

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 23 February, 1981

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order. We're on 2.(a)(2) — the Member from Churchill I think, or the Honourable Minister maybe has an opening statement.

HON. KEN MacMASTER: Just a couple of things, I have some literature that I want to give to the Member from Churchill. Also, I've been informed by the Workers Compensation Board that their year ends March 31st, has this year, has last year, and always has. Consequently, their report will be ready in the neighbourhood of March 31st, as of any other year.

There's some of the material that we have put out and as we pick up some of the rest we'll make sure you get it. I don't know what all you have, what you haven't, but that's a start anyway. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I have to go over to the other Estimates Committee for a couple of moments to ask some questions on the Minister's Salary and I know that the Member for Kildonan, and I believe the Member from Logan has some questions to ask in respect to Workplace Safety and Health, so I will leave the floor with them and be back as soon as it's possible to get out of the other Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's a couple of areas that I'd like to touch on in respect to The Workplace Safety and Health Act.

First, I'd like to ask whether the Minister is going to do anything about the unrest that is starting to grow in the agricultural employment area, where some of the organizations are starting to look for some protection in respect to their employees that are involved in the agriculture industry. I realize that there was an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act some time ago and that particular section was not proclaimed because it was going to be reviewed, and of course negotiations were going to take place with the agricultural industry in respect to that and I wondered if the Minister has any comment in respect to what has taken place since that amendment was made, I believe around 1976, and if his Department has been in any kind of conference or communication with the agricultural groups in respect to this area.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have had several discussions with various groups representing the agricultural community, and thought is being given, and I don't know whether it would happen in this session or not but thought certainly is being given to covering agricultural workers under The Compensation Act.

In addition to that we are asking for one additional person within these Estimates, this particular section, to deal with precisely the agricultural people's concerns as it applies to Workplace Safety and some of their other regulations that they're not presently covered on and the Workers Compensation Board situation.

We find that a lot of the farming communities do in fact have their own sorts of policies. Some of the discussions I have had with them tell me that they would in fact like a bit of an option even though they did get covered under Workers Compensation to carry on their own sort of policies, if they are equal too or better. So I guess the answer to the Member for Kildonan, precisely, is yes, we have had conversations with them; yes, we are asking within this particular section, the heading we are under now, for one SMY to be totally assigned to work with the various farming communities; yes, we are considering the Workers Compensation coverage for that group.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister indicate which groups he has contacted and whether the discussions that have taken place to date have indicated what particular areas they would like to have input on and what coverage they are prepared to have?

MR. MacMASTER: The Manitoba Farm Bureau is the major one, but there have been other groups in to see me in addition to that; I just don't recall the names of their organizations. And when I have travelled throughout the province, I have met with farming people and have had general discussions with them.

MR. FOX: I understand the Manitoba Farm Bureau is the one that has been specifically pushing for some legislation because they have found that even though some of the farm employers have taken out insurance, it has generally been inadequate and in the case of accidents and injury, the employee has generally suffered and not been compensated for what has occurred. Now, I realize that we have Medicare, but I believe that isn't sufficient to give employees any coverage when they are off work outside of Unemployment Insurance, which they may be able to get, and in some instances they may not have sufficient credits because agricultural work being seasonal, they don't always have sufficient credits.

Can the Minister indicate whether there are going to be any advances in this particular area of negotiations?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that there is a wide range of items that the member has touched on, virtually all of them, if not all of them, that have been discussed with the farming communities. It is a new area. There is only — I'm just thinking off the top of my head — I know that there are at least one or two provinces in Canada that have quite extensive coverage of their agricultural community. Manitoba is one of seven or eight who do not have very much.

It is interesting, and I think timely, when an industry, and we'll call the agricultural community an industry, when they start coming to government in a brand-new area such as this and say, we're not very sure about the hours and we're not sure about the overtime; we're not really sure about several of these things but we really do want to sit down and start talking with you. As I say, we have had a couple of preliminary discussions and several as I wandered through the province, and they are very interested in the fact that we are going to have one precise individual hired within the Workplace Safety Division to deal with the farming community and get on with maybe educational programs on safety, get some pamphlets and literature out.

I think it is an area, Mr. Chairman, seriously, that I wouldn't want to charge into as a regulatory sort of a body into the farming community. I think that now that they are indicating interest, it is, if I can say, poetically perfect, because I think a lot of these things should cover most people, coming from a union background, but I don't want to impose my union principles on all of society. It's very timely that the farming community is now interested. That's about all I can say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: In view of the fact that legislation was passed four years ago or better, can the Minister indicate what kind of research his Department has done into finding out what the problems would be if there are to be any problems in respect to enforcement, in respect to coverage, in respect to determining how to apply the act that was passed? Or did his Department just say, well it was the other government now there is no more work to do on this on this particular aspect.

MR. MacMASTER: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I could ever be quoted as saying because the other government started something and didn't finish it, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't carry on with it. I've never been quoted as saying that.

The other government as you say, the NDP, when they were in office made the initial effort at least on paper that they were somewhat interested in covering farming people in this province under the Workers Compensation Act. They didn't follow through with it, I think for a probably very good reason. They probably didn't want to go charging into the farming community in a brand new venture and ordering, thou shalt be involved in this sort of thing. I don't know what's — there has been reference made somehow that they were going to do some research or study on how that would be applied. I don't know if they did.

I tell you that we haven't done much of it. I tell you that the farming community is now talking to me personally. They're talking to my staff. They're now saying look, maybe it's about time that Workers Compensation — we give some thought to that. Some of the Workplace Safety sort of things — we give some thought to that. They even get into Employment Standards and they're a little hesitant there because there's so many variables about the agricultural industry that certainly doesn't apply to virtually any other industry. But they are, without question, interested in starting to talk to us, very seriously, about some sort of coverage under the Employment Standards.

So, regardless of whether the NDP did any research or whether I did any research, what is happening today, the facts are, that the farming community is starting to display a fair amount of interest in getting involved in some of the aspects of which I'm responsible.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that at the present time, the agricultural workers are totally unprotected in respect to payment of wages or anything else, is there any statistics available as to how the people have fared in this particular area in respect to payment of wages or holiday pay, vacations with pay, and any other kind of areas that generally fall under The Labour Relations Act? Is any of this being compiled by the Department to see where the problem areas would be in enforcing the act?

MR. MacMASTER: There may be, but in all honesty I don't think there's ever been ten, fifteen, twenty years of government, or twenty or thirty or whatever you want to talk about; I don't think those type of statistics have been compiled. The industry is now interested, I think, and another side point which the Member might appreciate, the agricultural industry is interested I think for their own sakes, very selfishly, and that's fine. Possibly from what I gather, nobody has ever come out and said it, maybe their workforce isn't as well thought of in the eyesight of society and maybe they're having a little trouble attracting and retaining people. The member can appreciate that when that type of feeling comes forth from an industry, it is an excellent time to sit down with them and start talking.

MR. FOX: Another point was raised earlier today, and that's in respect to domestics where, again, we have no coverage of any kind that I am aware of. I just wondered whether there has been any kind of liaison between the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Health, who I would presume has the Care Services under his auspices, and from which flows a lot of domestic work to assist senior citizens and others who are not capable of fending for themselves, and whether there is any kind of information that the Minister is collating to see whether there shouldn't be coverage for domestics at the present time.

MR. MacMASTER: We spent about an hour on that whole domestics situation this afternoon. Does the member really want to go all back through that?

MR. FOX: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go back to it. I want to ask specifically whether the government is aware of where it is governing and whether it is aware of the people that it covers. Now, I said I was aware of what took place this afternoon, but the Member for Churchill did not ask specifically, although the Member for Logan almost touched on it, in respect to Care workers, who come under government supervision and who are farmed out on domestic chores around the province to various people who need their assistance.

I just wonder whether the Minister is aware that this group of people come under government jurisdiction and whether they are looking at it and are going to provide any protection in the future, or

do they not care about Care workers who are domestics?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to spend a minute in discussing farm labour. I keep in pretty close contact with the Manitoba Farm Bureau, with the Canada Farm Labour Pool, with the Vegetable Growers, and just about everybody who is involved in employing labour in agriculture.

I would just like to say that we have come a pretty long way in the last four years or so. By and large, the workers are covered by compensation. Now, there still probably is the odd farmer who doesn't have his labour enrolled with compensation, but by and large, these are the people who — and also are going to get a very poor quality person working for them.

Group insurance has also been made available to many of these employees, which is contributed to partially, and usually on a 50-50 share basis by the employer and by the employee, as you have it with other labour forces. I know that at the Manitoba Sugar Beet Producers, for instance, they have a group insurance plan available to their employees, which they can get 24-hour coverage at much lesser cost than if you wouldn't have that type of insurance. There are also other organizations who have this group insurance available. We are trying to do whatever we can to keep our labour movement happy.

In addition to being involved in it from the employer's side, the chap that is looking after my farm for me is also on the board representing the labourers and I am encouraging him to be on this board, because I would like to know what the concerns are of the labourers in the industry and we are trying to get a good relationship between the employers and the employees in the agricultural industry.

We know that we have to have this if we're going to get competent people working in the agriculture industry. I think that by and large, they have advantage of most of the programs which are available to the other labour forces and possibly and in some instances they have considerable advantages.

The Member for Kildonan asked about vacation pay — yes, 4 percent of the salary, the same as what it is in any other industry goes towards vacation pay and they get their vacation. The Member for Kildonan says it's not enforced. No, it is not enforced at this time, because you do possibly have a much larger variety of labourers in the force. You have a lot of part-time labour in the agricultural force. Very much of it is unskilled so it is not being enforced, but I do not detect any unrest in the farm labourer at the present time and if there is, I certainly would want to know about it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow through with the line of questioning that was put to the Minister by the Member for Kildonan and that is that it seems to me that the legislation that

was passed on Workers Compensation for agriculture way back in 1976, that while it was not proceeded with at that time, I think that there were good reasons for it and I think the Minister eluded to some of them. But I don't believe that it was the intention of the Department of Labour to not follow through on proclamation of those sections and indeed to implement them. You know we've had three and-a-half years of new government, the government that inherited that piece of legislation and has not felt obligated to act on it for whatever reason.

It seems to me that there's a principle at stake that ought to be considered and the question of whether or not all of the industry agrees with the need to do something, I think, is here nor there, Mr. Chairman, because you are talking about people that have a particular interest in their industry; people who may not want to be regulated; not accustomed to being regulated and so on. But that has to take a back seat in my view, Mr. Chairman, to the needs and equity that all workers should be entitled to as a matter of principle, whether they are working in a factory, or whether they work on the land is of no consequence or relevance. The fact is that they are workers and they are working for employers. And if there is pain and suffering as a result of injury, it seems to that is the paramount question that has to be answered, not whether or not the employer agrees that it should be answered. I think that has to take a secondary or back seat position.

I would urge the government, Mr. Chairman, to proceed and indeed to co-op the farm groups into some kind of legislation. I don't expect it to be equal to that, that perhaps is already on the books for other workers, as a first step; ultimately, I think there should be no difference. But if it is a question of finding out the coolness of the water, if you like, if the Minister wants to proceed one step at a time, I wouldn't fault him, as long as he was proceeding in that direction.

I really can't accept the theory that we must yield to the sensitivities of those in the community who don't want to somehow be regulated by government, by law, with respect to working conditions, with respect to unemployment insurance, with respect to worker's compensation, with respect to fair employer practices, or whatever it is, or unfair practices. It seems to me that's the role of government, if there ever was a role. I happen to believe government has a major role, not only in a regulatory sense, but in the economics of the country. But certainly a Conservative Government has a role in the regulatory sense, if you want to accept the Conservative philosophy, Mr. Chairman. Here is an example where, I believe, that part of the Conservative Government's philosophy falls down because they are not involved in the economic areas to the extent that we would like to see them involved, but they are also failing with respect to regulatory areas where they ought to at least be the watchdog of society so that we have some degree of fair play as between employers and employees.

I would like to suggest to you that employers ought to have equal protection from employees. I am not suggesting that you weight the legislation on one side. But it seems to me that it is very difficult to put together an argument that there should not be legislation.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

The Member for Rhineland suggests that it's not really a major problem because if employers were not treating their workers well, then they would have poor-quality people working for them. Now, I don't know what a poor-quality worker is but, Mr. Chairman, if that perception were correct, then why are we not abolishing all of the legislation that does apply to workers in all other jurisdictions and let the employers suffer the consequences, because if you listen to that point of view, that is the answer and, that is, if they don't pay well, if they don't have good employment standards, that they will not have the quality of work and therefore it's a self-policing mechanism.

Why don't we apply that in Canada Packers; why don't we apply that in General Motors, Mr. Chairman? Why do we have all those other rules for all the other people if that is something that works? Obviously those rules were brought in because, while it may work by and large, it doesn't work in every case and therefore we must have rules that govern those instances where people are prepared to violate the principles of equity and rights and fairness and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that while I don't expect a revolution, I would expect some steps in the direction of providing all the necessary labour legislation protection for all employees in Manitoba, not just farmers — domestics, it doesn't matter who they are — as long as they are working for someone, they ought to have the protection of regulation and the laws of the land as they apply, so that they may be applied in a way that is equal to all citizens in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well I can concur with the general statements that the member is talking about, but we can't get over dramatic about the need and I'd say over dramatic. The need was there when the original legislation was brought in in 1976 and for a good reason. I suspect the NDP didn't bring it in, I think, for the same good reason we haven't, if you are talking about Workers Compensation, and I think we're talking about it, we haven't committed that particular piece of legislation yet.

We really believe that there's an education job to be done by ourselves within the community, being a brand new area that never in the history of any legislation has ever been covered in the province. We have no fear of those and we think the, those, number will be very small by the time we're through working with the community. But we have no fear of those who may object. There's always objectors. But it's closer to being more acceptable.

In my opinion the more dialogue you have with the agricultural community in this particular instance and we're certainly now starting to have a fair amount of dialogue with them . . . Now that they have asked for some very definite assistance, some definite education programs, some literature, we're going to assign one person specifically for that. It's in the estimates under this heading, to work with them, and we expect Workers Compensation wanted to proclaim that would be the easiest one. I really expect that somewhere in the future that's going to become a reality sooner than later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage.

HON. LLOYD G. HYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, what with the larger farms, whether they be corporate or otherwise, the stress of this is, they're emphasizing on more protection actually and this of course brings in the unemployment insurance and Workers Compensation, pension plans and otherwise. If these here larger firms, whether they're corporate or what — they're operating on a far larger scale than what they were say ten years ago, so you naturally have to have a well qualified individual to operate these \$75,000 tractors that the farmers are having or being forced to purchase, and the large equipment — you have to have a competent man to be able to keep these machines within the fence lines or the ditches and in order to do that we have to protect them.

So there it is, as far as I can understand it. The farmers today are in the position where they're ready and willing to take advantage of these programs, compensation and unemployment insurance. In the older days when there were more of the family farms around, than what there is today, they didn't — well of course these programs weren't available to us. But they didn't take and emphasize on, or even think about the compensation and such.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First I have a question to the Minister. Since we have a split jurisdiction here in Manitoba, and this is dealing with workplace and the jurisdiction of The Workplace Safety and Health Act, we have certain industries in this province that come under Federal jurisdiction, under the Federal Labour Code. Does the act that we have in place in Manitoba today, with respect to The Workplace Safety and Health Act — is that legislation in effect in places of Federal jurisdiction in this province?

MR. MacMASTER: Well where there's a Federal jurisdiction the Federal standards or Federal legislation prevails.

MR. JENKINS: Well a number of years ago, with respect to safety regulations and what not, there was an agreement worked out between the Federal and Provincial Government, that they would use Department of Labour experts in safety, pollution control, in places of Federal jurisdiction.

Now, I don't know if this is still in effect in the Province of Manitoba and I wonder if the Minister could enlighten us. Due to the fact that a few years ago, one Health and Safety Inspector for the Federal Government was domiciled in the Province of Alberta, in the city of Edmonton and so where you were working in places under Federal jurisdiction, in order to get a Federal inspector in here, it was just about, almost like pulling hen's teeth. It was a very difficult situation. I wonder if that agreement is still in effect between the province and the Federal Government at this time.

MR. MacMASTER: No, it's not, Mr. Chairman. It was cancelled January 1st, 1978. The Feds said they wanted to run their own show.

MR. JENKINS: With respect to the Workplace Health and Safety Committees, as we understand

them under the act, how many committees have been set up in the Province of Manitoba in the various industries that come under the Minister's jurisdiction or jurisprudence? I have some figures here in the . . .

MR. MacMASTER: 438 — I gave those numbers to the members this afternoon and there's 19 workplaces that require a Safety and Health Representative.

MR. JENKINS: I don't know, maybe this is an unfair question to the Minister, but since it is under the places under Federal jurisdiction, is the Minister aware, or maybe I shouldn't say aware, because we're not supposed to say that, but can the Minister enlighten the committee, has he had any information from the Federal Minister responsible for places of Federal jurisprudence in this province of how many health and safety committees have been set up?

Mr. Chairman, has the Minister been in contact with his Federal counterpart to make him aware of the programs that we have here in Manitoba and ask for his compliance for workers in Manitoba that come under the Federal? Otherwise, from what I can see, if we have one set of standards for those that were under — which we have jurisdiction — they're all citizens of Manitoba — unfortunately, because of the jurisdiction which they fall under . . . Has the Minister been in contact with his Federal counterpart to bring to his attention — I think that, I'm hoping that our program of health safety committees and the information and education that we're carrying on in the Province of Manitoba, is of superior quality to that under the Federal jurisdiction.

I would hope that the Minister, when he is dealing with his Federal counterparts, that he would certainly be aware of his own program and if it is superior to what the Feds have in place, that he would be urging them at least to upgrade their legislation, or if not, ask them to allow the workers who are covered under Federal jurisdiction, to fall under those guidelines that have been set up here in the Province of Manitoba and I hope that the Minister will reply in the affirmative to this. I hope he has been doing something.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, we've been in touch periodically with the Federal Government. It's an answer, I suppose there's a lot of rhetoric but the simple bottom line is that they are saying it's their show, it's their responsibility, it's their money, it's their jurisdiction, and thank you but no thanks.

MR. JENKINS: Maybe this is an unfair question and the Minister doesn't have to answer it if he doesn't want to, but is the Minister satisfied that the Feds are doing as good a job or an equally as good a job as what his department is doing in the provincial field? If the Minister — he can just shake his head.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, if I was satisfied I wouldn't be continuously after them hoping that they would take ours.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that answer. The Minister now is dealing with farm organizations with respect to Workplace Health and Safety committees. I see the Minister has bulletined for

extra personnel in this field, one person. Has there been any preliminary work done, especially now when we're looking at corporate farms, where when the season gets busy we may have corporate farms that are working maybe on two eight hour shifts, it could be even three eight hour shifts, depending if the necessity is there to take crops off. In view of the fact that both the Member for Rhineland and the Member for Portage la Prairie said that farmers are dealing with pieces of machinery that are 75, 100,000, 150,000, and I don't disagree with it, because I think that's exactly the type of machinery that you're dealing with today.

Is the department going to set up in this health safety program, the safe operation of machinery; that means driving that machinery, operating it properly, and hopefully setting up of Workplace Safety and Health committees in this field? If we are dealing with the farm industry here in Manitoba, the agricultural community — if we are to believe what we read in the paper here of Friday, November 21st, the record of some of these farms is not that good, especially when there has been no coverage for workers in this. If they are injured they sometimes have a 50-50 cost sharing of some compensatory insurance. In some cases they are told to go on Unemployment Insurance.

The only other out at the present time if someone is operating a piece of machinery that's worth \$150,000, and someone is injured through — it could be the worker's negligence, it could be the owner's negligence. Then we have the only other case where it can work in this case, we'll wind up like they are in some of the states to the south of us, where there is no Workers Compensation, where you find out that people are suing the employer for conditions and sometimes working on a fee-for-service basis by the legal profession. Some of the — I don't think I have to tell the Minister that some of the awards that have been awarded in the United States are of a considerable amount of money.

I am glad to see that some farm groups are starting to come forward but I think that the Minister should be pressing and pressing very hard for some sort of coverage, because otherwise we are going to wind up with litigation all across this province. No disrespect to the legal profession, but if there is money to be made on a fee-for-service basis, and they can get awards in the courts, I would say that the farm community is going to be in a very sad situation unless the Minister is prepared to in some way or another bring under coverage of some type — it may not be Workers Compensation, it may be some other type of compensation that can be worked out with the farming community of Manitoba, but eventually there will be litigation. The price of a piece of machinery might be small in comparison to the settlement that someone may receive in a court of law.

I would say that the Minister has a definite responsibility here to take up the gauntlet that has been thrown to him now, evidently by the Farm Bureau, and to put the bit in his teeth and really get to work on it. I am sure that there is some coverage for those workers, who unfortunately in the past through no fault of their own, sometimes do get — I believe one case here, somebody else pulled the lever. It went down on the other fellow's hand. You can't blame the worker that was involved.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

Then it comes down to management. Management should be making sure that the workers that they are employing in that industry are protected and are aware of the pitfalls of operating that type of machinery. There are some very complicated pieces of machinery that are in the agricultural field today as compared to what they were 25-30 years ago. We are seeing all sorts of machinery coming onto the market every year and I am sure that the people who are far more familiar with the farm industry than I am are aware of this.

For the Member for Rhineland to say that he's not aware that people are — that the farm workers are — I would say that they're up in arms — but they are certainly —(Interjection)— the Member for Roblin says there's nobody out in their part of the country at all . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time.

MR. JENKINS: . . . maybe that's part of the problem, why they are not getting the workers. And I would say that if a person is injured he is entitled to go on so many weeks of sick or injured leave, but if that is the only protection that he has in this province other than the two weeks coverage prior to him becoming eligible for UIC payments, and if he hasn't the sufficient time in, then he's out in left field with no coverage whatsoever, and I would say to the Minister that I would hope that he would be pressing, and pressing hard to make sure that there is coverage for these people in this field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There have been a number of things mentioned over here which I thought that I should reply to, and one of them mentioned both by the Member for Logan and the Member for Lac du Bonnet was labour protection. The Member for Logan also mentioned the work litigation. I know that every farmer is aware of how these litigations have gone, and in order to get farmer protection, then you have to have labour protection. The farmers are protecting themselves against this type of thing because labour can take them for a ride, because your usual litigation cases have invariably gone against the farmer, and the farmer ends up being responsible for keeping this person as long as his injury is sustained and if it's a lifetime injury then he becomes a liability on that particular farm. So the farmers are doing this not only for labour's protection but for their own protection, so they're getting into various insurance schemes not only Workers Compensation but their other insurance schemes which are probably much better than Workers Compensation that give you 24-hour coverage instead of just coverage or just while you are on the job.

The Member from Lac du Bonnet also mentioned that we should have many more regulations. Well Mr. Chairman, if I may say that this is exactly the reason why the member probably is sitting on that side of the table than on this side. We remember, very well, when he was the former Minister of Agriculture, that the regulations that he was going to impose upon the farming communities, where your labourer, he was going to be classified, it was going to be either a tractor operator or a truck operator or he was going to work in a hog operation or whatever.

Well, anybody who is familiar with farming operation knows that your tractor operator also has to drive a truck at certain times or your truck operator has to drive a tractor at certain times. There's just no way that you can regulate the farming industry in that way.

Shift work was also mentioned, and I think that the best example of what we had when you're trying to regulate the farming industry is what happened last year. When the farmers went out to hire their employees in April it was very warm weather, and they got their labour but everything was dry, they didn't get their labour really working until such a time as the rains came which was the end of June. So, they were out there with their labourer paying them the regular wage because they were hoping that they were going to get rain the next day or the next week or whenever and they wanted to be sure that they had the help available, and when the rains came then naturally that labourer was asked to work and they were glad to work more than eight hours a day. I don't think any farmer is going to ask any more hours of work from his employee than what that employee can handle because again the nature of the implements that he's operating, you don't want a tired man when you're having him operate \$150,000 worth of equipment.

So, you're very careful in your entire operation. I just can't see where we can put the farming operation under the same type of regulations which you would be putting on a factory where you're working on a line which is doing certain things and everybody does his thing and you can stop after eight hours of work, but you certainly cannot do that on the farm, so Mr. Chairman, I just cannot buy that type of logic at all and I would again assure the members that there really is no problem at the present time with the farm labour, if there was then I'm sure that I would be the first one to know about it.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a very interesting contribution on the part of the Member for Portage and indeed the Member for Rhineland on this question of whether or not there is a need to something for labour that is involved in Agriculture. The thing that bothers me is not so much their reticence to move into the direction of legislation, as opposed to the reasons that they give for it, Mr. Chairman.

I think the Member for Portage has spelled it out perhaps not realizing what he was indeed conveying to this committee and I would hope that he wouldn't want to leave us with that impression but the impression that he left us with is that there's a need to protect capital, capital tied up in the expensive farm machinery and therefore that in itself is a self-policing device, that farmers will respect the need to protect their capital and therefore will pay well, will have fair standards of employment and so on. You know if we're going to have some decency about this debate, it has not to do with whether capital ought to be protected but whether human beings ought to be properly protected and reinforced in the workplace.

What has capital got to do in the consideration of whether we pass labour law or not. It is again the same old argument as we had a moment ago about conditions if they were bad enough wouldn't attract the employees. The same argument applies, then

Monday, 23 February, 1981

why do we have labour laws in the first place? So, I would hope the Member for Portage would reflect on his contribution to this debate and at least clarify it, because I don't believe that the Member for Portage is putting capital ahead of the interest of workers or safety or fairness, Mr. Chairman, at least I would hope that he is not conveying that kind of philosophy to this debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I've only got a couple of questions, for the Honourable Minister or the committee and of course it deals with in fact if the farmer has taken out coverage with Workers Compensation or private insurance. It's in the matter of dealing with the fertilizers, the anhydrous ammonia, the pesticides, the carcinogens, etc., etc., as to whether in fact the Province is totally responsible, the Department of Agriculture in this Province is responsible or Federal Agriculture or the Licensing Bureau at the Federal level is responsible and I know the problems of the dust, the fumes, the gases are on the record and I think that maybe if the Minister, maybe he couldn't do it today, could put it in the record, as far as the Province is concerned for members like myself, or I could take it to the farm people in the province as to who is in charge of this ever changing world that we're in today regarding these different formulas that are being used by the farm communities today and then I could certainly pass it on, but as far as the year ahead is concerned it likely would change in the next year.

The other one that haunts people from my constituency the most about the farm labour pool is Unemployment Insurance. It's almost impossible to, once the Unemployment Insurance periods come on to take a farm chap, he would draw Unemployment Insurance, he doesn't want to get cut off, so to get back through all the red tape to declare his earnings and then under the terms of reference of the Unemployment Insurance Act, they're supposed to go around from place to place to place and try and get a job and to the best of my knowledge, I don't think that a farm is considered to be a workplace when they can go to a store or garage or a hardware or all these places and say, I have been at those places to try and find a job, but to my knowledge I've never and I've tried to get the Unemployment Insurance — if they go to a farm and ask for a job, it's not considered a legitimate place in the Unemployment Insurance Act. I could be wrong on that but those are creating many problems for the farmers in my area and in the wintertime maybe they only need help for maybe two months but the Unemployment Insurance legislation certainly creates a lot of problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Well, I'd like to start off, Mr. Chairman, by thanking the Member for Roblin for his last point. I had never realized that before and I think that was a good piece of information to this discussion on the Workplace and Safety and farm workers generally. So I thank him for it.

I'd like to ask the Minister some follow-up questions, to those raised by my colleague, the

Member for Logan, with respect to the role of the Province in areas where the Federal Government might have jurisdiction but where in particular circumstances, the Province might be involved. I have a particular case in mind, one is the case whereby a person employed by a provincial firm incorporated in Manitoba, and I would think subject to Manitoba law and regulations, was killed in an explosion that took place in the C.N. reclaim yards three years ago. Apparently, possibly, a shell exploded. I took that matter up with the Attorney-General, who informed me sometime ago, and also repeated this in the Legislature, that he had sent a letter to the CNR asking that a check be made of the reclaim yards to ensure that there weren't any other explosives, especially shells, that were lying around that could in fact lead to another fatality if another explosion took place.

As far as I can ascertain, the CNR has not responded to that request, has not formally notified the Attorney-General that they have in fact undertaken that sweep of the reclaim yards. What brought this to mind again was the accident that took place in Transcona a few months ago where a person employed by a company incorporated in Manitoba, was killed on land that supposedly was under the jurisdiction of the province, but I do believe they have run into some difficulty in terms of jurisdiction there because the shells were from the army, and the army said that they were looking into this.

What I am afraid of in these instances is that the ball does drop between stools, and I think that with respect to the CNR, that they have not, to my satisfaction and too bad he's not here, the Attorney-General's satisfaction, responded sufficiently with respect to their check that they were supposed to have made, of the reclaim yards at the C.N. Shops in Transcona.

We can say, well, this isn't our business, but surely it is our business because provincial firms do go onto that property from time to time and undertake work. So I would like to ask the Minister, under whose jurisdiction is it when a provincial firm goes onto Federal property or C.N. property or C.P. property to undertake work? Are those workers under the jurisdiction of the provincial laws, or are they under the jurisdiction of the Federal laws.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the CNR situation is something that I wasn't aware of, the one that the Member for Transcona said is three years old and he has been dealing with the Attorney-General's Department. If he wishes to scratch down some details on it for me, from my viewpoint, or our department's viewpoint, I would be glad to give him as many specifics as I could.

On the other one where the death occurred, it is our jurisdiction, but the army has, because of their very direct involvement, they are carrying out, with their massive amount of expertise, the investigation. I believe — I could stand corrected — I don't know how much farther we should go into the last one because I believe the inquest is presently in place.

But, yes, there are areas where we have — I don't know if the proper expression is joint responsibility — but we do in fact have some responsibility in the second instance you talk about; we do have responsibility in there.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

MR. PARASIUK: I will in fact provide the specific information and I will get the Attorney-General to send to you a copy of the letter which he indicated he had sent to the CNR in the House last week. I know that the CNR has taken the position that this is within their jurisdiction and they will look at it, but it strikes me that it is important that they satisfy the province, and especially the Department of Labour, that workers going into that area can expect a reasonable, and I would go even further, could expect to work in safe conditions.

The reason why I went through the Attorney-General is that at that time, the investigation had taken place under The Fatal Enquiries Investigation Act and is a follow-up to that.

But I certainly will provide that specific information to the Minister, because I would like to get formal assurance from the CNR that they have indeed completed the sweep; that they have called in experts; and that that area is safe for workers, not only under Federal jurisdiction, but safe for workers under provincial jurisdiction who may have to go there. I would like to ask the Minister a general question regarding Workplace Safety and Health committees. The legislation states that these will be voluntary committees, I believe, and I would like to ask the Minister if he could indicate whether his department has done much research to determine how many work places in Manitoba would be eligible, under the legislation, to establish Workplace Safety and Health committees?

MR. MacMASTER: No, we haven't researched the precise number, Mr. Chairman. Our approach to the Workplace Safety committee structure is such — as a matter of fact, it's not voluntary, once you have named a particular company, it is no longer voluntary; they must in fact put one in place. So I will clear up that particular point.

We haven't researched the number that could be. What we are determined to do is keep chunking away at it and biting away at the situation and get those that we do have in place working well. I wouldn't feel any better, in fact, I'd feel worse, I think, if we had a thousand or two thousand named and somebody, the Member for Transcona could be the one asking the question, how many are really working well and I had to stumble around and say, well, you know we think maybe 50 are, or 100 are, or 150. I would rather take it in pieces of 100 or 150, 200 or whatever, and work like heck with them, get them working well and then move on to other areas, so that eventually we have a large number but we can, by conscience, say they are all working reasonably well.

MR. PARASIUK: Could I ask the Minister to inform me how many Workplace Safety and Health committees are presently in place?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, with no sarcasm, this is about the sixth time that that number has been given out: 438, plus 19 that are designated for individual representatives because the workplace is really too small to have a committee as such.

MR. PARASIUK: I can appreciate that that question probably has been asked. I want to raise it, though, in the context of my previous question, which the

Minister said he didn't have the information to give us an answer. Four hundred and thirty-eight may be a good number; it may be a bad number. I think it depends on what should be covered, or what could be covered. If in fact we are talking about a situation whereby something in the order of, say, 3,500 or 4,000 workplaces within Manitoba could have Workplace Safety and Health committees, and I would suggest that if they could have Workplace Safety and Health committees, that the objective of the department with respect to this program is that they should ultimately have Workplace Safety and Health committees.

I can appreciate the Minister saying, well, I want to make sure that the committees are working well. Given that, and I agree that I would like to have the committees working well as well, you would want to ensure that you expand that coverage, because surely you wouldn't want to have, say, 3,600 workplaces not having committees. Because presumably if they are working with respect to 400 places, they could work with respect to the other 3,600 or whatever it is.

What concerns me is that we have no idea of what our overall objective is and we really don't have a good enough way of monitoring our progress in terms of trying to achieve fairly universal coverage of the workplaces in Manitoba, with Workplace Safety and Health committees. I'm not a real detailed expert in this, but I am lead to believe that there are something in the order of 3,000 Workplace Safety and Health committees in Saskatchewan. I know that the number of workplaces in Manitoba is larger or greater than that of Saskatchewan. So then I wonder to myself, well shouldn't we be moving faster than 438 and if that is the case, why aren't we moving faster? Is it because we don't have sufficient staff? Because we're not really moving fast enough to promote this program, because it strikes me that the best way to ensure workplace safety and health at the workplace level, is to have both management and workers involved in these committees, working together in a co-operative manner, to ensure that that happens. And I'm pleased that it's happening in 438 and I say that it should be happening a lot more and I don't know whether it should be another 1,000 at this stage or another 2,000 and one way of determining of what it should be is to get some idea from the Minister, from the department, as to how many workplaces might be eligible. That's why I asked the previous question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. HYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to clear up one thing. The Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated it and that possibly that I was prepared to — or indicated that I was putting capital investment before the safety of the labour force. If that is the way it come out, it was not my intention to leave it and I don't want it left on the books in that form.

Accidents are going to continue to happen. They're going to, they will continue, they will more as time goes on with the bigger equipment that we're using today. I want to make certain right here now, Mr. Chairman, that I, and my family do take every precaution we can to protect the labour force that work on our place, if it's through insurance, unemployment insurance and Workers Compensation

Monday, 23 February, 1981

or better still, the private policies that are available to us to protect our investments and the labour force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Member for Transcona has brought up the area of Workplace Safety and Health committees and I think it's important that we examine this area in some detail, because I think it is an area where we will find ourselves in disagreement with the government's approach to the provision of mandatory Workplace Safety and Health committees.

The Minister has indicated that there are 438 committees now in place, not all of which are functioning, I would imagine, because some of them are new committees which have just been designated and have not had an opportunity to develop to the point where they're functioning satisfactorily yet and that he has done that because he feels that it in fact is a proper course of action. It is the way in which he wishes to proceed in the development of Safety and Health Committees in this province. And we all know that they are important. No one in this room would disagree as to the importance and the role of Safety and Health Committees. They are extremely important.

However, not only do we disagree with the Minister on this particular point, but the Advisory Council disagrees with the Minister on this particular point and it was a recommendation of the Advisory Council that all workplaces, or excuse me, that's an oversimplification — that great numbers of workplaces in certain categories with more than a certain number of employees have mandatorily designated Workplace, Safety and Health committees. And that was a recommendation that was forwarded to the Minister.

I would ask the Minister why it is that he chose to proceed in the manner in which he has chosen to, rather than to proceed in the way in which the Advisory Council offered their recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the Advisory Council is just exactly that. It's an Advisory Council and they put their advice forward. Some is taken in part as all advisory councils, some in total and some part of. This is part of the numbers, part of the mythology they asked us to consider and our department put together a number and we eventually implemented that number.

I know what Saskatchewan's done. The Member for Transcona says 3,000, well that's easy to find. That's what they have. And I'm not going to run a match or a race with Saskatchewan as to who has the most numbers of committees that are functioning well, but I think in all honesty, they'll tell you that large numbers of those committees are in name really only, and it's just virtually impossible for them to, with that large number, really work the heck out of it and assure themselves those committees are working. They know that they all aren't; we know that they all aren't; and nobody's taking any glory or anything about that.

The numbers the Member for Transcona mentioned, we have, if you combine the mines

people in Saskatchewan, though they are in fact presently under the Workplace Safety, but if you combined our mines along with our Workplace Safety, the department in Saskatchewan has 41 people involved and in Manitoba we have 67. So that's the answer to the member, for numbers sake. And again numbers don't always signify anything. I don't think person to person, they're any better or any worse than our people.

MR. COWAN: Well, the Minister indicates that this is one of the options which was presented to him by the Advisory Council and by this I mean the designation of 162 more specific committees. But, if I can refresh his memory, what the Advisory Committee suggested to him, and it was passed by the Advisory Council, was that except where committees are required under certain sections of classifications of the Workers Compensation Board, in all workplaces where five or more persons are employed, the employer shall cause a worker not connected with management to be designated as a worker, Health and Safety Representative.

And then it says in No. 2, In workplaces classified by the Worker's Compensation Board of Manitoba in the following groups — and it goes into the different groups, Group 1, Group 2, Group 3, Group 5, Group 6, Group 7, Group 8 and Group 9, — In employing 15 or more persons, the employer shall cause a committee to be established to be known as a Workplace Safety and Health committee and than in 3, it says, In all workplaces not specified in Section 2 or Section 6, employing 25 or more workers, the employer shall cause a committee to be established to be known as the Workplace Safety and Health committee. Then it goes to No. 6, In all workplaces classified by the Worker's Compensation Board as group 1.5 construction, the employer shall cause a worker from each trade not connected with management with the designated worker's safety and health represented for that trade and than where there's 3 or more trades, which are represented at any one time on construction sites, there shall be a committee and according to the February 15th, 1980 meeting of the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council, Clause 6 and 7 regarding construction were dropped and Clauses 1 to 5 of that proposal be adopted and Clause 6 and 7 to be tabled for a later date and to wait for the construction report and the vote was four in favour of and two against. Those two persons who were opposed, were opposed to Clause 3 in the proposal as it applies only to office workplaces.

So it was a fairly definitive statement by the Advisory Council that there should be this type of formula implemented for the designation of Workplace Safety and Health Committees in this province. And the Minister it is only a recommendation and he's absolutely correct, it is only a recommendation. However, if the Minister will recall, as we've gone through Estimates over the past two years, and two years running, everytime we ask the Minister about the designation of more Workplace Safety and Health committees, the Minister said the Advisory Council is looking at it and the Minister said, and these are his exact words, "They will come up with good criteria" for the designation of Workplace Safety and Health committees.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

And the Advisory Council, in my opinion, did come up with acceptable criteria for the designation of Safety and Health committees, and the Minister tells us now that, after having led us to believe all that time that he was going to act on the advice and the recommendation of the council, that in fact he chose not to act on the advice and the recommendation of the council.

The Minister may say that there would be an extreme amount of difficulty in being able to make all those committees function. I agree with him, however, the Advisory Council took that under consideration also. As a matter of fact, they went to Saskatchewan, where there are 3,000 committees functioning, in order to determine as to how that was working, and their recommendations arising out of that trip were extremely positive. The chairperson of the Advisory Council, and I don't have it before me now, but I can recall it, suggested that it was in fact working for them. The employer representative on the Advisory Council who went there said that it works well for them. He also said, in all fairness to him, that he was not satisfied with their percentage effectiveness figures, however, he did say that it worked well for them. He said that it might not work well here, however, he didn't speak against it, other than to say that.

The Director of the division, who was at that meeting, also suggested that they were performing well in respect to data base, coding their minutes, putting them on codes, and that that should be looked at here. Those 3,000 committees were formed in a matter of months in Saskatchewan by the Saskatchewan Department making that a priority and going out and concentrating on that. So it can be done. As a matter of fact, most other jurisdictions are moving towards that type of designation of committees.

I had someone, while we were in here today, calling the different jurisdictions to find out exactly how they designated committees, and I'll give you a rundown, to show that we are, in fact, out of step with most of the other provinces in respect to the designation of committees.

In B.C., they have different classifications: "A" is the most hazardous industries, some construction industries, forestry, mines, hazardous industries, where 20 or more workers are involved, there is a mandatory committee; "B" as well, which is a less hazardous industry; and in "C" which is office, in training, in teaching and retail, a workforce at 50 or more necessitates a committee. They are very satisfied with that. As matter of fact, they think it is working extremely well. They have a system where they take the minutes from the committee hearings and they compile them, and it presents them with a fairly accurate picture of what is happening in that province in respect to occupational safety and health. That system has been in place for about 15 years and it has been developed over that period of time and they believe it to be an extremely well-run system.

Now, Alberta, and I don't think I need to say anything about the politics in Alberta, but Alberta doesn't mandate committees at all; that's my understanding, that it is up to the Minister, and they are all voluntary at this point and they find that that's working well for them. One would have to look more deeply into that to verify or not to verify.

Saskatchewan, we have talked about the 3,000 committees, of which only 30 percent are giving minutes on a regular basis. But one has to take into consideration Saskatchewan's approach, that if there is a problem, they are going to go in and demand those minutes, or at least strongly encourage those minutes. If there is no problem coming out of that workplace, then they are going to be more lax about the minutes. So, while they say that there is only 30 percent reporting minutes on a regular basis, that in fact does not mean that the other 70 percent are not functioning; it just means that is their approach to it, —(Interjection)— and as the Member for Transcona says, it's still 900 committees, and those 900 are in the most hazardous industries.

Ontario, 20 or more employees in shop areas. They exclude office workers, retail establishments, multiple residence accommodations, libraries, museums, those sorts of places, or by Ministerial order, where there is a designated substance being used, and those designated substances number seven in length. They are mercury, lead, asbestos, silica, . . . cyanates, and noise. They think that their system is working extremely well, and working like a charm, because the inspectors are very actively involved in the formation and the development of those committees. I think our inspectors are probably of that calibre also and if they were provided with that direction to work with the committees in such a way, that we too would think the committees were working very well in such large numbers.

New Brunswick, 20 or more employers, since 1976, have to have committees; Newfound, 10 or more employers. If less, they must have a rep, which is one of the workers. Nova Scotia, I wasn't able to get today. No committees in P.E.I. They don't like them there, they tell us; they don't think they work very well. So that's a quick run across the country. Quebec has new legislation in place, as well, in respect to committees.

So what we can see is, while Manitoba is sticking to the old process of designating certain committees, the other jurisdictions are taking a broader approach to it and seem to be enjoying success in respect to their approach.

I would ask the Minister, since he has chosen not to take a very strong recommendation from the Advisory Council, what evidence was presented to him, by whom, that would substantiate and would support his particular approach to this particular problem?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, we are satisfied that the committees that we have are functioning. Out of 300 — 314 originally — something in the neighbourhood or 300 or slightly better, are functioning very very adequately. We are aware of that and I am satisfied that that is the route to go. My department is satisfied that's the route to go. In three to four years, whatever it is, three years, I suppose, since we have really been moving in this direction, it is a degree of success. Saskatchewan certainly now allegedly has 900 that are reporting in some method. I wonder, really, how many inspectors are attending their meetings and how many types of educational seminars they are putting on with the numbers of people that they have involved, which are about two-thirds of what we have.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

Yes, we do deal with our committees. Our inspectors do deal with them. We run educational sessions with the employers and the employees and, I think, originally having 314 designated areas and 300 are working very well at the moment, is a very good record. If we can, a year from now, say that we have 100, or 135, or 140, whatever it was that we added, then I think that's substantial progress. There is no sense, in my opinion, of just having large numbers for the sake of large numbers. I want whatever we have working well, working with our staff, working with our education people to assure ourselves that they are very meaningful committees, not just numbers.

MR. COWAN: I certainly hope the Minister is not suggesting that we want large numbers of committees just for the sake of large numbers. We want a different system of designation of committees because we believe the different system to be better, and the Minister believes his system to be better. I suggested at the beginning that we would probably be in disagreement as to the way in which to proceed in respect to designating committees; I see that we are. That does not surprise me, nor do I believe that it surprises the Minister.

However, I had asked him if he could provide us with sources as to the reasons for his deciding to proceed in the way in which the government has decided to proceed. It is in contravention, it is directly opposed to the recommendation of the Advisory Council. Who is providing the Minister with advice that would suggest that he should disregard what the Advisory Council was saying to him in very strong language after so many occasions, and I can find the exact references in the Hansards if necessary, where he said we are awaiting the Advisory Council recommendations; the Advisory Council is going to come up with good criteria. Who told him that wasn't good criteria or did he just make that decision on his own?

MR. MacMASTER: We took portions of the advice of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee is there again to advise. It's up to the government to make the decision on how their advice should be implemented and what portion of it. I have said the manner in which it's going to be implemented and at this particular time I see no reason to change our approach.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates time and time again, that they took portions of advice, and I can only suspect that he's talking about advice concerning Workplace Safety and Health committees from the Advisory Council and based their decision upon those portions. I would ask him if he could be more specific as to when the Advisory Council ever recommended to him the approach that he has chosen.

MR. MacMASTER: Nobody said that I took advice on the approach that we're taking. The approach that we're taking is our approach and it's going to be maintained, that approach, unless darn good evidence is brought forward why it should be changed. But the methodology of accident experience and nature of work and that type of thing, was taken into consideration by our

departmental people and the Advisory Council is aware of that type of criteria, and we concur in that area. We just don't don't concur on the number game.

MR. COWAN: I guess we are going to have to continue to choose to disagree, or agree to disagree in respect to this. I don't want to get into a long drawn-out discussion on it. We have had them in the past. I do regret that the Minister has chosen to proceed along the course which he has. I regret that he has rejected the advice of the Advisory Council. I regret that we don't have more committees because I believe that just the formation of a committee, just the designation of a place as a committee, that provides an avenue for workers to more fully express their concerns in respect to workplace safety and health hazards.

The committee doesn't have to function all the time for it to play a role in that workplace. If the Minister designated, such as Saskatchewan did, 3,000 and had 900 of them working, that would still be 500 more than we have working now, and those other 2,100 would be providing some sort of avenue and mechanism for the employee to protect himself or herself at work. We do feel that that way is better. We understand and we recognize the difficulties with it but we feel that the advantage of it far outweigh the approach that we have in Manitoba at this time.

The Minister indicated last year in Estimates that — I just have to find my notes — while I'm looking for my other notes, perhaps before going on to that, I would like to stay on another recommendation of the Advisory Council which involves itself with this department, and that was a recommendation on December 14th, 1979, that was unanimously passed, that the Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Branch, be named as the Minister as our representative to the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. They have brought that up in a number of Minutes. The Minister has chosen to name someone else, even previous to that recommendation, as our representative on the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, and I would ask him if he has any intention of following the advice of the Advisory Council in respect to our representative on the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. MacMASTER: The previous Deputy Minister in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Jack King, was the first representative to that committee. His term has expired. I have been in touch with that national body and told them as soon as I have a new Deputy Minister, my present one is retiring, once I have him in place, then we'll discuss the makeup of appointments and that one will have a high priority on my list. But I think in all fairness, the new Deputy Minister should be involved in making that decision.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has jogged my memory and perhaps I had neglected to say this at the opening remarks, and I am certain the Minister will not suggest that it shouldn't be said now, and that is, we have to commend the Deputy Minister who is retiring for his many long years of service to the Department. I know he has been well liked and well considered by almost all who have come in contact with him. —(Interjection)— I am going to avoid the

Monday, 23 February, 1981

temptation to respond. However, just for the record the Minister had said that is the same as the Minister, and I don't want to get embroiled in that argument because he had lectured me at the beginning of his remarks that this was not the place for character assassination, and we've been pretty good at it so far, better than most years, and I know we'll keep the discussion on the high level that it has begun on. But we do want to commend the Deputy Minister for his many activities and his long years of service and wish him very very well in his new endeavours. I know that he will do well, and I know that the Minister will choose his next Deputy Minister very well, and that he too or she too, perhaps I shouldn't make the inference that it would be a male, that whoever it is will in fact do their utmost for the workers in this province.

Having said that, I would like to get back to the Estimates at hand. The Minister has indicated that there will be a discussion as to who that representative on the Canadian Centre for Occupational and Health and Safety as soon as the new Deputy Minister is in place. We look forward to that and we hope that he will take the advice of the Advisory Council into consideration.

Can the Minister indicate what regulations have flowed from his department over the past three years in response to the many suggestions that there was need for more regulations to deal with matters that were not effectively dealt with under the legislation, as is always the case?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: None to date, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has indicated none. I wonder if he could be more explicit as to why we have not had those regulations when it has been suggested by him time and time again that those regulations were necessary and that those regulations would be forthcoming in the near future. Why is it that we are still left without any additional regulations for the Workplace Safety and Health Act, to supplement it and to provide better protection?

MR. MacMASTER: I have never said that they were necessary in past. I say that we are now getting to the stage where some may be very likely proposed in the near future, but up to date we have been trying to live with a new Act which was proclaimed about six days before we were elected, so we have had it with us for three, three and half years. We have done some reasonably substantial things that all members are aware of and the possibility of regulations in the near future is a very real one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2) — pass — The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: What regulations might those be, Mr. Chairperson?

MR. MacMASTER: There is consideration, and I want it made clear it's consideration, being given to regulations as it relates to first aid, rollover protective structure regulations, logging, asbestos, hearing, some regulations possibly as it relates to the

construction industry; some regulations as it relates to toxic chemical regulations and those are in the works — nowhere near ready but I certainly suspect that's the seven areas that we would be moving on in first.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has, in the past, suggested that regulations would be forthcoming, and he has even provided himself with a schedule, and I direct his attention specifically in regard to the hearing control conservation program where he suggested it would be forthcoming last year and on many occasions the Minister has suggested that regulations would be forthcoming in the near future. I know that's not a specific date, however it is an indication that we can expect those regulations in the near future and the fact is that he's giving us that sort of general indication now, and we only hope that he is more successful in fulfilling the expectation than he has been in the past because there has not been very much activity in respect to formalizing regulations, although in fact there have been regulations discussed at many levels. As a matter of fact the first aid regulation which the Minister indicates is one that should be implemented shortly, went to the Legislative Counsel over a year ago, or approximately a year ago for a review, and yet we don't see any regulation coming forward. I would suggest that they are dragging their feet on the matter of regulations and that there is need for some change in existing regulations and there is need for new regulations.

I understand that the spray painting regulation and the sanitary and hygienic welfare regulation are not consistent with the Manitoba Fire Code and the Manitoba Building Code respectively, so those have to be changed. If they are not consistent then it would seem to be an urgent need for that sort of change as to avoid contradiction and duplication, and yet nothing has been forthcoming in that respect, and the Minister has known about that, or at least the Department has known about that for quite some time.

We are concerned that we have heard those sorts of assurances before and we are concerned that we may hear them again without the regulations having been brought forward for examination and review. We don't want regulations just for regulations' sake, we want them because, as the Minister knows, they are an important supplement to the act and they will provide more protection for workers in this province, and for that reason they should be pursued with all due haste.

I would like to move on to a different area now and that's in respect to the Chief Medical Officer. We had a bit of a discussion earlier in the day as to why that position has not been filled. I went back through my notes and I certainly don't have all of the references to that Chief Medical Officer, but I just want to read one to the Minister which was about two years ago, on May 14th, 1979. My question to the Minister was, could he indicate why there had not been an appointment of a Chief Medical Officer as required under the Workplace Safety and Health Act, and the Minister said back to me, and I quote him, "I think it is just a technicality. The doctor on staff in effect fields that position." We talked about how we didn't believe it to be just a technicality, that there were legislative provisions made for that Chief

Monday, 23 February, 1981

Medical Officer, there were legislative responsibilities that Officer could carry out that couldn't be carried out by a Chief Medical Consultant. Then the Minister came back to me and said, "just a point of clarification, I didn't I guess complete my statement. The gentleman in question does not have that title now," — by way of note, that gentleman was the Chief Medical Consultant — "but that is being considered in the very near future. I had a note on it and I didn't follow through on it but that is being considered. I am aware of possibly all the points that the member is going to be raising, the values of having that particular appointment." Again we questioned and the Minister came back with this statement, this categorical statement, "The only guarantee I can give the member is that that position is going to be filled." — March 14th, 1979.

It is not a moot point. This in fact is an area where problems have arisen because of the lack of a Chief Medical Officer. I will just read into the record a letter to the Minister dated August 11th, 1980, from an occupational health and safety research group operating out of the Department of Social and Preventative Medicine, University of Manitoba. These were a number of students that were engaged in a summer project, and I'll read to the Minister the pertinent parts: "We wish to bring to your attention a matter of grave concern, which is in need of immediate rectification. Earlier this summer, while engaged in a Federally-funded summer project on occupational, health and safety, we visited a worker from a steel processing plant. Toward the end of our discussion, the worker, who will remain anonymous, confided in us concerning a very serious personal health matter. He had been complaining of ill health and finally paid a visit to his doctor, who diagnosed the problem as a disease which was exacerbated by the employee's job. The doctor provided the employee with a note to the foreman of the department, informing of the severity of illness with a medical recommendation that the worker be rotated off the job. The foreman refused to acknowledge the directive and the worker, fearing loss of his livelihood, remained on the job.

"We were appalled by the situation and contacted and later visited a Health and Safety Inspector for the Department of Labour. We queried on behalf of the worker as to the possible avenues of recourse. We were politely informed that the only obligation the foreman had was a moral one. Not being satisfied with this we turned to the Workplace Safety and Health Act and found there Section 51, which is titled Power to Require Alternative Work. The section reads as, we are sure you are aware that "where it appears to the director upon the advice of the Chief Occupational Medical Officer that a worker has been over-exposed to a harmful substance, the Director, may, by order require the employer to provide . . . the worker temporary alternative work . . .". We thought that we'd found the answer to the worker's dilemma and immediately contacted the Health and Safety Inspector. To our utter dismay we were informed that the worker still had no recourse, due to the fact that the Government of Manitoba had failed, since October, 1970, to appoint a Chief Occupational Medical Officer.

"As the Honourable Minister directly responsible for the enactment of the regulations pertaining to

occupational health and safety, we felt it an obligation and duty to bring to your attention the gravity of the situation. Unless the Chief Medical Officer is appointed as mandated by the act three full years ago, workers remain with absolutely no recourse in seeking alternative work for medical reasons. We hope that you will see to it that this position is filled promptly."

Well, we hope too, that you will see to it that this position is filled promptly and the Minister is aware of the difficulties that they can see it creates. So I would ask him why it is that we have not seen any action on his guarantee of two years ago, or nearly two years ago, in respect to filling the position of Chief Occupational Medical Officer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (a)(2) — pass — The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: The member says that I'm aware of the difficulties that the vacancy in this particular position has created. I am not aware of any difficulties. I am aware of the particular letter that was drafted by some very enthusiastic, I assume, young people, doing whatever they were doing during that period of time and they familiarized themselves to a degree with the procedures, not entirely. We have, in fact, administrative-wise and I've been informed by the department, that we have had no problems, because these two young people allegedly found a problem. And I say allegedly because we don't know who it was.

We, and I am assured by my staff repeatedly, that there's really no difficulty in administering that Act with that position being vacant. We have, with very little problem, had workers relocated without any difficulty when we're dealing with companies for a variety of reasons.

MR. COWAN: The Minister says now he's not aware of the value and the arguments of having that particular appointment, but he said on May 14th, 1979 that he was aware and I quote him, "I am aware of possibly all the points that the member's going to be raising, the values of having that particular appointment", and that particular appointment is the Chief Medical Officer and he guaranteed us at that time, that that officer would be appointed.

Now, I'm not going to or I don't want to get into the argument of what convinced the Minister over the last two years that that appointment wasn't necessary. I would ask the Minister point blank, is he going to appoint a Chief Medical Officer, which is required under the Workplace Safety and Health Act, or he is going to continue on for another year in contravention of the Act?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (a)(2) — pass — The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I have no immediate plans to fill that position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (a)(2) — pass; (b) — The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairperson, I don't appreciate being rushed through these, such as the attempt has been made. The Minister and I have

Monday, 23 February, 1981

developed what I feel to be a very good rapport in discussing these Estimates . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Maybe you don't need a Chairman.

MR. COWAN: . . . and we have been able to go along.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I apologize. I'll just let you discuss it back and forth.

MR. COWAN: Thank you. Well that may be helpful too. The Minister and I are both capable of that sort of discussion. We've had it in the past and I'm certain we will have it in the future, although I don't mean to suggest that a Chairperson is not necessary. I do hope that you would take into consideration the way in which these discussions have been proceeded with for the past couple of days, which has been a very effective and efficient way.

I would ask the Minister why it is that now they have no intention of filling that position after having assurances from him for two years running, that they in fact did have intentions of filling that position and filling that position in the near future.

MR. MacMASTER: When I'm advised by my staff that there's a need to fill that particular position and we find that we have a difficulty which we can't overcome without filling it, than I'll give greater consideration to it, be it 1979 or 1978, I can only assume the rationale at that point was just because it said it then you must do it. We have had no difficulties. I want to assure the member that we feel, certainly that we've had no difficulties with that position not being filled to this date. That doesn't say that if difficulties arise and we think we can't handle it, we can fill that position rather rapidly.

MR. COWAN: Is the Minister then going to bring in amendments to the Act, because if the Minister is not going to fill that position, he is going to have to change the wording of the Act which says — the Minister says he knows what it says. Will the Minister agree that the Act requires the appointment of Chief Medical Officer by the Minister? —(Interjection)— the Minister says he knows what the act says. Now I'm going to have to find the particular section to read, so that others know what the Act says and the Act is very explicit in that regard. It would be easier if the Minister would agree that the Act does call, very specifically, for the appointment of that particular person.

I don't want to take up the time of the committee. I will have to find it and come back to the Minister in respect to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I just have one concern about this. I know of no member of the public or I would think that if the Minister was in opposition or even if he was looking at the actions of another Minister in the Cabinet, that he would just sort of lightly pass by a situation where the legislation calls for something and say, the Attorney-General refuses to carry out what the legislation calls for.

I thought that is a classic situation where the government, if it is not in favour of what the legislation requires, would change the legislation. But for the government to say that we don't have to respect the legislation is to say that it has a double standard with respect to legislation.

What would happen if the general public said we don't respect legislation that calls for certain behaviour with respect to driving. There's the Highway Traffic Act. There's the Criminal Code. There's a whole set of other things. Are we going to tell the public that there is one standard for the public and one standard for the government?

And I thought that everytime I've heard of this situation, the government says we think that the piece of legislation isn't warranted, they would bring in legislation to change it. But you can't say that legislation says that something is required and then say we will continue to disregard it.

And the Minister has specifically said that he understands what the Act says, but that it's not his intention to meet the requirements of the legislation. I just think that that is a double standard and I would like the Minister to indicate why he is leaving that inference.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (a)(2) — pass — The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Well to read into the record the proper section, that's section 17(1) of the Workplace, Safety and Health Act and it says: The Minister shall appoint as a Chief Occupational Medical Officer, for the purpose of this Act, a person who is a duly qualified, medical practitioner and who has training and experience in occupational medicine." The Minister "shall appoint". Those are the words. There is no discretionary power provided the Minister in this regard and we are disappointed that after two years of hearing the Minister assure us that that appointment is going to forthcoming in the near future, we now find out that that appointment, in fact, is not going to be forthcoming and that the Minister has no intention of living up to this particular aspect of the Act.

So we find that that is a matter of grave concern to us and we will have to be following it up in different ways.

Moving onto another item, because I don't want to belabour any one area, we are going to agree to disagree again. I would ask the Minister if he can provide us a detailed update as to what has been done in respect to the hearing conservation program. At one time it was suggested that there would be a survey done of industries that would identify high noise workplaces, that would, then the Minister or the department would develop and specify appropriate action to be taken in respect to protection of workers in those workplaces. And regulations were talked about at that time. I'd ask the Minister if he can provide us with an update estimate.

MR. MacMASTER: The branch is currently developing a proposal for a comprehensive hearing conservation program, which will include regulations and a code of practice. And I mentioned that is one of the regulations which is on the books and more than just in the back of our minds. It's something that we're working very hard at.

We hope the elements to include workplace noise surveys, assessment of workers' exposure to sounds, engineering controls to reduce sound levels, selection of hearing protective devices, worker education, medical surveillance and record keeping. A draft regulation is being prepared. We hope to have it distributed. It's expected further revisions will be required before adoption of the proposed regulation. That's where we're at.

Certainly I again, was optimistic a year ago, or whenever we first talked of it and I thought it was a lot easier to put together than it ultimately ended up being, but we're very close now to having some regulations that we'll be making in the very near future.

MR. COWAN: I appreciate the fact that when we want to see something done as I'm certain the Minister wants to see happen in this respect that there's positive action taken to protect workers from conditions which might result in hearing loss, that we're enthusiastic. I too am enthusiastic and sometimes over-extend myself in respect to what one expects to accomplish in a given period of time. I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. MacMASTER: One more grouping. I was looking for the people that we've been working with to try and put this together. Your CSA Committee on Acoustics Control; the Manitoba Medical Association; Department of Health and Community Services; Health and Welfare Canada; Manitoba Speech and Hearing Association; University of Manitoba and the National Research Council.

Now again, a year ago when I made reference to this, I sure as heck didn't believe there was this many groups across our country involved in trying to put together a good set of regulations, but it's obvious now, the department's done a hell of a good job in trying to track down those that are really involved and have obviously a fair amount of input into what could be prospective regulations.

That's not an excuse. It's meant as a reason and I always think there's a heck of a difference between both, and that's part of the reason that we've tried to involve so many people who are knowledgeable in the field.

MR. COWAN: I appreciate that the Minister is trying to put together the best possible program and really don't fault him that much in respect to that not meeting the timetables, which he suggested were the timetable he was going to follow during the last Estimates. I've done it myself; we all do it; he'll do it again; I'll do it again; it's just part of wanting to see something happen.

However, I'm not certain that the program is, even with that effort, working as well he had expected it to. At that time he suggested that it would isolate or that they would find areas where the noise levels were too high. Has his department drawn up a list of workplaces where noise levels are too high?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I think enough is said. We haven't got a precise list of areas where we think it's too high, but I think it's suffice to say that we now have come to the conclusion that we, without question, need regulations governing noise, hearing, in the Province of Manitoba and this will of course,

encompass all areas of employment within the province.

MR. COWAN: Has the Minister looked at other regulations from other jurisdictions, because that was one of the areas in which he had suggested that activity would take place? —(Interjection)— The Minister indicates that that was such.

Moving on to the next special program of last year then, which was the carcinogen program, I would ask the Minister if he can provide us with a specific update as to what activity has taken place in that program. In last year's Estimates he indicated that there would be one person working on it, and one or more summer students working on it. I would ask the Minister if he can provide us with details as to how that program is shaping up at this moment.

MR. MacMASTER: I gave you all that this afternoon, item-by-item-by-item-by-item.

MR. COWAN: The Minister suggested he gave it to us this afternoon and indeed he did. I don't have my notes here but I can remember fairly well what he said and it's my fault, I don't have my notes here. So I'll proceed on the basis of what I remember.

The Minister last year suggested that they were going to draw up a list of chemicals which are being used in the province. He said, quite justifiably, that there are chemicals being used in this province that nobody knows about, nobody, the workers, much less the employers. The employers are bringing chemicals in and they have no idea of what effect they are having, and that's not confined to this province, of course, that's all over the industrial world right now.

The Minister, I am certain, knows of the difficulty sometimes in even obtaining data sheets from companies in respect to what materials they have in their substances and chemicals and preparations which they provide to be used in the workplaces, and it is a very complex area.

So, at that time we said that we were concerned that with only one person, and we weren't thinking of the summer student at that time but I will include the summer student — only one person and a summer student are only two people — that you are not going to be able to make much progress in respect to this very large problem. You will be able to create an expectation that something is going to be done, but you will in fact be able to do very little. So the only way to test that thesis, which we put forward last year, is to ask the specific questions. Has a list been drawn up that shows where chemicals are being used in Manitoba's workplaces today? —(Interjection)— The Minister indicates not and I don't fault him because I don't think that that list is possible with the entire bureaucracy of the Workplace Safety and Health Division working on it; I just don't think they will be able to put that sort of a list together.

So, obviously, while work must be done in respect to this, that is probably an item that is going to take a great deal of time and we don't expect it this Estimates or next Estimates, but neither do we think that we should expect it, nor do we think that the expectation should be created that it in fact will be brought about.

The Minister also indicated that they were going to look at the storage of chemicals. Has the Minister

Monday, 23 February, 1981

been able to develop any regulations or any informational bulletins or any procedures in respect to the storage of chemicals in this province?

MR. MacMASTER: Storage and handling is an area that we think we have made some progress on and if, in fact, we can get some regulations together in the near future, that certainly would be — I don't know whether you would call it a prime concern, but it is certainly an area that you can get into without a matter of years and years of studying a situation.

MR. COWAN: In order to have a proper storage program, one is going to have to find out where they are being stored. Is the department co-operating with the City of Winnipeg in regard to their survey of where chemicals are presently being stored in the province?

MR. MacMASTER: No, not precisely with the City of Winnipeg, but we are being made aware, by our inspectors as they go through the many and varied plants within the province, of the types of storage areas that are in place. We think we are making some progress, at least in identifying the types of storage areas that are being utilized, and certainly we will be able to gather from that what, in fact, types of storage areas are being in place in Manitoba, used in place in Manitoba, what procedures are in place for handling.

As I outlined before supper, we are gathering all the information we can from other provinces as to how they deal with the storage and handling, and I think that's a very basic, reasonably quick sort of an area that we can move into with the information that we are gathering.

MR. COWAN: I might suggest that this would probably be a good area for co-operation, as the city has done a fair amount of work in regard to identifying storage areas, as well as the fire department has done a fair amount of work, because firefighters must be as aware as is possible of toxic chemicals which may represent severe hazards to them and to the general public in case of fire, and they are putting all this on computer banks and probably have a lot of information which can be of some value to the Minister. So I hope the Minister will in fact be able to follow up on that suggestion.

I would ask the Minister if the people working on this project have been involved with other agencies in respect to identifying problem areas — just for clarification — other agencies both inside and outside of the Provincial Government?

MR. MacMASTER: They are certainly working with the Federal Government and they are certainly working with the Fire Commissioner's office. Now, I don't know whether the member meant the fire department as being the Fire Commissioner's and we have made a note of the fact that the City of Winnipeg is working in that area and we will get whatever information we can from them.

MR. COWAN: The Minister suggested at one time that these individuals would start to look at Manitoba workplaces in respect to trying to determine if there is a problem that is manifesting itself in increased rates of cancer. The fact that there is a carcinogen

does not always mean that there is going to be a significant increase in cancer, because some of these cancers are statistically rare and when you have a small work force that is dealing with them, you may not find a particular cancer that might be associated with a substance, because of the size of the control group which you are dealing with — not the control group — but the size of the group in which you are studying.

So I would ask the Minister if they have been able to conduct any studies, and I would specifically be interested if they have been able to work with the mining companies in Northern Manitoba in respect to epidemiological studies which they are conducting and of which the department is aware, because they mentioned them at the Mine Safety Seminar review last year. They are being conducted on behalf of the company, sponsored by the company, and solely under the direction of the company but I would ask if the division had any luck in co-operating with these individuals and if the division has been looking at other areas where they might be able to develop comprehensive studies?

MR. MacMASTER: We haven't been working with the Mines Department as it relates to carcinogens, but we have been working with them on the lung X-rays, and both labour and the mining industry have suggested that they want to carry on meetings with us as it relates to the lung X-ray program. They think that there are better methods in place, quicker response, and we are always open to suggestions from both industry and labour if there is a better way to do something. We will be carrying out meetings with the mining industry and the trades people within that industry as it relates to the one particular situation, the lung X-rays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, it is good to see you back in the Chair.

I don't know whether or not I had made specific reference to the department but what I was referring to in specific was a study that is being conducted by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in Flin Flon, an epidemiological study of the workers there by a doctor who is directing the activities of university doctors here in respect to studying the effects of occupational hazards on the community at large.

I would ask the Minister if the persons involved in the carcinogen study within the department are co-operating with private enterprise in respect to this particular study or any other study.

MR. MacMASTER: No, we haven't been precisely in touch with them.

MR. COWAN: I would hope again, that they would try to find out what activity is being undertaken there.

I also have heard rumours that the Mines Branch is doing an epidemiological study, or that they are co-operating with an epidemiological study, I don't know the details, but they might trace that down as well.

Are there any other studies which are being undertaken by the division in respect to trying to determine the long-range effects, either carcinogenic

Monday, 23 February, 1981

or otherwise, of hazardous substances in Manitoba's work places?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, they are always looking for other data base from which to start studies. I think one member of that group has had his hands full trying to get the information together that we have got. We are interested in getting into other areas, but there are some particular regulations that we want to get in place as quickly as possible, and that certainly has been my direction, to try and get some of those regulations in place first before we start getting into other areas of studies.

MR. COWAN: The reason I asked the question specifically is that I was in touch with one of the union reps today on a different matter; however, when I mentioned that we were going into Estimates, we suggested some of the areas which might be discussed, and he asked me to specifically question you in regard to a study which was done on Manitoba Hydro. I don't know whether the study was done in respect to carcinogens; neither does he. I don't know whether it was done in respect to short-term hazards or long-term hazards, but he was approached several months ago in regard to that study and was interested in determining if the study had been completed, number one; and if it had been completed, if there had been any results which can be made public. Now, I know that there are interim studies; I know that there are short-term studies; I know that there are long-term studies and that it is sometimes difficult to make public a study which is in fact only half completed. But the information that he requested was not so much the results, but what is the status of that particular study at this point?

MR. MacMASTER: We have been looking at four different areas in regard to fatalities over a 30-year period, and you must appreciate that it has only been a touch-of-the-brush sort of a thing. The four that we would be talking to in the near future are right within the City of Winnipeg, and Hydro is one of them. There is nothing concrete, nothing positive. We haven't laid out a particular formula of how to review the entire situation and, of course, once you start reviewing something that in-depth, I think you should really more appropriately have a medical team, if you wish, and then you have to certainly have others, national bodies for sure, to bear out whatever information you get.

MR. COWAN: The Minister mentioned four areas. I have only been in contact with the one representative from the Manitoba Hydro. Was it four areas in the Hydro or was it four different areas, one of which was Hydro and the rest were outside of Hydro?

MR. MacMASTER: The others that we are considering are outside of Hydro and I would prefer not to even name them at this particular time. We haven't got an arrangement made with them. We don't have the staff, in our opinion, to go into it in an in-depth manner, and that's what you have to do if you wanted to go into this program.

MR. COWAN: The Minister is indicating that they don't have the staff to go into studies in an in-depth

manner and what they need is a medical team. Is there any development of that medical team to study these areas in depth, so that the Minister can more adequately provide us with information as to what has been found?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there is nothing precisely in place at the moment but if we found that, again, brushing over the situation and having a look at it on a cursory nature, if we found that it was required or they were saying substantial evidence to indicate that a more in depth review could or should take place then that certainly could be considered.

MR. COWAN: The question that follows then is has there been evidence found that would necessitate a more in depth review? Is the division embarking upon a more in depth review of any of these four different areas or all of these four different areas?

MR. MacMASTER: We're not at that stage yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: When could I advise the representative of Manitoba Hydro that he can expect the results of that particular study?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know what particular study he's making reference to. If there was a cursory look at the number of employees that have gone through Hydro and some tentative conclusions reached, they'd be so tentative that I don't think he should be advised as it relates to that at all at this moment.

MR. COWAN: What the Minister is telling me is that the union, and let's move from dealing with an individual to dealing with a group, is not a part of the studies. They are informed that a study is being conducted but that they are not part of the development of the study and that they are not privy to the information which is derived from the study. Is that an accurate assessment of the Minister's procedures in respect to these studies that are being done under this program or any other program? It could be the Noise Control Program or it could be any program. The reason I ask that question is that I'm somewhat surprised, because the Minister had in the past, especially in dealing with the lead situation, involved the union as much as he could and that they had been a part of developing the program, although not as much of a part as they would have liked to have been, nor perhaps I would have liked them to have been. They were at least made aware of everything. Is the Minister suggesting that when we are dealing with this area, that the unions won't be a part of the development of studies and programs?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not suggesting that at all. I am saying at the moment there is absolutely no progress sufficient to this time to involve any other group. If we decide to take a very thorough review of Hydro or any other operation in this province, absolutely our practise has been to involve the unions and they so will be.

MR. COWAN: Has Manitoba Hydro been advised of the results of this particular study or have any of the

Monday, 23 February, 1981

other three areas, which I don't know of, been advised of the results of the studies which were conducted in their areas?

MR. MacMASTER: The Member seems to be under the illusion that something has been completed. Nothing has been completed.

MR. COWAN: No, I don't want that misconception to be made. What I am suggesting is that even at the initial stages of the development of a study, before even results have been made or completed or data has been compiled, the employer and the employee both should be advised of the study; should be a part of developing the study; should be a part of determining what that study means. In other words, they have to be part of the process right from the start to finish. Now, the employer and the employee can also be translated into the employers' organization and the employees' organization which would be an association and a union, but that when you're dealing with those sorts of problems, you want to in fact get the best advice possible and the best advice sometimes comes from front line people as the Minister knows, and as the Minister has said on many, many occasions in the House and during Estimates.

What I am suggesting is that the union, if there is a union, if not the employees as a group, and the employer and the employers' groups be made a part of the whole process. Is the Minister saying that he does not approve of that particular approach to the development of Epidemiological Studies on occupational hazards?

MR. MacMASTER: The Member knows different than that.

MR. COWAN: Exactly, I do know different than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister . . . one at a time.

MR. COWAN: Okay, I'm sorry, I apologize.

MR. MacMASTER: The Union has been made aware that we were considering looking at the those who had been employed over thirty years and had passed away, and Hydro is aware of that, and as I'm trying to tell the Member for Churchill, nothing concrete has come out of that yet, nothing substantial. Once that is completed if in fact it's completed, today or tomorrow or a year from now, we have a lot of work to do. That may not be at this point, the first thing that this group will be doing. You can't do everything at once and the union will in fact be kept aware be it a month from now or six months now or a year from now, as to where we are going with that particular review.

MR. COWAN: Again, I'll state the point and leave it on the record, because I think it's important. I'm not suggesting that the Minister is not going to inform them of the results of any study, whether it be good, bad or indifferent. What I am hoping is that the Minister will make them a part of that study, not a part in respect to being a guinea pig or the subject of the study, but a part of developing the study; a part of working with the researchers; a part of

reviewing the data and a part of reaching the conclusions. The reason I suggest that it is the appropriate way to proceed is multifold.

(1) It is going to insure that the employer and the employee buy into the study. You need their full co-operation. You will most likely get their full co-operation in most instances. I don't know the other three studies, I only know of Hydro because of the Union Rep. however, I'm certain that you've had good co-operation with all the parties involved in those studies, but that co-operation can be made better by making them a part of the process.

(2) It provides you with data that you might not get otherwise.

A person who comes in and superimposes himself or herself on a situation and tries to in a very short period of time determine exactly what is happening in that situation, may in fact be able to pick up the highlights and to pick up the broad picture but they certainly can't get the subtleties, and in this instance, it may be that those individuals which you are studying in a statistical sense, had specific things wrong with them or right with them, as the case may be, but that their co-workers knew about, and that you wouldn't find on any sort of official document. But if you talked to the co-workers they would say, oh, yes now I remember, this was a problem with so and so, and for that reason you increase your data base. Now that data has to be checked out because it's sometimes third hand, and sometime heresay, but it certainly a starting point for further investigations.

Finally, if you find a problem, and I'm not certain that you have or haven't from what you've told me, but if you find a problem, then you are going to be able to convince those participants in the study who have been with you from day one, of the necessity for quick and urgent and comprehensive actions. They have bought into the study, they are part of the study and they will be able to provide you with specific information on how to develop what you believe might be a solution to the problem, because they are the ones that are working first hand with it. They are ones that know what will work and what won't work and you will avoid a great deal of duplication and you will avoid a great deal of unwieldy programs if you listen to them, and the Minister knows that.

The Minister has said that in the past, the Minister is aware of that and that is why I'm somewhat surprised that we haven't seen more involvement by the union and the employees in respect to these studies. The Minister is aware in other jurisdictions, I think there was just a study completed in Quebec, I know there is one undergoing now in Inco in Sudbury, that the union is an integral part of developing the study. As a matter of fact in Sudbury, I think they negotiated it as part of the contract, I'm not certain, but that studies are being conducted now jointly by the union and the company and they are turning out to be very effective studies. Those two groups stick together, devise a criteria for the study, devise a strategy for the study, devise what they want to see come out of the study and then direct professionals such as the Minister has in his department, to come up with that data.

I think that is an area that should be looked at very carefully and I would hope that the Minister

Monday, 23 February, 1981

would involve those employees and the employer, and I don't know how much the employer has been involved so, I can only speak to the employees at this time, but involve all parties more so in the activities of this particular group and of the Noise or Hearing Conservation group and of any other group.

On Manitoba Hydro, I have to ask this question then. It is my understanding that Manitoba Hydro was one of the areas designated for a committee in 1977 by Order-in-Council but was exempted from having that committee and is still exempted. I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what action he has taken in regard to that exemption, because I know that it's been brought to the division's attention through the advisory council and through other parties?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. (a)(2) — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I'm waiting for the Minister's answer on that, he is consulting, but I can go ahead on a different item while he in fact does consult.

MR. MacMASTER: We've been in touch with both unions and I understand from my staff that they have not replied to our request. I wasn't aware of that so I'll get back to them myself tomorrow.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicated both unions, that would be both unions at Manitoba Hydro which would be I believe International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and CUPE?

MR. MacMASTER: It's the Electrical Workers that haven't replied yet.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates it's the Electrical Workers that haven't replied but that the Canadian Union of Public Employees has replied? And was there a suggestion that that exemption should be continued or did they have some concerns about that exemption?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that CUPE and Hydro are going ahead with establishing a committee. I still don't know why and neither does my staff, why IBW hasn't concurred to do just that at this moment but we can check it out and find out. I don't know what the holdup is there.

MR. COWAN: I'd appreciate the Minister getting back to us with that information. According to the Advisory Council minutes on December 30, 1980, there is an inquiry being conducted into lead poisoning in the fire departments or that there is some concern about that. I'm wondering if the Minister can provide us with any more information respecting that inquiry.

MR. MacMASTER: Can you rephrase that? I just didn't quite catch it.

MR. COWAN: Okay, perhaps I can read from the minutes if I can find the proper one. I'm sorry, it's October 3, 1980 minutes of the Advisory Council, No. 1. It says: "Inquiry into lead poisoning in fire departments is being investigated. Item 2(e), Business Arising Out of Minutes."

MR. MacMASTER: Apparently there were some original samples that indicated some concern. They

were resampled and found that there was no reason for concern and the only thing that our staff can assume is that the original samples must have been contaminated in some way, shape or form and this sometimes happens.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Minister for that information and indeed it does happen from time to time and it is always a consideration. When speaking to the problem in lead, I'd ask the Minister if he can update us as to the status of the lead contamination problem in two specific workplaces in Manitoba; one, of course, being Northwest Smelting and the other being Canadian Bronze.

MR. MacMASTER: We've had relatively reasonable success with both operations. The Canadian Bronze one, I understand that they have brought in a new system and some new equipment from out of the country which will be installed very shortly and in fact is in the process of being installed now. We expect that will even make it better than it is today. They have certainly cleaned up their act in a lot of ways. We understand that at Northwest presently today, there is one of the hourly rated employees who is on compensation today because of lead in blood.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister can confirm my information, that's that Northwest Smelting has been shut down for some time now, that it has not been operating for some time and that it is starting up operations again. Is that correct?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, approximately Christmas Eve, I think, or just before that they closed down a portion of their operation. They are now presently — new equipment is in place, expecting to start up — we're guessing, in the next few days or the next week or two, and testing of that new equipment will take place at that time. But you are right, it has been, I guess, virtually shut down, if you only have somewhere between six and ten people and you normally have 20 or 25. It's been running on a maintenance sort of a basis for the last month, month and a half. With the new equipment now installed they expect to start up operations — momentarily isn't the right word — within the next week or two. At that point our people will be inspecting how this new equipment — and taking tests how it's bearing up.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister can indicate if it's his knowledge that that equipment has been brought in to alleviate many of the problems in respect to lead-in-air contamination. — (Interjection)— The Minister says hopefully. Well certainly that is our hope as well and we would look forward to being provided with information as it becomes available in respect to the lead-in-air levels in that plant. They are as important as the lead-in-blood levels in numbers on compensation. It's been a long, difficult battle in respect to that, and it's my understanding that Canadian Bronze has made a number of changes which has in fact provided a more satisfactory environment for its workers and that Northwest Smelting has undergone greater difficulties in making those sorts of changes but that we may finally see something occurring in respect to

Monday, 23 February, 1981

that, and I am being as kind as I can. — (Interjection)— The Minister says, you sometimes need 2x4. We said that a long long time ago, but the fact is that it is as true today as it was then.

The Minister reminded me a while back as to the question which I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: We are just trying to determine when we'd shut down. The other committee has shut down. I had hoped that we could maybe finish Workplace Safety at least tonight, if that's agreeable with the member.

MR. COWAN: We might be able to finish it. I wouldn't want to confine myself to any suggestion that we can, because as you know as we get into it certain items come forward that were not anticipated. I would just ask the Minister how late he would expect to go on this, and I can perhaps then give him a better indication.

MR. MacMASTER: Give me an idea of how long you think you're going to be. If you are going to be two hours, then we are not going to stay for two hours. If you think you could wrap it up by 11:00 o'clock without confining yourself too much, then that's satisfactory. There's no bloody sense in staying to 12:00 or 1:00, it doesn't do anybody any good.

MR. COWAN: As the Chairperson knows, we are of one mind on this, he and I, and I prefer to leave as early as is possible. I don't think we would finish it by 11:00 o'clock. I am not saying we wouldn't finish it by 11:30, but I don't think that we would finish it by 11:00, and could probably give the Minister the assurance that notwithstanding interjections by other individuals we could probably finish during tomorrow afternoon's session. I just want to check with my caucus colleagues to see if they're in agreement with that.

If we were to adjourn now, we could give him the assurance that we'd make every effort, and again we can't be responsible for what happens outside of our own caucus but that our caucus would make every effort to complete these by tomorrow's Private Members' Hour.

MR. MacMASTER: Are you responsible for what happens in your caucus?

MR. COWAN: The Minister has asked a very pertinent question. I have no answer for him.

MR. MacMASTER: I am prepared to ask that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 78 of the Main Estimates, Department of Highways and Transportation, Resolution No. 79, 1. General Administration (a) Minister's Salary — pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We are getting to the end of the Minister's Estimates and I think we have brought a number of items to the Minister's attention. I think we have been given a fair opportunity to review and look into his Estimates. I don't think we have been too hard on him this year. At least he nods in agreement, Mr. Chairman.

We have made some suggestions to him that I think are valid suggestions. We hope that he will take some of those items that we have brought to his attention and we hope that he will make note of what we have brought to his attention.

We have dealt with Transportation in general and I am sure that we will be discussing more of this particular item as time goes on. I hope that we have a thorough discussion insofar as the impact of the Crow rate and other problems of that nature insofar as what the impact is on the farm community and, as well, what the impact is on our highway system, that we are now seeing more pressure being applied to our provincial road system as time goes by with many rail lines having been abandoned and many more with the prospect of being abandoned.

I think we have brought to the attention of the Minister that there are still a number of rail lines that are going to be abandoned and naturally, when these go, there will be more pressures applied to our provincial roads and municipal roads as well.

So we have to move very carefully on these two fronts to make sure that we try and lessen the impact of the costs, first of all, to our farmers and people in agriculture; and secondly, the cost to the population and the taxpayer in general in the Province of Manitoba.

We would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that there would have been some roads. We tend to become a bit parochial when we get into roads because it is important for the rural areas and I am sure all members want to see road improvements in their particular area. I know that one particular road that we brought to the Minister's attention last year, and it was also brought to the attention of the Minister via petitions by people from those particular areas, and I would have hoped that the Minister would have included in his Estimates this year, some of the roads that we had suggested to him last year and also this year when we were into the construction program.

One particular road that I didn't mention in my previous remarks, Mr. Chairman, was PR 278 and I hope that the Minister will make note of this. I hope that the Minister takes his pencil to hand, if he is listening, and get his pencil out and make note of this particular piece of road, because last year we had hoped that he would have extended the upgrading of PR 278 from Shergrove on to the Hillridge School, which would have made sense to us because that is where all the buses end up in front of the school, unloading children, and that is one piece of road that we certainly would have hoped that the Minister would have taken into consideration this year. However, Mr. Chairman, we do not see that particular piece of road on the program again for this year, so many of the concern that we have brought to him on this side of the House and many of the concerns that have been presented to him from delegations from Glenella, Hillridge, Baconridge and

Monday, 23 February, 1981

those areas, have been completely ignored. Delegations and requests from community councils in Meadow Portage and so on, these have been ignored.

So, again we want to point out to the Minister that we are dissatisfied as far as the construction program goes. It is saddening for those people in those particular communities when they see that they can't get a five-mile piece of road to a school where buses congregate or where buses head to, and then they look at the map, Mr. Chairman, and they look down in the Morden area and within a 30-mile radius, they will see four or five major roads being upgraded, entirely around the area of Morden. We're happy for them, Mr. Chairman, we're happy that they are getting roads and getting upgrading but, Mr. Chairman, surely there can be a more fair distribution of the construction throughout the area.

I point this out to the Minister and hope that he will perhaps be able to divert some of those funds that he has or maybe by way of even additional warrants, and we know that there were additional warrants brought about last year that were expended throughout the province, I understand, part in Winnipeg and partly in other areas, but unfortunately none of those funds were funnelled into our area, as far as I know.

There's another item that I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention and that is that I would have hoped he would be able to comment on what are the regulations, if any? Does the Minister have any guidelines insofar as the transportation of dangerous materials? This has been a reoccurring problem whereby very dangerous commodities are being transported; and we've had just recently another accident regarding inflammable substances that are being transported. I suggest to the Minister that we should be coming up with some long-term guidelines and in the short term we should be addressing ourselves to these; to what direction we should be going insofar as the handling of these dangerous materials; toxic chemicals and so on.

Mr. Chairman, with those few comments, I believe there are still some members on this side of the House that wish to make some comments and if anything comes up during the ensuing debate from here on in, I reserve the right to maybe stand up again and say a few words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for not having been in this committee while the detailed estimates were being examined, however, I was in the other committee and found it impossible to break away. I, therefore, would like to take this opportunity to ask a few general questions of the Minister. I admit that I am fully aware that he doesn't have his staff before him and will be unable to answer detailed inquiries, however there are some areas where I would like his general opinions.

The first of course is in respect to the problem that the Minister has currently experienced in replacing the MU-2, the airplane that was being used as a medical evacuation aircraft in northern Manitoba. The Minister has told us that he has his department looking for a replacement aircraft; that they are experiencing some difficulties; and that they are

getting conflicting testimony as to the advantages and disadvantages of certain aircraft which they are currently considering for that task. I would ask the Minister if he can take this opportunity, which is a much better opportunity than question period for providing detailed answers, if he can take this opportunity to indicate exactly what the status of his search for a replacement aircraft is at present; when we can expect to see an aircraft replace the damaged MU-2; when it is the considered opinion of those people who are working on the MU-2 that it will back in shape for flying; and if he has given any consideration to basing both Aztecs in Northern Manitoba, one in the Thompson area and one in The Pas area until such a time as they have been able to come up with a replacement aircraft?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, we are dealing fairly close to what we think is finding a suitable replacement aircraft for the MU-2 and hopefully, in roughly a week's time, we may well be putting out offers to various suppliers to see what sort of price arrangements we can come up with.

The present MU-2, I haven't received an accurate estimate of how long it will be down, but it is indicated that it could be anywhere from six months to one year. In terms of locating the Aztec that we have in Winnipeg at The Pas, that consideration is not being given right now and we won't be moving that aircraft to The Pas. It will remain in Winnipeg and serve the communities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and other areas of Manitoba. With the Aztec that we have in The Pas, or not in The Pas but in Thompson, it appears to date as if it can fill in on a temporary short-term basis.

The MU-2, as I say I haven't got an accurate estimate as to when it is deemed that we might be able to get it repaired. The last indication I had is that we may have to bring in a complete wing section from the manufacturer, in which case, if that wing section is not repairable and has to come in from the manufacturer, that gives us the upper limit of the range from six months to one year. If it is repairable and the aircraft can be certified as airworthy after repairs, the lesser value of time would be probably in the ballpark for getting it back in the air.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I listened carefully to the Minister, I noted that he suggested that they were now contacting different suppliers, or various suppliers of aircraft, in order to make price arrangements. I would ask him if he can just indicate if that is the price arrangements for leasing or price arrangements for purchase?

MR. ORCHARD: For both.

MR. COWAN: For both. In other words, under active consideration is an option to buy an aircraft that is specifically suited to medical evacuation. Is that a proper assumption? The reason I ask that is because while the previous government did use the MU-2 for medical evacuation and now this government continued the use of the MU-2, it has been suggested, at least to me, that there are more suitable aircraft for medical evacuation than the MU-2.

In conversation with individuals in the north they have suggested that the MU-2 is not entirely suited for the northern climate, in other words it's a difficult plane to base in the north because of the cold climate in winter and the effect that climate has on the operation of that machine; and that is one of the reasons, I am told, why it was never based in northern Manitoba. What we would like to see happen at this point, where we have an opportunity to review the whole northern medical evacuation program, and we also have an opportunity to make a capital investment in new equipment, that we look at a plane that is more imminently suited to northern climate, and that the Minister provide direction to have that plane based in Thompson on a full-time permanent basis and to have a medical evacuation team, which would be part of the normal medical component at the hospital, specifically designated and formed in order to provide full-time permanent staffing for the plane on an around the clock basis.

I think this is the way in which a number of other jurisdictions are going now in respect to providing medical evacuation from the more remote areas, whether they be northern or not. I think it is worthy of a great deal of consideration by the government.

I would ask the Minister if they are considering that possibility of purchasing a plane which is more suited to the northern climate and providing a medical evacuation program to compliment the basing of that plane in a northern community, and that community most likely of course would be the central community of Thompson.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in knowing what planes have been suggested to the honourable member.

MR. COWAN: Without being a person who is aware of the planes and without my notes in front of me, I would have difficulty in giving the Minister a name right at the time, but I assure the Minister that I will go through the notes that were presented to us and I will come back to him with more specific details. I am not certain as to whether they were names or whether they were general types of aircraft, but I will find out and get back to the Minister. Having given him that assurance, I would repeat my question to him. Would the Department consider making the medical evacuation program a more comprehensive program with aircraft and personnel based in Northern Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Medi-Vac Program, depending on the aircraft, and this is why I am quite interested in finding out from the Member for Churchill just what aircraft have been suggested to him, the scope of aircraft is still not very broad that can serve that role of medical evacuation. We certainly have had our share of investigative difficulties, shall we call them, in trying to determine what kind of a plane, other than an MU-2, can be used for that role, because we have heard exactly the same kind of potential concerns about a replacement aircraft as the Member for Churchill has.

We are looking for a fairly fast aircraft as the MU-2 is. One of the problems when you get into the faster aircraft, is that most of our fields in Northern Manitoba, with the exception of Thompson, Fliin Flon

and The Pas and Churchill, cannot accommodate faster aircraft because they can't land or take off on those strips, because we're talking most of our strips being 3,000 foot and gravel, rather than surfaced. That has certainly slowed up to some extent, our search for replacement aircraft and there from the investigations — and I'm not an aircraft engineer by any means — but from the investigations we've had to date, if you bring in a plane that can operate on 3,000-foot gravel strips, you sacrifice generally speed, and if you don't sacrifice speed, the wing configuration prevents you from landing on the gravel strips because of the potential prop damage from a low wing aircraft, and that of course is why in 1973, I suppose the choice was made of an MU-2, which had the capability of landing on a shorter strip and was a high wing configuration so that gravel strips could be utilized.

The past experience has indicated that an aircraft such as a Medi-Vac aircraft, will service most of the area in Northern Manitoba, from Winnipeg where we can maintain much more readily 24-hour staffing, much more readily the servicing that's needed for that aircraft and much more readily the hangar space that's required to keep that aircraft always in operative condition when we are called upon in 40 below weather to perform a medical evacuation. So what has happened with the 350-mile-per-hour aircraft, you will find that with very few exceptions, the aircraft reaches the airport at the same time or before the patient does, from Winnipeg to any area that we've moved into or we've had to Medi-Vac out of.

That has left Winnipeg as being a logical choice for the stationing of that Medi-Vac aircraft, because all Medi-Vac flights are destined to end up in Winnipeg. Other than that the Aztec, of course, which is stationed in Thompson, performs the less medically complicated Medi-Vacs into the Thompson hospital and the Aztec is a suitable aircraft for those kind of shorter hop evacuations into Thompson.

So that we haven't given consideration to location of a medical evacuation aircraft in any other place but Winnipeg for those reasons and if we can maintain the Medi-Vac aircraft in a plane with 350-plus miles per hour capability. That decision is not likely to change because the geometrics of locating out of Winnipeg and the ability to service Manitoba out of Winnipeg, is just not all that bad in terms of making the decision to move a 24-hour, seven-day a week, Medi-Vac operation to Thompson where we don't have the staff at present.

MR. COWAN: Without wishing to belabour this particular point, I would just inform the Minister that we are aware that it would require certain staffing changes and that it would require certain changes within the operation of the Department. We think that they might be worthwhile changes, and that's the point that we have to make to him.

Also, I have to take some disagreement with his statement that the aircraft reaches the patient before the patient reaches the airstrip in most cases. I'd suggest that just doesn't happen that way. If it does, it's because they are holding the patient at the hospital until they have news that the aircraft is coming in, because far too often they have sent the patient to the airstrip and had to have the patient wait at the airstrip for the aircraft. We are talking

Monday, 23 February, 1981

primarily about small towns where the distance between the hospital and the airstrip is a couple of miles. I have heard more problems, or have been informed of more problems, in reaching the pilot here in Winnipeg and having a pilot get to the aircraft here in Winnipeg, than I have in having heard problems of the patient getting to the airstrip in northern Manitoba. I would suggest that just isn't the case from my experience. Maybe I have been misled by my constituents in that respect, but I doubt it very much. I think it's a matter of the Minister probably being technically correct, but is only technically correct because they are holding that patient back until they have word that the aircraft is coming in. I think the problem is on the other end, and that's one of the reasons that we would like to see it stationed in northern Manitoba.

But there will be more opportunity to discuss that particular problem during this upcoming session and I just, at this point, would hope to wish the Minister good speed in getting a replacement aircraft because that's the most important problem that confronts us right now. We will have opportunity to discuss in detail the whole aspect of locating a northern medical evacuation aircraft and team in northern Manitoba during other portions of this year's legislative sitting.

I would also like to, at this point, bring a constituency matter to the attention of the Minister. I have had some people talking with his department on it over the last couple of days and I am not certain whether he can provide me with an answer to the questions this evening, but I would hope perhaps by tomorrow he would be able to do so. He will understand the urgency of the situation when I mention that it is involving winter roads. We all know that the conditions are such this year that any travel on a winter road becomes more and more precarious as we continue into this warming spell.

The situation is specifically one dealing with a winter road that was constructed by a private construction firm, McLean Construction Firm out of Co-op Point and going to Brochet, and Lac Brochet, I believe. The construction company which built that road did so under a contract with, I believe, Manitoba Hydro, and perhaps other government departments for the purpose of hauling freight into those communities, probably oil, diesel oil or diesel fuel for the generators and perhaps building supplies. There is another individual, an entrepreneur who wishes to use that road as well and has been informed by McLean Construction that if they are to use that road they will have to pay a certain fee. The fee in this case, I'm informed, is 250 per trip. As the individual would be wanting to make eight trips in to carry fuel oil in for the community that would be an onerous price to pay, and would probably not be able to do so with that tariff imposed upon him.

I would ask the Minister if he can inform us as to what specifically the policy is in respect to privately constructed winter roads? As well I would appreciate knowing if this is indeed a privately constructed winter road, or if there was government money provided for the construction of it, and what recourse he would suggest for my constituents in respect to the tariff which has been suggested is necessary for him to use the road.

MR. ORCHARD: That particular winter road is not a part of the winter road program which my

department handles, and I would have to assume that it would be a winter road constructed by private contractor primarily to service Manitoba Hydro's fuel needs in some of their diesel generating stations in Lac Brochet, I believe the member said.

There is no policy control or policy guidelines for privately constructed winter roads. Those are put in by the successful bidder who, if it's for Manitoba Hydro, as I understand, the system will put in a price to deliver X-number of gallons of diesel fuel into a location; and whoever agrees to do that or contracts to do that at the lowest price will be awarded the contract. The use of that road by anyone else desiring to take in supplies has to, of necessity, be in negotiation with the contractor who has pushed through the original road.

We ran into that kind of a situation last year on the east side of Lake Winnipeg for a short period of time. We had some difficulty in getting our winter road pushed up from Hole River. That south end last winter, because of mild conditions, was late in being built and, if my memory serves me correctly, the section of winter road from Bloodvein down to Berens River was contracted. We were under separate contract last year with the Bloodvein Band and they put in their winter road and had it operative. And they had need of fuel supplies for Channel Area Loggers at that time.

Now, at the time the Provincial Government-funded winter road from the south from Hole River was not in service and no traffic had come in there; at the same time the Berens River Band had successfully put an ice road across Lake Winnipeg to join up with, I forget which provincial road, provincial road ending up in the neighborhood of Matheson Island; and they were allowing, or shall we say they were contracting single load traffic on their winter road which they had constructed privately, to the outfit that was hauling the diesel fuel up to Channel Area Loggers and they were charging something in the neighborhood of \$200 to \$300 a trip. To undertake that, and once again we had no method of suggesting to the Berens River Band that they couldn't do that; they built the road; it was across reserve property in one section and they had every right to, so to speak, charge what the market would bear. And I suspect, I don't know the circumstances on the Lac Brochet Road, but the person or the contractor undertaking that road is on delivery contract with Manitoba Hydro I would fully expect and does have the ability to charge another user, a non-Hydro user, a non-contracted user, certain fees for the use of that road.

MR. COWAN: That, Mr. Chairperson, is what I believe to be a good argument for including Brochet and Lac Brochet and perhaps even Tadoule Lake into the Provincial Winter Road system because what you have now is a situation where you have certain communities that have winter roads provided by the province and then there, of course, is no fee for use of the roads, and you have certain other communities where the winter road is constructed by a private contractor and you do have a fee for use of the road. So it is a discriminatory system in that respect. I can only suggest to the Minister that given the situation as it exists today and the policy of allowing private contractor's to charge access fee on privately-constructed winter roads, that he make it a

priority to include all communities which are isolated and not served by other means of transportation outside of air service, part of the winter road network.

I thank him for the answer to that. I just ask him to check, if he would, perhaps with his colleague from Northern Affairs, to see if there was any government money used in the construction of that road; I just want to clarify that situation for myself. If there was government money used in construction of the road, even if it was not a fully-funded winter road and therefore was not part of the normal winter road system, that perhaps there was a grant that was used to provide some support and assistance to that person constructing the winter road, then notwithstanding the percentage of that grant in the total cost, there would be free access on that particular section of the winter road? The Minister is nodding his head yes, so I take that as the affirmative, and therefore would try to impress upon him the urgency to check with his colleagues to see if there is, in fact, any money of that sort.

I would also ask the Minister if he can indicate if there was federal money involved, Federal Government money under a government employment program —(Interjection)— He asks me if there was in that one? I don't know whether there was or not, I'm trying to build a hypothetical case for some policy discussion — if in fact federal money had been used to provide some support and assistance to the construction of that road would that in fact enable free access to the road? I'll leave that question with the Minister because he'll probably have to check with his department on it.

There are quite a few areas that I had wished to discuss, I can only assure you that I won't and with one final point try to elicit some more information from the Minister and then deal with the more specific items by correspondence as the Minister and I have been doing over the past couple of years.

I'd ask the Minister if there is any intention on the part of his government to construct a road into Gillam from the Split Lake Road which is currently accessible by all weather road and barge system. The reason I ask this is his colleague, the Minister of Labour, had indicated in Northern Manitoba on a number of occasions that that road could be considered and that there was probably some justification for the construction of that road, without giving a commitment. He was very careful not to give a commitment as to time or even as to the ultimate construction of that road. I'd ask the Minister if he can provide us with some more specific details as to the intentions of the government respecting the continuation of the road into Gillam on an all weather basis.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I like my colleague who's not in here, the Minister of Labour, see that extension of the Split Lake-Gillam Road to be a positive asset to future hydro development on the Nelson River and hopefully we can clear some of the hoops and get that road under way in the very near future. However, at this stage of the game it would be ill advised on my part to indicate to the Member for Churchill that that road will be proceeding posthaste, but it is a road that definitely we consider to be an asset to the Gillam area of the Nelson River Development.

MR. COWAN: The Minister is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairperson, in his suggestion that it would be an asset to the further development of hydro in the area, and just as I'm not going to ask him for a specific date as to the initiation of the construction of hydro, the limestone station in the Gillam area, neither will I ask him for a specific date as to the initiating of construction of a road extending the Split Lake Road to Gillam. However, I would ask him — I ask him this because I did miss the detail part in examination of his Estimates — if there is any work being done on that section of road such as surveying work or preliminary planning which might give us some further indication as to exactly how soon we might expect to hear an announcement on that particular section of road.

MR. ORCHARD: The department has considered over the past short while, I think it's two or three lines to accomplish that connection. If my memory serves me correct two are south of the river and require a crossing in the vicinity of Split Lake, Split Lake or immediately east, and one is a more northerly route which loops over the top and ends up connecting to some hydro aggregate haul roads, and like I say to the Member for Churchill we're hopeful that we can proceed on that very, very quickly.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister can indicate, and I don't wish to put him on a spot without his staff here, if any consideration is being taken in respect to connecting York Landing and Ilford as part of that road into the Gillam area or if that is off the suggested pass?

MR. ORCHARD: The connection to Ilford and York Landing wasn't part of the three alternate routes, two of them being southerly routes south of the river that I saw, that both of them were more direct and angling over to a . . . once again it's, as I understand it, a gravel haul road westerly from Gillam that goes to one river crossing west of Gillam south of the river and then the other one of course connects in on the north end to a gravel haul road. But to go to the communities of Ilford would mean a right angle road which was, if my memory serves me correct, about 50 percent more mileage to connect them into a road from Split Lake to Gillam. And always, as the member is aware, the problem of crossing the Nelson River is quite a severe one, particularly in that area from Split Lake immediately east, and despite the additional distance it would appear as if that northerly route might be the most favoured one considering terrain, even though the distance is higher, but considering terrain and the fact that once you get into that Gillam-Kettle area you've got a river crossing in existence of one of the hydro dams. So that may well be the most persuasive factor in swinging that road as an extension straight north of the Nelson River rather than trying to cross and entertain a road construction on the south side.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. That road being a logical extension of the existing road and one that is well received by the residents of Gillam, I can even suggest by residents of other communities in the area which might benefit by spin-off and also benefit by the extension of the road in

Monday, 23 February, 1981

respect to possible further extension of the road at later dates, I can only encourage the Minister to proceed as soon as is possible with the development of the integration of Gillam into the existing all weather road system. It means a substantial savings for residents of that community in respect to transportation costs of goods in and out of the community as well as it tends to take away some of the feelings of isolation that are most often felt by residents of isolated communities who do not have an opportunity to get in their cars and take a drive out of the community. However there are residents in Gillam who are going to mourn with some sadness the passing of that isolation. They believe that it provided unique qualities to their community and I've listened to them as well. In my own opinion however, I've found the arguments for a road to be most convincing, not only from the economical standpoint, but also from the perspective of providing a service to residents of that community which they don't enjoy right at the moment.

I wish that I had had some opportunity to partake in these Estimates a bit more to discuss many of the important activities of this department in respect to my own constituency, and that's upgrading the roads and providing more roads to communities which presently don't have roads.

I had hoped to be able to talk a bit about the airstrip policy of the government because, as the Minister knows, that's an area of great concern and where there is need for some positive action. It's a very complex and difficult area to move rapidly in with respect to the split jurisdiction and we had the discussion today during the Private Members' Bill about federal and provincial jurisdictions dealing with Reserve communities, and we find that that is indeed a problem in several instances of airstrips that are currently being considered and have been requested by the communities in Northern Manitoba. So I intend to work closely with the Minister, providing what encouragement and pressure I can in order to help solve some of those concerns and bring to bear the type of pressure, which is necessary on not only this government but the Federal Government, to convince them of the necessity of proceeding posthaste with the development of airstrips. Far too often, emergency airstrips, Mr. Chairperson, are exactly that — the residents of the community will tell you if you have to land on that airstrip, it is indeed an emergency, and the emergency is probably going to revolve around your landing. That's a favourite statement of the Waasagamach Band, who have been pressuring for an airstrip.

I will continue to have those sorts of discussions with the Minister via our regular route of correspondence, which is ongoing on a permanent basis I feel, in respect to the different airstrips, for as soon as one is built, there seems to arise the need for another one, it's a never-ending task, and I wish the Minister well in being able to fulfill the requests and expectations of northerners in respect to that.

As I had indicated earlier, we will be discussing the situation revolving around northern medical evacuation at other times during the upcoming Session, but again, I wish the Minister speed in being able to replace that aircraft.

As far as our comments concerning the winter roads systems in Brochet and Lac Brochet and

Tadoule Lake, I can only encourage the Minister to undertake active consideration in respect to including those as part of the normal winter roads activities of the province as part of the provincial winter roads system.

Having said that, I thank the Minister for his answers this evening, and we'll be discussing those other matters with him as the opportunity presents itself. As I said, I wasn't going to belabour this part of the Estimates and Mr. Chairperson, I am happy to be able to report that for once I have kept to that promise that I make consistently at the opening of all my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) — pass; (1) — pass; Resolution No. 79 — pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,713,800 for Highways and Transportation; General Administration, \$2,713,800 — pass.

Thank you very much gentlemen. That completes the Estimates for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

SUPPLY — GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct the committee to turn to Page 67 of the Main Estimates, Government Services. Resolution No. 69, 1. General Administration, (a) Minister's Salary — the Honourable Minister.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I present the 1981-82 Estimates for the Department of Government Services to your committee for review and approval.

Over the past year, a number of programs related to the provision of services to provincial government departments and agencies have been integrated into the Department of Government Services. These programs include the office of the Queen's Printer, Advertising Audit Branch, and the Legislative Building Word Processing Centre, formerly housed within the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment, and Legislation, respectively.

The Estimates presented today will reflect a number of new initiatives for 1981-82 which I would like to briefly highlight to you. The 1981-82 fiscal year will see the completion of a number of major building projects begun in 1979 and in 1980 as well as the launching of construction of several more projects for which planning and design are well under way.

Among the former, will be the occupancy, early in the fiscal year, of a new correctional institution and court house in The Pas, the completion of a fire training facility in Thompson, and the occupancy of the first stage of construction of the expansion of the Assiniboine Community College in Brandon.

Projects for which construction will begin in 1981-82 are the new Law Courts Building in Winnipeg to be located adjacent to the existing Law Courts Building. This will represent one of the largest single building projects undertaken by the Provincial Government in the last decade.

Construction will begin on a new physical activities building at the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage la Prairie, providing a gymnasium, a

Monday, 23 February, 1981

swimming pool and special activities facility for this institution. A new fire training facility will be started in Brandon later this year.

Following completion of the new Law Courts facility in Winnipeg, it is the government's intention to renovate the present Law Courts facility and Land Titles Building, thus preserving these architecturally fine buildings as part of the judicial complex development's plan.

During the past year my department has worked with the Department of Health and the Department of Community Service and Corrections to develop a five-to ten-year upgrading plan for several of the provincially-owned and operated institutions throughout the province. As a consequence, the 1981-82 Acquisition Construction Program will see not only the continuation of our fire safety upgrading programs begun in 1978 in these institutions, but the acceleration of this program incorporating improvements to these institutions to compliment changing program requirements of our client departments.

Some of the larger projects in this category will include renovations and upgrading of major buildings at both Selkirk and Brandon Mental Health complexes and the Portage School for Retardates. Major renovations will be started at the Dauphin Court House and Correctional facility and the Manitoba Archives Building in Winnipeg to provide archives program expansion for the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources. As well, upgrading will begin at the Highway Services Building in Winnipeg where various functions of the Motor Vehicle Branch and its related Traffic and Licensing Boards are being consolidated.

In concert with the Department of Finance, the Department of Government Services initiated a construction projection reporting system which provides the Manitoba construction industry with information regarding the government's yearly construction program which allows its membership to more adequately plan for their manpower and business requirements. This program has been in place since last May and has received widespread acclaim from the building construction industry.

The latter part of 1980, my department embarked upon an aggressive energy conservation program in government-owned buildings which will realize significant reductions in energy consumption over the next several years. A very successful pilot project in the Beausejour Provincial Office Building which received the complete co-operation of the government employee occupants paved the way for this province-wide program. Our target for 1981-82 is to realize a reduction in energy consumption of approximately 10 percent after this first full year of the program's implementation. I'm advised that the initial preliminary results of the program demonstrate that significant reductions in energy consumption adjusted for annual seasonal variations will be realized even as early as this winter.

In order to unencumber the bureaucratic processes and to enhance overall departmental performance, the department has delegated limited purchasing power to other departments for routine daily purchases through the implementation of a direct purchase order system. This will result in more purchasing being conducted for the day-to-day

operations of departments in the regions of the province in which the services are being delivered. Client departments as well as the private sector can expect improved efficiency and a reduction in turnaround time in our services in this area during the 1981-82 fiscal year. The size of the provincially-owned vehicle fleet has been stabilized and placed on a complete cost recovery basis in 1981-82 and the department is moving towards a replacement program which will eventually bring the fleet into a more cost efficient operating position. As part of our government's energy conservation and cost reduction measures, compact vehicles were introduced into our fleet in 1980 and this program is continuing, such that by the end of the 1981-82 fiscal year it is estimated that 40 percent of the fleet's automobiles will be in the compact size range.

In March of 1979, the Provincial Emergency Measures Organization was transferred to the Department of Government Services. Since then an extensive review of the Provincial Government's role in the providing of emergency service to municipalities and the public has resulted in a significant re-organization of the Emergency Measures Organization. As part of the decentralization of this operation and to complement the province's emergency response program, two new regional offices are being established in Thompson and Portage la Prairie in order to provide a more direct service to municipalities and the general public in the preparation of contingency plans for responding to emergencies and disasters in the southeastern and northern regions of the province. These offices are in addition to the existing regional office in Brandon serving the southwest and western regions. This, Mr. Chairman, concludes my opening remarks and I now commend the Estimates of the Department of Government Services to the members of this committee for their consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) Executive Administration, (1) Salaries — pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I also hope in opening my remarks that the Minister will perhaps send a copy of his introductory statement because Hansard is not exactly up to scratch and rather than wait a few days which might be too long I would hope that I could get a copy of that either tonight or tomorrow at the opening of the Session.

Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the shocking things about the Lyon administration is their performance in office. These are the same people who told the voters of this province and the members of the official Opposition that they were good managers and that they could get the economy going, and that they could run government and they could run the economy by an application of their particular and somewhat peculiar notions which were taken from several hundred years ago.

I'll just give you a couple of current examples, they are small examples but I want to deal with the larger ones in the context of the economy and the key role that could be played but has not been played by the Department of Government Services. We have already dealt in the Legislature with the wasted expenditures by the Minister of Economic Development who failed to tackle, fails to realize,

Monday, 23 February, 1981

fails to grapple with the fundamental economic facts of the day and instead of trying to do something as any activist government would in a time of a downturn, the Minister decided to tackle that problem with an advertising program by producing a series of films and a series of commercials to make people feel better.

Now this Minister has also thrown some money away and I'll deal with that briefly and get to the heart of the matter. He's responsible for throwing away his predecessor's, throwing away \$70,000 on this sound system that doesn't work. He has spent and his predecessors \$80,000 to computerize our Hansard operation and that doesn't work and this is the same government that estimated that the Tritschler Commission Report, the inquiry, would cost \$150,000 and it came in I think at \$1,500,000.00. You know, that is just a good example of the kind of managers that the Conservatives have proven to be.

In Opposition they proved to be flawless businessmen who could get the economy going. In government they proved to be a bunch of stumblebums who don't know what they're doing, who can't operate even a peanut stand, let alone the economy of Manitoba. I want to say and I don't want to get personal here but I may have to, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition has no confidence in the present Minister of Government Services. He was a fine member of the Opposition; he was a professional attacker; he was a House Leader who knew Parliament and loved Parliament and still does love Parliament but his record in office has been a total blank. That is because the Minister epitomizes, in some ways he is the purist of the pure, he epitomizes the perfect Conservative; namely, a person who sits back and does nothing; a person who feels that any intervention in the economy is philosophically wrong. To that extent, I suppose, he is a direct descendant of Herbert Hoover and of the other people who put together the Conservative philosophy and now is exemplified by somebody named Ronald Reagan, the new President of the United States. Now Reagan looks terrific, I must admit he looks terrific — he dyes his hair and he smiles and he's on all the old movies and he hasn't made a mistake; hasn't made a decision but he hasn't made a mistake. We'll see as the months go by as to what happens in terms of the United States, in terms of their foreign policy and their economic policy.

Mr. Chairman, we know what happened to the Federal Conservative Party which took a nosedive after six months in office, and we know as well that this administration was also good for six months, that in the first six months their popularity wasn't bad, but it's been downhill since early 1978 to the present, and the slide continues.

I want to say to the Minister that we have watched his performance as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and his record there is zero because of the fact that he failed to take an activist position in terms of his portfolio, so now by one means or another he has been given the portfolio of Government Services and we look forward, Mr. Chairman, to his column. I will be one of those who will faithfully read his column; he said he's going to become a journalist; he said he's not going to become a biographer or autobiographer but he is

going to write a column. I hope it appears in the Free Press. At the very least it'll appear in the Scratching River Post which I believe is the name of the Morris paper and the member has considerable background as a parliamentarian in Ottawa and in the Legislature. Maybe he'll be good there, maybe he'll do a good job there. I wish him well in that endeavour, but I am pessimistic.

A MEMBER: Another Dalton Camp.

MR. DOERN: Another Dalton Camp. I don't know, I'm not sure, I don't know whether he is. To parallel to a certain extent, he would have to help get rid of Joe Clark. I think that Mr. Camp is not against Joe Clark but I think that our present Minister would have to go after the present leader and help dump him in order to have a historical parallel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would strongly recommend to all of the honourable members as we get started in this department that we are going line by line. I have allowed a great deal of latitude but I can see no relationship with the last part of the debate, with the subject that is under discussion, and I would ask the honourable members to please use some reference to what is under discussion rather than going all around the world and confusing me, because I do find the debates very very interesting, but I have trouble following more than one subject at a time.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take from my time to explain the relevance of my remarks but I also want to mention that I'm getting warmed up for Wednesday night which is our annual hotel association do.

The main part of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, if you are following my remarks was that the present Minister is charged with a serious responsibility. He is part of the team that is supposed to tackle the economy. The leader of that team I suppose is the Premier. It certainly should be the Minister of Economic Development who spends most of his time making commercials about how there are no problems in Manitoba, and this Minister is part of that team. He plays the role of the man who affects construction, and construction in the Manitoba economy, as in the economy of Canada, is one of the most important sectors.

I am going to draw to the attention of the Minister a number of facts which he may or may not be acquainted with. For example, he gave us some illustrations which I would like to go into in some detail when we get down to those lines about how The Pas Correctional, I think he said, was going to finally be opened. That's been four years plus in the making, Mr. Chairman. That's a pretty tardy record of construction. There are a lot of other projects that he mentioned and I hope he gives me his opening remarks so that I can refer to them specifically, but most of this, a lot of this, were previous New Democratic projects which have been delayed and delayed and delayed and are now finally getting implemented. I suppose we're going to see the semblance of some activity in Government Services prior to the election. I suppose that's the main idea, to announce and reannounce and reannounce and

Monday, 23 February, 1981

announce again, projects that were started in some cases three and four years ago.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has to concern himself with the state of the construction industry. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I guess the members of the Conservative Party they're not interested in this, they're fooling around, dumping ashtrays down. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the situation in Manitoba is deplorable. I have all kinds of articles here about the construction industry taken from the daily papers — for instance, it was only a few weeks ago that it mentioned that building permits were down in the City of Winnipeg I believe by \$42 million. Where is the action in the Manitoba economy? Where is the Conservative policy that promised us that if we wanted to do things properly and tackle inflation in Manitoba what we would do is sit back, let the private individual make his investments and make his decisions, he would have more money and everything would be just fine — that's the Reagan philosophy and it's the Lyon philosophy, and of course the two are interchangeable. We know of the conservative ties from Ronald Reagan.

I have to tell the Minister I was really quite amused at this, at one point we were looking at our new offices. I don't know when we're going to move in, I don't know when the change —(Interjection)— You see our problem is this though, we are trying to stall this issue until the election so that we can just move into the ministerial suites and then you'll move into those Opposition offices that you've designated towards us. That's really the problem, there's a lot of foot dragging because of the fact that we don't want to do a double move, we want to just move right into government as opposed to move twice. I want to tell you that on one particular tour as we walked around to look at those office, and we were interested in what was being planned for us, I happen to glance at a desk in one of the offices and apparently one of the Premier's young speech writers or publicity types or something, and there on his desk proudly displayed wasn't a picture of his children, wasn't a picture of the Premier, it wasn't a picture of Joe Clark, it's a picture of Ronald Reagan. It almost brought a tear to my eye to think of the influence and the pride with which the Conservatives associate themselves with this man, who just announced his budget the other day and I think it was attacked by James McGraw or McGrath, who I think is the normally more effective members of the Conservative Party and by Joe Clark, and I think was shot down in flames by Allan MacEachen, who asked what expenditures they wanted eliminated from their budget, and then listed a whole bunch of social programs which I think made them look pretty bad.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying that I want to know what this Minister is going to do? If he is going to suddenly, in his last few months in office, reverse himself as a Minister and start to stimulate the economy by stimulating the construction industry by building some of the requirements of government to get Manitoba moving again. You know, Mr. Chairman, the action in Western Canada is not in Manitoba and I lay the blame for most of that at the doorstep of the government, the honourable gentlemen opposite.

Friends of mine are travelling Western Canada and they are coming back and they are saying to me,

and I believe it, that they are talking to people in Western Canada and they regard Manitoba as a depressed area. They talk of Manitoba as the Maritimes. You know that's the exact parallel given, the exact parallel given, an underprivileged area in relation to the booming economies of Western Canada.

Now, you know, Mr. Chairman, can the government do something about this or not? I say that the government can and I say that the government can play a role in this and that this Minister can play a role in this. I'm telling him that when we look at these megaprojects that were announced by the government, they're all way down the road, they may never occur. Some of them may be just pipe-dreams, may be just projections, may be just dreams, but they are certainly not in most cases going to have any hit or any effect or any impact on Manitoba in the 1981-82 season, they're all way down the road. Here is what my honourable friend has to look at, article, after article, after article, news item after news item, on the national news and on the local news. Here is the Free Press, January 15th "Bleak Future for Tradesmen - 4,000 out of 29,000 Construction Workers are Jobless" Now that's performance, that's what my colleague says; that's the kind of performance that we're getting. Thirty percent of all the unionized construction tradesmen in Manitoba are unemployed and what are people saying about this. I quote here at the end of the article, a Mr. Dobie of the Construction Labourer's Union. He said about 450 of his 700 members are unemployed and it's going up everyday and he says some are on welfare, some have left the province and some are on Unemployment Insurance and this is contributing to this whole mentality and this whole state of affairs in Manitoba.

Housing starts hit twenty-year low in city, twenty-year low, and I think that that is not a good situation. I suppose there are some benefits to the present situation. Housing prices are low. Apparently if you have the same house you have in Winnipeg and lived in other places in Western Canada, like Vancouver, you'd pay five times the price. I'm told that a \$60,000 in Winnipeg, \$60,000 to \$70,000 home in Winnipeg is going for \$ 300,000 or \$400,000 on the west coast. (Interjection)— Well, I'm telling you that's what friends of mine tell me. (Interjection)— No, I don't want that, but I know what is happening. I know that the people from Vancouver aren't selling their houses and moving to Winnipeg; maybe some of them will, but I don't know if that's your intention is to deplete the province of people and keep the price of housing down. I know why the demand is high in Western Canada; the demand is high because of the fact that there are people there who want to move there and want to work there and that is driving the price up. The demand is not for Manitobans, for people to come to Manitoba, because the jobs aren't here, the action isn't here, and a whole lot of other things. And this is the government that is at the helm, so if things are good they should get the credit, and if things are bad they deserve the blame, Mr. Chairman. You know the ship is sinking, one of my colleagues says, well of course that's the government's ship that's not the province; it's the government's ship which is going down.

Here's a headline from January 24th in the Free Press, "Manitoba's Economy Slips Below the Zero

Growth Mark." For the first time in twenty years and possibly since the 1930's — I mean what kind of a performance is that. Reuben Bellan, the U. of M. Economist, said that it was his impression that this type of a real decline has not happened for decades. So what does the government do? Does the government respond? Does it do something positive? No, what do they do? They keep doing what they're doing, sitting back, sitting back. They're making commercials, they're taking it as notice; they're monitoring the situation, but where is the action, Mr. Speaker? Where is the action? Where is the stimulation, where is the mixed economy?

I mean the Conservatives, I think, themselves realize that we live in a mixed economy, that it's not just the government enterprise or private enterprise, but it's a blend or a mix. Well, if they believe that, some of them believe that, I think maybe the Minister of Finance does, I don't know, but some of them surely must believe that there must be participation on the part of the government as opposed to none.

Mr. Chairman, I'll stop now and say that if you look at the indicators in the economy and you look at the statements of Manitoba businessmen. If you look at the fact that we graduate architects and engineers and they leave the province, that we're turning out graduates who we spend thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars — I don't know how much it costs to educate someone from grade one right through to university on part of the public payroll or the public purse, but it must surely cost tens of thousands of dollars to educate one person. Then they graduate and they go. Nowadays they tend to go out west; in the old days it was Toronto and Vancouver and so on and now it's west of Winnipeg, that's where the action is.

I say that if you look at all the indicators; you talk to the businessman; you talk to the small businessman and so on, how are these people going to pay their bills? You know the whole downtown area of Winnipeg is dying. We've got shopping centers all over the place, we have little businesses all over the place; those people aren't going to make it, Mr. Chairman. There's bad figures now on bankruptcies, there's going to be worse; they're going to be compounded, because there is an over-expansion and there is a decline in our population and a decline in job opportunities. I tell you, these people in small businesses under a Conservative administration are finished. They are going to have to wait for a New Democratic administration to stimulate the economy and get things moving so that they can pay their basic rent.

My honourable friends laugh because they think that that isn't so, but I tell them that business was never better off than when our government was in power. You know, that's going to become recognized by people in the economy, by people throughout Manitoba, that although their heart is with the Conservatives in the sense of they believe in some of that bunk that masquerades as economic theory, that when it comes down to dollars and cents and paying their bills and having business and keeping their doors open, they're going to have to wait for a New Democratic administration who's going to stimulate the economy and play a positive role in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass; (2) — pass; (b) — pass; (c) Administration (1) Salaries — pass; (2) — pass. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister read off a long list of projects that he had planned; he didn't provide us with a copy of that, so I'd like to know if we could get that, I'd like to know what direction he intends to take. I wonder if he could either provide me with a copy or if he would care to restate a number of those projects, because it's difficult to follow when he just read his statement; I'd like to review some of those points with him.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought my honourable friend would have been familiar enough with the Estimates of the Department of Government Services to recognize that the list of those projects which he spoke of would come under Item 73, which would be Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. If he can contain himself until we reach that particular point, I can give him a list of those buildings that are scheduled for either completion or destruction or design. We are on the item of Administration and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be wise if we endeavoured to follow the particular items so that we don't cross our tracks several times during the course of the consideration of these Estimates.

Perhaps at this point I might just make a comment with reference to the remarks of my honourable friend. I couldn't help but get the impression that he had been caught somewhat short, hadn't recognized that the Estimates were going to come up as soon as they were and was sorely in need of something to say, so therefore wandered all over the world and paid particular attention to events that have taken place in the United States. I want to assure my honourable friend that no place in these Estimates do I find that I am going to take the responsibility, or have any responsibility for the administration of the government in the United States, particularly the programs of Ronald Reagan, so any reference he makes to the President of the United States, I'm afraid I am going to have to decline to take responsibility for, or to comment on.

As a matter of fact, there was very little in my honourable friend's remarks that related to this particular department. He made some reference to the sound system and to Hansard and we will deal with those matters when the appropriate time arises. Outside of that, I found little in my honourable friend's remarks that was not a regurgitation of what we have been hearing during the course of the past month or so — and I presume will continue to be regurgitated on frequent occasions during the course of the next few months. They have been commented on by other members here from time to time, and I see no need to repeat those comments again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister. Under what item would the sound system be discussed?

MR. JORGENSEN: It would be again, Mr. Chairman, under that same item, Acquisition/Construction, of Physical Assets.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, just a question or two to the Minister. I wonder if he could

inform the Committee whether any Special Warrants were issued by this department in this financial year.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the question that my honourable friend has posed is one that I can't provide him the answer to at the present time. There are Special Warrants, I will endeavour to get that information for him, but we just don't have them here at the moment. I'll have it for him tomorrow.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is seeking that information, perhaps he could also give us an estimate as to whether any further Special Warrants will be required until the end of this financial year and how much he expects there to be lapsing under the various resolutions at the end of the year. I realize the latter is strictly an estimate; we'd appreciate if he could give us his best estimate of those figures.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, it is not anticipated that there will be any further Special Warrants now to the end of the year, and as to the estimates of lapsing, that's a somewhat difficult thing to predict, I wouldn't want to hazard a guess at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass; (2) — pass; (c) — pass. (d) Operational Support Services. (1) Salaries — pass; (2) — pass; (d) — pass. (e) Emergency Measures Organization, (1) Salaries — pass. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one of our main critics on this is now preoccupied in the Labour Department, the Honourable Member for Churchill and I know he would speak on this and will probably deal with this item in some detail or if he can get away, may even grace this committee with a few remarks tonight. I wonder if the Minister could give us some breakdown of this particular department. There seems to be a significant rise in the salary levels and also a doubling of Other Expenditures; I know there are a lot of projects and sometimes unexpected developments in Emergency Measures — floods and fire and drought and all sorts of natural calamities — but I wonder whether the Minister could begin by giving us a breakdown of SMYs and new positions, etc. in regard to Item (1).

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there is no increase in the total number of SMYs. The figure for the period 1980-81 was 13 and again it's 13 for the period 1981-82. The increases in salary are due largely to the provision of merit increases, shortfall of general salary increase allocation and adjustments to bring salary levels in line with the new reorganized branch. There have been some changes in the structure of the Emergency Measures Organization.

I know my honourable friend is hoping for the arrival of the Member for Churchill, who, I presume, would want to discuss this matter a little more fully; I wonder if we should go into detail on this particular subject until his arrival, since it will be then just a question of repeating myself for the second time and I wouldn't want to do that. If he has any more questions with regard to the salaries and expenditures, I would be happy to answer them until the arrival of the Member for Churchill.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister about a standard procedure operated by EMO and that is the monitoring, in terms of flood forecasting and so on. I don't know when this begins. I assume this tends to be an activity that commences in March and April. Certainly by that time, I guess the government knows what is going to shape up, but I wonder whether the Minister can give us any information of the present status or any projections. I assume that there has been light snowfall and precipitation and that therefore this augers well for the spring, but I just wonder whether EMO is in fact now making their estimates and projections and whether he has anything to report to the House in that regard.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, it is not the responsibility of the Emergency Measures Organization to do this forecasting; that is done by the Water Resources Branch of the Department of Natural Resources. I believe that their initial meetings are held some time in February to make the early estimate of the possibility of flood damage. Without even hearing from the Water Resources Branch, I can tell my honourable friend that if there is no further precipitation between now and breakup, there will be no flood, because just about all of the snow has melted at the present time and it doesn't appear as though there is any danger. But to answer his question specifically, it's the Department of Natural Resources that are responsible for carrying on those forecasts.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on (e)(2), I wonder if the Minister could explain the Other Expenditures.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the major increases under Other Expenditures are for the new northern and eastern regional offices in the province. They also would include rent, furniture and furnishings, postage and telephone, maintenance, supplies and equipment, building materials; also provides for increased training of municipal officials through seminars and conferences.

As my honourable friend may be aware, part of the reorganization of the Emergency Measures Organization contains provisions for training of municipal officials who do play a rather significant role in any Emergency Measures operation and we feel it advisable to ensure that the municipal people who carry a fairly substantial share of the responsibility in these operations, do have at least some minimum training in the carrying out of those responsibilities; so we do have a training program that we carry on in order to ensure that there is co-ordination between Emergency Measures headquarters and at the municipal level. We in our experience have discovered that the closer the co-operation between municipal people and the Emergency Measures people themselves, the more effective can be any Emergency Measures Operation, so we do try to provide as best we can that kind of training for them.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to clarify again this expansion. He

Monday, 23 February, 1981

mentioned two new offices. I wonder if he could indicate again how many personnel and where these are located and why this expansion.

MR. JORGENSON: There are three offices outside the City of Winnipeg; one in Brandon which has already been filled and is in operation, the other two are, one in Thompson and the third one in Portage. There are two people in each of these offices that we will be staffing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) — pass; (e) — pass; (f) Advertising Audit Office, (1) Salaries — pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister here about this operation. The Audit Office is the one that places the ads and I presume also was involved in this cosmetic program that the Minister of Economic Development undertook, his great \$62,000 commercial endeavour which should have been undertaken by his political party but was done at taxpayers' expense to bolster the image of his political party, especially after the First Minister had taken a whole series of shots at the federal program, of attacking Mr. Trudeau's program by which he was promoting unity in Canada and I suppose indirectly his view of the Constitution and his view of Canada. Our own Premier slammed a federal expenditure along those lines and then either himself or his Minister sanctioned one along those lines, an obvious contradiction.

I want to ask the Minister again here about the Audit Office, if he has any knowledge of the program that his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, undertook; whether there were a number of advertising agencies that bid on this particular project or whether this was just the assignment of the one agency to that particular project. I would like to ask him that.

I'd also like to ask him about costs, whether he can indicate anything about that particular program to date. One of the problems with advertising is unless firm prices are obtained, most of the contracts are open-ended and although one may begin by talking about a program of \$60,000-odd, one can easily wind up, I suppose, with \$100,000.00.

I alluded already in my opening remarks to a government estimate in regard to the Tritschler Commission of \$150,000.00. The figure came in ten times higher than the estimate and I'd like to know whether the Minister can shed any light on this particular contract in terms of how much money has been spent to date, whether it's all been spent and, if not, how much has been allocated to date and what the projections are to complete that particular job.

MR. JORGENSON: As my honourable friend is aware, the advertising that is proposed by any particular department is the responsibility of that department and if he has any particular complaint to offer against the advertising of a department of government, then it should be directed to that government and not to the advertising Audit Office.

The Advertising Audit Office simply provides the facility whereby these advertisements are placed and the costs are completely recoverable from the client departments.

My honourable friend wanted some information as to the amounts that have been expended up to this time. The 1980-81 Budget of the various departments of government, the Department of Legislation budgeted \$8,100.00. My honourable friend also wanted to know how much was spent up to this date, \$7,000 has spent, \$7,041.21. Executive Council didn't budget anything but have spent \$1,579, that was for the Ombudsman's Office; Agriculture budgeted for \$107,850 and have spent \$94,513 up to this point; the Attorney-General's Department budgeted for \$15,500 and have spent \$6,945; The Consumer and Corporate Affairs budgeted for \$24,000, but they've exceeded that somewhat because of some programs that had been unforeseen at that present time, the Rentalsman advertising and the Clean Environment Commission official legal notices somewhat exceeded their expectations; Co-op Development budgeted for \$1,500 and they have spent \$1,778, so there's a slight increase in what their expectation was there; Finance has budgeted for \$9,700 and have spent something in excess of that, \$42,000; Government Services, \$10,000 and have spent \$11,000; Community Services and Corrections budgeted for \$19,500 and have spent \$76,000; Economic Development and Tourism budgeted for over a million and have spent about half of that, \$625,000; Labour and Manpower, \$43,700 and have spent \$31,000; Natural Resources budgeted for \$82,300 and spent \$112,000; Municipal Affairs budgeted for \$5,000 and spent \$4,000.00. I don't know if my honourable friend wanted to go down that entire list or not, I can do that.

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. JORGENSON: Cultural Affairs, \$22,000 and have spent \$12,000; Highways and Transportation have budgeted for \$81,000 and spent \$56,000; Education has budgeted for \$119,000 and spent \$83,000; Civil Service has budgeted for \$1,300 and spent \$759; Flood Assistance, there was no budget for that but have spent \$40.98; Northern Affairs budgeted for \$20,000 and have spent \$3,000; Urban Affairs budgeted for nil and have spent \$1,312; Health, \$97,000 and have spent \$25,000; Energy and Mines didn't have any budget to begin with and they've spent \$28,000 because of the energy store that has been opened recently in the city; Fitness, Recreation and Sport, \$6,300 and have spent \$1,097.00. That's the list of the departments that have been spending.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd also like the Minister to give us a breakdown on the SMYs. I assume there has been a new employee hired but I might be wrong in that regard. Could he indicate what the staffing is of the Audit Office and whether there has been a new employee or two added?

MR. JORGENSON: No, Mr. Chairman, there have been no increases. The staff man years for the fiscal year, 1981, was 5.31 and it's the same for the coming year. I might add just a comment to the figures that I gave my honourable friend just a moment ago and tell him that about 30 to 35 percent of those figures that I quoted from being spent by the various departments were spent outside the province in advertising outside Manitoba.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if he can tell us from those figures that were given to us, that he just gave to the committee, how much would be spent for expenses other than the actual renting of space or time, whether any other expenses for agency fees or any other types of fees or expenses?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, agency fees are not included in these estimates. If my honourable friend wants that information, he will have to get it from the client departments.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then confirming that the entire amount of \$2,060,000 for last year and \$2,300,000 for this year are all for the purchase (Inaudible)

MR. JORGENSON: Those are the estimates of the advertising that will be done in this particular year and recoverable from the client departments.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister still doesn't answer the question. I'm asking him whether those amounts are entirely spent on space in the print medium and for time on the electronic medium.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's advertising in the print media; there's advertising in the electronic media and advertising in television.

MR. WALDING: One further question along these lines, Mr. Chairman; I'd like to ask the Minister where the decision is made when a particular department wishes to launch a particular advertising campaign or to say something either here or outside of the province, is it the department itself that says it wants a print campaign as opposed to a radio campaign, or is it the Auditing Office itself that apportions the proportion that is to be spent in the different areas?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of the Advertising Office is to work with the client department, since they are familiar with advertising and advertising methods and the best means of advertising. They will work with the Advertising Office in order to determine and decide which would be the best means of advertising for that particular program, and I suppose that varies from client to client; it could even vary from season to season and it could vary from program to program depending on the nature of the advertising that is intended, the people that they intend to reach and what they have budgeted for. The decision is essentially one that is arrived at by consultation between the client department and the advertising office.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, since there appears to be some 9 or 10 percent increase in this amount for the forthcoming fiscal year, I'd like to ask the Minister whether this is accounted for by inflation and the additional or an increase in advertising rates or does it come about because of an increase in the Estimates in the different departments as to their own advertising requirements?

MR. JORGENSON: Essentially the increase can be attributed to the anticipated increase in advertising rates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass; (2) — pass; (3) — pass; (4) — pass; (f) — pass; (g) Word Processing Branch; (1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I assume that we're going to deal with this subject in a couple of places in terms of the Queen's Printer and the Word Processing and I assume that by the word processing branch we're talking about the operation downstairs in this particular building where the government has invested some \$80,000 on what is called the "Wang System"; that system has either failed to produce as a piece of machinery and a computer type of operation or it has been badly managed by the Minister and his predecessor so that we are not getting value for our dollar.

Now it is my understanding that system is being accessed by a number of departments and it is the intention of the government to add more hardware to that particular system and to allow a greater number of departments and individuals to access that particular system.

Now it wasn't too long ago; it was during the last Session when members of the Legislature were invited to go downstairs and have a tour and I was one of those who was interested enough to have a look at the new wonders of science, namely what I would describe as a computerized system with word processors which are the latest thing in this type of a system. I guess the typewriter is now being somewhat threatened by the word processor which is really a more sophisticated version. So we even see people in the press rooms and so on working away on their word processors which are connected to their computers back at head office, downtown.

And you know it's all very impressive to spend this kind of money and to computerize and modernize but the important thing, the most important thing, is to see the final result and I must say that it has been to date a disaster. Now, it's either the equipment, which I find difficult to believe, although it certainly is quite possible that the system is not meeting our requirements. I was told originally I think that the — (Interjection)— no, I'm not talking about your sound system that doesn't work; I'm talking about your Hansard system that doesn't work —(Interjection)— Right. And fortunately my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, has good hearing and I have a clear voice so we can communicate, but others of course have problems hearing and some even have problems speaking.

But, Mr. Chairman, the important thing, and I know, Mr. Chairman, that you have my sympathy because when somebody dropped something over there or kicked something over there it hurt your right ear and those of us that aren't plugged in at all times with that little earphone didn't get that sort of feedback and I have to tell you that this afternoon you sounded most peculiar. It wasn't the mellifluous tones of your normal voice; it was a croaking of an arena, a public address system that was coming out of that long microphone that you have and I hope that we're not going to get distortions of your voice in the future. I hope you heard what I said, Mr

Chairman. You are not showing any reaction; I assume that you're getting some sound, — oh, you did hear that, in your ear phone.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister what the problem has been. I mean, some of us were here in the old days, in the mid-Sixties. In 1966, for example, I think it was traditional and expected that Hansard would be out a day or two later; that was a normal system. You would get Hansard a day or two after the speeches were made and that was in the previous period of time of what was going on for many years in this Chamber where the transcriptions were done on typewriters and then I guess shot over to the Queen's Printer and then were printed and sent back.

And now we have this great modern system with all the word processors and the typewriter printing system that prints 630 words a minute or better and it doesn't work — it doesn't work. We no sooner started this second part of the Session, the main body, we came into this Chamber and after one week of operation, Hansard was falling behind. And after two weeks of operation I think we were a week to ten days late and it's my understanding that the area was understaffed; that they were not given sufficient trained personnel and that is the direct responsibility of the Minister of Government Services, present, past and recent, and that things were not well organized; that instead of that particular word processing operation being dedicated first and foremost to the needs of the Legislature, that it was being accessed by a whole series of departments and that our people were unable to get to the machinery until 3:00 p.m. every day. So that in effect, a working day was being used by other people and then the needs and requirements of the Legislature which should have priority, were being attempted from from 3:00 p.m. I guess until midnight or so, and obviously it didn't work — it just did not work. The result is that we fell seriously behind and I'm concerned because if we're starting out like that, where are we going to be when we go into Speed-up somewhere in a couple of months, and we're going in a couple of weeks as the Minister of Finance hopes and he's going to give us an early budget and we're going to have an early election and so that may save some time.

Mr. Chairman, I say that fundamentally it's poor management on the part of the Minister responsible and his predecessors for allowing a situation to deteriorate so that you did not have trained personnel working normal hours and extended hours upon requirement and I say that if we're starting out like this it doesn't auger well for the future because when the demand rises sharply as it will later in the Session with committee meetings going and all sorts of long hours, people starting at 10:00 in the morning and going to the ridiculous hours that we sometimes do past midnight and so on, I think that we're going to be in trouble. So I'd like the Minister to explain why we're off to such a poor start and what measures he has taken to correct this situation.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is partly right in his assessment of the situation but not completely. I can say that he obviously has learned his lessons well because when I was in doubt as to who I could blame for something it's always safe to blame the government and that's

what my honourable friend is doing at the present time and that's a pretty safe bet.

The facts are though that there have been some difficulties with the word processing, not with the equipment itself, but there have been some difficulties in getting the people to operate them. A machine of that nature is certainly a tremendous device but somebody has to operate it and the problem is finding people who will work the kind of hours that are called for in this particular job. Although those unusual hours are, we endeavour to compensate for them by increases in salary that are not available to the normal stenographic staff, nonetheless they are made up essentially of people who have retired, housewives mostly, and housewives in many cases that really don't need the jobs and so they can act with somewhat of an independent mind. To be able to maintain on staff at all times during the course of the Session, the number of people that you require, notwithstanding all of my honourable friend's protestations about unemployment and lack of job opportunities, it's still difficult to get the people that you want to man this equipment.

I can tell him, however, that the operations of, or the printing of Hansard comes under the direct responsibility of Mr. Speaker and he has been seized with this problem and endeavouring to provide sufficient bodies to ensure that Hansard will be printed as quickly as is possible to have it printed. I am assured that by the end of the week it is hoped that we will be back on schedule and that Hansard will be less than 24 hours from the time that the words are spoken in this Chamber.

So when you invest in new equipment of this nature it is also necessary to find the people that will man the equipment and there is a period of time at the outset that bugs have to be ironed out and a procedure established that enables us to run effectively and efficiently. We certainly hope that period is now passed us and that we can expect that the printing of Hansard will return to what we consider to be a normal schedule which would be around 24 hours.

I can tell my honourable friend that priority, in the use of that machine has been given to Hansard and will continue to be given to Hansard while the House is in Session, but as my honourable friend is probably aware, it is the intention of the government to utilize the word processing equipment as much as possible and given the priorities that have been assigned to Hansard we will still hope to be able to use the equipment for other purposes as well, to fully utilize it, and I would think that would be even what my honourable friend would want to see, notwithstanding some of the difficulties we've had up to this point. I still believe that it's far superior in terms of accuracy, in terms of minimum amount of manpower that is required and in terms of speed, in anything we've ever had in this Chamber and hopefully we can maintain the staff at levels that will enable us to fully utilize it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take much time to remind the Minister of the value of a rapid system; one to which we are used to, because he is only too well acquainted with that, that it is useful and desirable to have Hansard within a short period of time. I know that Members of the

Monday, 23 February, 1981

Opposition, I think, find it a necessity and what we want to do is to be able to look at the speeches made by the Minister and his colleagues; analyze some of their statements. For instance, in question periods, sometimes in the to and fro of questioning, it's difficult sometimes to exactly determine what has been said, or what statistic provided and it's useful the following day to have the transcripts even in draft form or in final form so that one can look at them and then reconsider the statements made and the questions asked so that one can go on from there, or too, sometimes people aren't present.

I know my colleague, the Member for Churchill, is going to be interested in saying something about Emergency Measures, maybe tomorrow, or if we go into Wednesday, then into Wednesday on this particular matter. He's not here. If he wants to know what has been said in that department, then other than asking for the Minister to repeat himself and to start at square one, he would find it useful to be able to look at previous debate and this holds true of all debate in all departments.

Mr. Chairman, I have just a few more questions here for the Minister on this particular section and then I hope that he would consider calling it 10 o'clock and then we could go on tomorrow. I want to ask him when this system was introduced. It's my impression that this was some six to twelve months ago. Could he answer that particular question? I know it was during the last Session of the Legislature and I would have thought that the bugs would have been ironed out by now.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my remarks previously, a large part of the troubles stems from the inability to maintain staff at levels that will fully occupy the word processing machine. It's just difficult to find people who are competent first of all, and secondly, who are willing to work the unusual hours that they are asked to work on this processing machine, particularly in the reproduction of Hansard. Their normal hour begins at around 3 o'clock in the afternoon when the first tapes are provided and then they will continue on until they're completed, all of the tapes that are provided for them and if the House sits late, that means that they will work later. There are two shifts at work. I think the first shift starts at 3:00 and works until 9:00 or 9:30 and then the other shift carries on until the work is completed. Those are unusual hours, particularly for people who are somewhat independent. They quit if they feel like quitting, or they move into other departments as indeed has been the case. They got back to work, rather liked it, so applied for positions that have better hours and so then you're out seeking more help. That is a problem and I don't care whether it's this government, this side of the House, or if my honourable friend was in charge. We would still have that problem. We're endeavouring as much as possible, to find the people that will fully utilize these machines and when that happens and all goes well, he will have the answer to his dream. He will have Hansard within 48 hours.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the Minister to clarify here then, the system is now being utilized by the Legislature in effect from 3:00 p.m. on and I'm just wondering whether — I guess the

problem being that if you moved us into a 9:00 a.m. onward accessing then this would create problems for other departments. If you — right now — I assume that normally that we would be using the facility downstairs almost exclusively and I was somewhat taken aback to discover that it was from 3 p.m. on and I gather there's going to be more equipment bought and more accessing of that area and I'm just saying to the Minister, shouldn't the needs of the Legislature receive the highest priority on the accessing of word processors when the Legislature is in Session? That may even mean giving them access from 9 a.m. until midnight.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend perhaps is not aware, that in order to have the turnaround time that my honourable friend is asking for (24 hours), Hansard processing has to be completed before 9:00 in the morning and usually it's completed before 7 o'clock. From that point on, it can be used until 3 o'clock in the afternoon for other purposes, and is being used for other purposes. The Hansard processing is completed sometime before then, so if there is no further work to do in Hansard, it may as well be used for other purposes and that's exactly what we are doing. If Hansard piles up to the extent that it goes beyond that, then of course it's another day's delay because it has to be over at the Queen's Printer earlier than that in order to meet the deadline. Hopefully, when things are working normally, Hansard is completed before 7 o'clock in the morning. It's sent over for setting to Magnecord, who do the setting for the Queen's Printer, who do the printing. That's the way that you're going to get the turnaround time that my honourable friend is seeking. So there is that period from whenever the staff come on duty in the morning, until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, that the machines can be used for other purposes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what other departments are now using the word processors, and secondly, what expansion is planned for that facility? I gather there are going to be more departments accessing it. I gather there is going to be more equipment and I gather that therefore there will have to be even more staff and I just hope that the Minister will always hold the position that the needs of the Legislature deserve the priority, or get the priority that they deserve during the session. I'm asking him what is now the case with other departments and what expansion is being planned?

MR. JORGENSEN: The Department of Education have some work that they are doing, the Attorney-General's Department and other departments. I might tell my honourable friend that we've been examining the operations of word processing in other areas, both in other provinces of Canada and in the United States and there are some problems that are developing in those areas. We are hoping to benefit from the experiences that they have had, so we have set up a task force to study this whole question of allocation; to study the whole question of complete and total use of the equipment and to ensure that we avoid proliferation, that we avoid duplication, that we avoid all of the problems that seem to have arisen as a result of the use of word processing in other areas

Monday, 23 February, 1981

of the country. We hope to have that report ready reasonably soon and then act upon the recommendations that hopefully, will come from that particular study. But if we do not do a thorough examination of the problems that we will run into - and indeed we will because other provinces have - then we could perhaps get into more difficulty than we can get out of with word processing. So we are endeavouring to do a pilot project so that we get some experience in our own level to determine just what direction we should go and how we should proceed in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I realize that Mr. Speaker has jurisdiction as far as Hansard is concerned, but since he is not here to answer questions on the subject, we only have the Minister who after all, is responsible for the equipment. I wonder if the Minister could give us some details concerning the staff shortages that he alluded to, but didn't spell out for us. I'd like to ask, what is the present staff assignment for the word processing branch and how many actual people are employed there at the moment?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there are six stations in the Hansard processing office. When all six stations are fully occupied, there will be no problem. Those are sufficient numbers to carry on the workload that has to be carried on. We started the Session with only three stations being full. At the present time, all six now are filled because of recruiting that has been done by the Speaker's Office. So we hope - and that's why I said earlier that it's hopeful that perhaps by the end of this week, we will be back on a normal schedule. Our attention is now directed towards catching up on this backlog in Hansard and until that is done it's not likely that extra work will be done for other departments. It is our hope that we can bring Hansard up-to-date and on schedule before we expand out to do work for other departments again.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, further to the Minister's remarks that there are three stations, he did tell us earlier that there are two evening and night shifts and presumably one day shift as well. Would this then, indicate that in order to fill these six stations on a regular basis that that would require 18 people and if that is so, can he assure the Committee that there are now 18 people working in the word processing branch?

MR. JORGENSEN: I would think so. If there are three shifts, there would be 18 people and the day shift now is being used for Hansard purposes as well until we catch up.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has confirmed that there are a minimum of six people employed there filling the daytime shifts. Can he tell us what the position is with the two evening and night shifts as well?

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not sure that I understood my honourable friend's question, when he asked

what the position of the nighttime shifts are. Is he asking the numbers; are there full complement? Yes, there is.

MR. WALDING: Just to confirm the position, Mr. Chairman, and make sure that I understand. Is the Minister now telling us that he has 18 people working regularly, three full shifts a day?

MR. JORGENSEN: I am advised that there are six on each of the two night shifts, which would be 12 and four on the day shift, which is just two short of the number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (BUD) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could possibly make arrangements for somebody who is knowledgeable in this area, who could walk me through it. I was very much interested in the discussion that was taking place and if the Minister can make such arrangements some morning this week perhaps, if somebody that's knowledgeable that could take me through it. I'd really like to eyeball it. The Deputy Speaker and I can go together perhaps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, actually I was offering to take you through it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, that can be easily arranged. Hal Glanfield is the person that's in charge of that office, and I'm sure my honourable friend knows who that is, he will be happy to take you through at any time you want to go through. If you just want to make arrangements with him, I'm sure that he will be happy to show you the equipment.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't have my hearing aid on. With whom?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I will tell my honourable friend again that Mr. Glanfield is the person that is in charge, but if my honourable friend wants to get in touch with my Deputy, Mr. Hryhorczuk, we will be happy to arrange a tour for any number of members or anyone who wants to go through. I think it will be a worthwhile exercise and you will get a far better understanding of just what the operation is all about and I think more fully appreciate how it can improve the entire system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass; (2) — pass; (3) — pass; (g) — pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, if we're through with that particular item, that's Item 69 we have completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we haven't. I haven't completed (a) Minister's Salary.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, with the exception of the Minister's Salary which we will come back to when we are through with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the exception of the Minister's Salary, Resolution 69 is completed. Resolution No. 70 — the Honourable Minister.

Monday, 23 February, 1981

MR. JORGENSEN: I think it would be an appropriate time to have the Committee rise then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll just call out Resolution 70, Field Services — the Honourable Minister.
(Interjection)— It's committee rise?

MR. JORGENSEN: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.