatives falling in 1969, the reasons that the Roblin government was replaced in 1969, he went on and on, he listed a bunch of reasons, and he gave us the benefit of his great wisdom on which were meaningful and which were not. I just suggest one reason, there is one reason why he is no longer on this side of the House, and that is because there is an axiom that affects all truly free societies, and that is those governments which overtax the people are inevitably turfed out of power.

The Member for Churchill asked: "Why is the system failing? Why aren't these capitalists producing all the thousands of new jobs we need every year?" I would suggest it's because they are overburdened, they are harassed by too much government. Take away some of the government and they will produce those extra jobs for us. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster, when he introduced this resolution, he asked us, he said he wanted to see which of the members of this House were in favour of real right to work, so that the people of Manitoba could make the decision. Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the real right-to-work. I am in favour of producing jobs for people, meaningful jobs. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the members opposite agree with me, they will stop their attacks on INCO, they'll stop their attacks on the Builders' Exchange and the Chamber of Commerce, because INCO and the Builders' Exchange and the Chamber of Commerce have produced infinitely more jobs than all the socialists in the world put together.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the policies being followed by this government will lead to full employment. The policies being followed by this government will, in the end, produce more jobs; in the end, produce a healthier, a freer and a happier society with less strife. Mr. Speaker, that's why I am in favour of the real right-to-work.

Thank you.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly had not intended to speak until I heard the last speaker. You know, it was obvious that he had prepared that speech a long time ago and he thought this might be the time to do it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, there is no doubt, that free enterprise is a great thing. There is no doubt that they will find the jobs. The government could not invent jobs. I think that that's true. But what are those people thinking about? Do you think there is any company — and I'm not going to name anybody — that are saying, you know, because the last words of my honourable friend was: "They're the ones developing all the . . . they should get the credit; they're developing jobs — and period." You think any of them started a year and say, "We're going to have so-many jobs because the people need jobs."? They are employing people because they want to use them, and they will not get any profits or anything without staff. Any time that they can replace people by some other means, they will do it. So let's give credit where credit is due. There is no doubt

that you have to work together and you have to rely on the people that are making money, that are investing funds. But there are other people that are investing their labour in everything they've got, every single thing. They're not diversified, they're not going to work at Eaton's for so-many days and to protect that work at The Bay, or work something else, like some of the industry will invest here, and invest somewhere else. They've got everything, their soul and everything, in that job and that's the only way they can put bread and food on the table of their family. There is no doubt that free enterprise is right.

Now, another thing I'm damned tired with, Mr. Speaker, is lately we're talking about restraint and everything, and the only way is, don't tax the people and they're going to stay here — period. It's a statement that might as well be inscribed in the Bible or on granite. That's the important thing. Well' Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not against a decent form of revenue and profit. There is no doubt about that. And the people, you know, they wouldn't be interested. But let's look at the people. How many people do I know personally who might be making \$2 million a year. They're not going to spend that money, but it is a challenge to them, they want to be able to say, "Well, it's not \$2 million; it's \$2.5 million or \$3 million." And then they're happy, they're going to stay here because they make \$3 million instead of \$2 million.

But where do you draw the line? Where do you draw the line? You know, if you look at that, this is what gets me, gets under my skin, is all we've heard the last year and a half or so is, don't tax the people, they're going to stay here. That might be possible, and I would venture to say that if they reinstate slavery in Saskatchewan, they'd move to Saskatchewan because they'd get free labour. And I'm not joking; I'm not being sarcastic; I'm saying it exactly the way it is, because a corporation has to make money for their shareholders.

But where do you draw the line? Where do you draw the line for these people? There are some people they'll never be able to spend the money that they make, but it becomes a challenge and we need these kind of people. They will create jobs, if it happens that they need people. But what about somewhere, somewhere, somebody from the other side just wake up and say, "All right, but there's a limit. We're going to try to make it a very healthy climate where the people will invest." But if there's other provinces that can start cutting it down. You know, we made a great thing, we were challenged, we were challenged a while ago to say where we stood on this succession duty tax. I'm going to tell you right now, if I had anything to do with it, no way would we reinstate that tax — and start cheering now.

A MEMBER: What would your leader say?

MR. DESJARDIN: I don't care about my Leader; I'm answering the question. When he gets up, he'll answer. I'm saying there is no way. But I'll tell you why, I'll tell you why. I think it is the fairest tax of them all. I think it is the fairest tax, and that I will never deny. I'm not going to stand like you people and think it's a big joke. You know, I think it was \$250,000 — wasn't that it? — (Interjection)— No, no, \$250,000. Just imagine, you're left something like \$250,000 and you don't pay a cent. Now with these new laws, your wife can have the same thing — there's half a million dollars. And you make a big thing of it that you're defending these people. Great if you can do it. But what the hell do we hear from the Minister of Labour? That he's thinking of the minimum wages. And that's where my beef is, that's where my beef is. Of course, if you want free enterprise and if you want these people to go free enterprise, that's what it says' where are you going to make more money while spending as little as possible? Bring back slavery; bring back these things and you'll have it. —(Interjection)—

I'm answering you about this great defence that you had about this free enterprise. I want free enterprise — and I don't blame free enterprise. I know that. You know, we can speak like this now and something would happen, we would do the same thing. And that's where the government comes in. I think that minimum wages are important. If all these people wouldn't work, what would happen? What would happen? They wouldn't make any money at all. So, why should you . . . You know, you make such a great thing about these people. It's practically like playing God. They give them a job — imagine. Don't ask for decent wages, that's not important, they give them a job, and if they don't want it, let's go somewhere else. If there's more people out of work, it is a better climate for free enterprise because they're going to get people to work cheap. And is that good? Is that what you're proud of? You're standing up there and you think it's terrific? You know, it's the same thing; don't build homes; don't build homes; and, you know, it should work the other way, that if you've got too many homes, well then you're going to lose because you can't charge exorbitant prices for them.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . suggest to the honourable member that we are discussing Resolution No. 1.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am not talking about complete employment, I don't know what the hell I'm talking about.

MR. DESJARDINS: And, you know, I think I'm just as well as this member who made such a defence of free enterprise, and it was the greatest thing, and they are the ones pal playing God and telling us we can have jobs.

Now, this resolution suggests that: let's play ball; let's co-operate with the industries. We need them. There is no doubt about that. But let's draw the line somewhere. Let us not say, "Fine." You say you're going to lower this. It was a great thing, and we were supposed to be ashamed of thinking that succession duty is a fair tax. It was just that if it's not the only thing . . . the reason it doesn't work is because some other provinces don't have it, that's all. And that's why Saskatchewan took it off, not that they don't think it's a fair tax. I challenge you people now — I'm not going to make the mistake of your leader of sitting down, I'll finish my time — but I challenge you to get up and tell me and explain why that tax is unfair, and the great sacrifice that it imposes on the people that are getting a quarter or half a million dollars. Well, you haven't got the guts to talk about the minimum wages and trying to create jobs for people and where society is copping out when we're talking about free citizens.

You know, you talk about restraint. It's not restraint at all. You haven't any restraint. It's redirection, it's redirection. You will say, "Okay, you will pay more; all right you'll justify your increase in Autopac, you'll pay more in your premiums." You know, at the end of the month, I look at how much money I've got in my pockets. If it's you that's got your hand in my pocket or if it's my friend here, if the money disappears, it's the same damn thing to me. I want to know what I'm going to be left with. I want to know what I'm going to be left with. So if you, by being chinzy, if the municipality and the hospitals and the school division have to charge more, have to come and get more money, or the premiums, or trying to deal now with extra billing by the doctors, by changing, I'm not going to have any more money; I'm going to have less money. This is the point that gripes me. Go ahead. Try and get a climate here where you're going to have industry — (Interjection)

That's right. But if my honourable friend was in order, I'm damned sure I'm in order, because I know that my honourable friend would never think of being out of order in this House. So that's my safeguard, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to read that at all. I just follow after my honourable friend. —(Interjection)— What's that? I'm not speaking to the resolution? If I'm not talking about employment and fairness in employment . . . What did he say, that you were talking by the seat of your pants? What the hell is he doing up there now?

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, that's the only thing. I agree with a lot of the things that are being said on the other side, but the difference is I guess that you have to have a conscience and you have to draw the line somewhere. And you can say don't. You're going to bring back slavery ' fine, if you because it's going to be a hell of a lot better. Well, why not? Isn't that going to bring industry here, if they have everybody working for nothing? Aren't they going to make more money? Aren't they going to be able to go to the Annual Meeting and say, "Here, this is the money we've made, and we've paid so little wages."? You laugh. And you don't want to talk about us. But if there hadn't been people that are talking the way they are now, slavery would still be here.

Not too long ago, you told us about the greatest country in the world, about how they became rich and all that, the United States. Tell us how they did, tell us how they did. All right. It seems far-fetched when I talk about slavery. Nobody would do that. That's not what they used to say a while back. —(Interjection)— All right, no, I haven't got a guilty conscience but you should have a guilty conscience. You should have a guilty conscience because you don't care about the individual. You know, you're the same one that laughed, you're the one that laughed when you talk about

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is attempting to speak on Resolution No. 1 on the Right to Work. I would hope that all members give him the courtesy of allowing him to carry on.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That's right. My honourable friend said, "You're not suffering," and I'm not. I'm not a millionaire but I'm not going to starve. But I don't begrudge paying a few more dollars in taxes to help somebody. I don't begrudge that at all. My motive in life is not to say I'll make as much money as possible and I'll leave it to my children and don't dare tax it. But this guy who's getting very little, to hell with him. No, that's where the difference is. I don't begrudge that. When ever somebody who has a kind of a social conscience

or who might go along with socialist reforms, you know what they say? They throw at you, well, you should know better, you had a business.

And then we're told that we're dividing the groups, we're dividing the groups. You just don't want us to rock the boat, that people that are having trouble, don't tell them they're having a bad deal, don't rock the boat, everything's fine. We're the privileged class in society and let those people keep their place where they belong. They shouldn't rock the boat, and if this guy has a chance of making \$2 million, well then forget the minimum wages, forget those kind of things.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but this kind of diatribe that we heard a while ago, I think that some time the public of Manitoba has to realize that all right, we believe in free enterprise, but we believe that free enterprise will not, or cannot, act fairly with the employees, that it is the responsibility of government. Most of them will go along. There's always some that can make a buck more, maybe in Saskatchewan or somewhere else. Well, maybe those nickel company and so on. They go where? To Africa and those places where they get cheap labour. Fine, they get their money here and then they buy mines or property somewhere else and they develop it where it's cheaper. Those are the same people that you said a while ago, they are creating all the jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After the last outbreak there, I almost am embarrassed to stand up and contribute my small amount to this very very interesting debate.

The Resolution by the Honourable Member for Inkster has quite a lot of content to it as is usual in some of his resolutions and some of the proposals he makes to this Chamber, and in perusing the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in fully supporting the first clause that he has in the Resolution, "That the right to perform productive work is essential to enable maximum self-realization of the individual." I think that that is a tremendous way to start a resolution, because it has so much truth in it. It fits right in with the Protestant ethics of work, work and the rewards of work — a very very honourable first line.

But after the first line, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution gets a little shakier, and as we go further down to the, "Therefore be it resolved," line the Resolution reaches its shakiest portion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, did I hear my honourable friend correctly referring to it as "The Protestant work ethic"? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that wasn't what I intended by the Resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry I supported that, I'm a Catholic, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I supported that, I didn't know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the support from the Member for St. Boniface on the Protestant work ethic.

Now, the Resolution as I said, Mr. Speaker, begins to lose some of its effectiveness as we get towards the bottom line, and the catch phrase that's in the bottom line presents a certain amount of problem to me, Mr. Speaker, that catch phrase which has come to the surface for various reasons in the last couple months, that catch phrase "the right to work". And I would like to question the interpretation as presented by the Member for Inkster. He never did really explain what the right to work really meant; if it means, Mr. Speaker, right to work as some of my constituents in Pembina constituency may interpret, —(Interjection)— God is with me, gentlemen, God is with me. He will cast light upon the situation, gentlemen.

But if it means that, during a strike for instance, if right to work means that during a strike that members of the union who are on strike, who do not want to be on strike, can peaceably return to their jobs, then I think — along with many people in Pembina constituency — that I could support that concept of right to work.

If it means, Mr. Speaker, that for instance that during the postal union troubles we had last summer, that if a person who had no employment, was maybe on social assistance or unemployment insurance and desired the benefits of the jobs that so many people, apparently, in the Postal Workers' Union had decided were not good enough, if that person on unemployment insurance desired that job and was able to fill the working roles of those postal workers who had decided that conditions

were not good enough, pay wasn't good enough, then I would support that type of right to work. And I think most people in Pembina constituency, and most people in the province would, but this is where we run into some confusion on the right to work.

And the Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker, developed a very interesting train of thought, and in a certain regard the Member for Churchill Churchill further developed that line of thought, Mr. Speaker, and it involved one of the companies in the mining industry in both Manitoba and Ontario, that company being INCO. Now the Member for Inkster developed quite an impressive list of statistics, something in the neighbourhood of 6 million radiators could have been produced from the metals mined by the lay off of those 3,400 workers by INCO in 1978, and I believe he even had a figure of a stainless steel tube which would encircle the globe thirty times. —(Interjection)— Well, if he ran it from north to south it would make an excellent worldwide still with built-in cooling on the poles. But the member for Inkster indicated that because these workers were laid off, there was a considerable loss to the GNP of Canada, and that that loss of GNP was very unconscionable. And Mr. Speaker, to a certain degree, I have to agree with the Member for Inkster that that type of loss of productive man hours, that type of loss of productivity, that kind of loss of salable commodities is not in the best interest of the GNP of Canada. It is certainly not in the best interest of the GNP of Canada in the short run. Rather, if INCO were not allowed to lay off those 3,400 workers and had been forced by one way or another to continue to produce that metal, then certainly the GNP of Canada would have greatly benefited. And it would have greatly benefited, Mr. Speaker, only in the short run.

Now, what would happen then, Mr. Speaker, if we followed through on the logical line of thought the Member for Inkster had developed in that INCO would not have laid off those 3,400 workers and had continued to employ them with their contribution to the GNP. Well, what we would have, Mr. Speaker, is a stockpile of metals produced by INCO; that stockpile of metals would be at whose cost? Well, it would be at the cost of INCO of Canada. They would bear the total cost of carrying that inventory; of paying for the workers; of paying the operating costs of the plant.

Now, I offer you this proposal, Mr. Speaker. What would happen after the short run benefit to the workers, to the GNP of Canada, what would happen after a couple of years of production where the commodity was not salable because the market demand was not sufficient, and what, Mr. Speaker, would happen? Well, we may end up with the situation, heaven forbid, that INCO would no longer be in business; they couldn't afford to carry the inventory; they would be a bankrupt company. The short run benefit definitely would have been to the workers at INCO; would have been to the government of Canada through collection of taxes and revenues; but, Mr. Speaker, in the long run the people of Canada, the workers at INCO, would not benefit from the bankruptcy of INCO. Not 3,400 workers would be temporarily out of work, it would be the entire employment force of INCO, and who would benefit in the long run? No one, no one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member would permit a question?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question when I finish my presentation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member carry on.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, it follows through, and this is where the Resolution gets very very very catchy, and he says, "The implementation of such public and private programs," and it's that very point where the Resolution gets very very difficult to deal with, because is the Member for Inkster then suggesting that after INCO has been required to maintain its labour force, produce itself into bankruptcy, that in order to protect the jobs at INCO then the government, whomever it may be, whether it be the government of Manitoba nationalizing the INCO operation at Thompson, or whether it's the government of Ontario, or indeed the federal government nationalizing INCO, then they can go ahead and produce; they can employ all the people. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that no longer are the shareholders of INCO, the principle owners of INCO, bearing the brunt of production of a commodity that is not saleable because the world demand is not there, it becomes each and every taxpayer of Canada because each and every citizen of Canada is a shareholder in the government that our honourable friends would have owning INCO in order to create the employment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in the long run that no one would benefit if a government nationalized INCO and produced a commodity for which there was no salable market, and this seems to be the nub of the Resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster in the implementation of such public and private programs. If his public programs involve the creation of jobs by nationalization, by direct government intervention, into a system which the free market commodity, the global market commodity, has said we do not need, then Mr. Speaker I certainly

Tuesday, March 6, 1979

cannot support that kind of a Resolution. It is not in the long run interest, Mr. Speaker, of all the citizens of Canada for them to become engaged in such a "make work" project to assure that each and every individual has in fact employment which is gainful and suitable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, when next this subject comes up, the Honourable Member will have ten minutes.

I'm leaving the Chair, and the House will resume in Committee at 8 o'clock.