

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Monday, March 22, 1976

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

REV. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Fort Garry Trust praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Fort Garry Trust.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have on the record the scheduling of Law Amendments Committee for Thursday at ten o'clock. I'd also like to have concurrence, if I can quickly or else come back the next day, that the House would not sit on Wednesday one week hence.

MR. SPEAKER: March 31st?

MR. GREEN: That is correct. Certain members wish to attend the Manitoba Agricultural Fair --(Interjection)-- How about the International? But that Law Amendments Committee would meet next Wednesday at 2:30 for the sole purpose of hearing briefs which may by that time not be completed relative to the Rent Stabilization Bill, so that there will be members from all sides of the House at the meeting next Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I raised the Minister's suggestion to caucus on our side of the House and from what I could gather it almost assuredly guaranteed 100 percent attendance at the Royal Winter Fairs in Brandon, from our side of the House. So I don't know if the Minister is going to be able to raise the quorum in order to hold the meetings on the 31st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rather thought it would go more easily than that. Perhaps we'll wait with that position until later in this week.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could indicate whether he has, as referred to late last week, if he has conferred with his Cabinet colleagues to get their agreement for a full-fledged investigation into the WesCan Lottery.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): No, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know if my honourable friend said that I committed last week that I would, but it's not the case. I said I wouldn't oppose it at all. Let's get this straight.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to Saturday's report that the Minister would support the Opposition's request for an inquiry and that he would take it to Cabinet for that purpose.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I know what my honourable friend is referring to. Again that was wrong. What I did state: that as far as I'm concerned, I certainly wouldn't oppose it. At no time did I say that I would go and request it from Cabinet. If

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) it's discussed in Cabinet, if something is decided, the House will certainly find out.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the same topic to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister could confirm, as has been stated by the Manitoba Sports Federation, that a full explanation was given to the Cabinet in an earlier report and such was not reported in his statement on Friday in this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the full explanation of what? I don't know if you're just going to refer to the newspaper. I'd like to have the question a little clearer than that.

MR. CRAIK: . . . the allegations made by the Minister of the Manitoba Sports Federation and the Sports Federation is now reported in their statement to say that they are basically "after the fact since all the matters referred to were refuted in a Federation brief to the Cabinet."

MR. DESJARDINS: What I said on Friday still goes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that a group known as the Manitoba Foundation for Sports Incorporated has received its Letters Patent by the Provincial Government and with the endorsement of the Minister will operate in the "Sports Federation field on the same basis as the present Manitoba Sports Federation."

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case at all. There are some people that have got together and I think that they were going to get their Letters Patent to raise money to assist sports. I can't see where anywhere it states that people can't do that or there is only a certain type of people or certain people that can do that. This is not an act of the government at all. There is no approval needed from the government at all.

I think it's Mr. Cohen was the Chairman of that. I think that the first time that he approached me was a few years ago with this when he happened to be with the Sports Federation, that he was looking for a centre to help sports in general. I think it was a kind of an administration centre with the Sports Federation and so on. When he approached me he came in with the officials of the Sports Federation and I don't know of anything else. I don't know if he received his charter. I know that this is their wish; that I received a letter and I wrote back that I felt that it was a very good idea.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. In endorsing this "Sports Federation" or new "Sports Federation", was the Minister --(Interjection)-- or "Sports Federation Foundation" - was the Minister looking at additional ways of raising funds for sports activities?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister was looking for nothing. It was private individuals who decided that they would like to raise money for sports and like everything in sports they asked me for a letter seeing what I thought of it. I said that I thought it was a good idea. It wasn't an endorsement; they didn't need an endorsement from me and I still think it's a very good idea and I'm very surprised because the first time this subject was brought up it was Mr. Cohen and members of the Sports Federation. So if they have their battle that's one of their own battles, I'm not involved in that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. I wonder if he might report to the House and give us some indication of the situation with regard to the deer population in southwestern Manitoba and if it has been necessary to feed any of the herds up till now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister of Renewable Resources) (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated some time ago in the House I would try to deal with this question more fully during the Estimates. The last information I have on the deer population is that it has increased substantially from last year. However counts are still going on and there will be a final assessment made after this period of heavy snowfall and bad weather is over. We expect that there'll be some problems with the deer population as a result of recent weather conditions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BLAKE: Well as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was concerned with the situation right now. By the time we get to the Minister's Estimates there could be hundreds and hundreds of them starve to death. The problem is immediate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the same Minister along the lines of my colleague from Minnedosa. Are your counts not made in the month of February so the Minister would have some information as far as that was concerned at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: There are deer counts, as the member has indicated, earlier in the year. But there's a further assessment made and we will be making that assessment before there'll be a recommendation as to whether or not there'll be a season or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In the Saturday Free Press, Judge Baryluk was quoted as saying that he had seen the authorization ordering wiretaps. Could the Minister indicate whether the authorizations for these wiretaps are not supposed to be totally secret, to be seen only by the presiding judge of the Manitoba Court, and if that is not so could the Minister indicate how wide a distribution this authorization has and who is allowed to see it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that question as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, if in fact it is taken for notice could the Minister also consider that if the authorization is available for distribution as it seems to be, would the Minister make it available to members of the House so we could also see who was included on this tap?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member does realize that it is not a document that is available for distribution. Certainly the provision in, I believe it is Section 178, of the Criminal Code relates to the authorization and the contents of any wire tap reference. As to Judge Baryluk's statement that he has seen it, I would have to take that as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: A final question, Mr. Speaker. According to the statement by Chief Stewart where he said that the authorization that was issued allows tapping on trunk lines, and if there is people on extensions then that is simply legal and authorized, could the Minister indicate whether he is now prepared to issue very specific orders or guidelines restricting the use of taps on trunk lines and allowing people whose lines might otherwise be tapped into to be notified of such or some way of controlling this particular procedure?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have an uneasy feeling that I am repeating myself from answers given in the past in this connection. Certainly the wiretapping of the trunk line was such as was authorized as per the authorization itself. In saying that I repeat, as I have indicated last week, I think that the practice was wrong; it ought not to have been done and when it was discovered by our department there was instructions that it be immediately dismantled. There has since been a tightening of the guidelines in this connection with applications for authorization. Such guidelines I would intend to deal with during my Estimate review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): My question is for the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether all those whose phones either advertently or inadvertently had been tapped, were advised of that, as required by the law, in the prescribed time period. Can the Minister indicate at what date each one was advised that their lines had been tapped?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is placing himself in a position of really interpreting the law in connection with notices. The only persons that are entitled to receive a notice as according to the law are those

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) that were tapped, their lines were tapped as per the authorization.

MR. GRAHAM: Then the Attorney-General is telling the members of this Legislature that those - I'm asking for clarification - that those whose lines have inadvertently been tapped are never notified that they were tapped at all. Is that correct?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between what is required to be indicated by way of notice and what is required by way of common courtesy. In this instance, as a result of my instructions, those that were in the position of potentially having their lines tapped were notified by way of a meeting with them in which the entire matter was fully explained to them some weeks back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Mr. Speaker, in light of the reported charges having been laid in Ontario against McMillan and Company for the distribution of the children's sex instruction book, Show Me, I wonder would the Minister advise the House if any of those books have been distributed or if they're on the newstands in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Not to my knowledge Mr. Speaker, in the sense that no complaints have been laid with my department or with those officials in my department given responsibility. It could well fall within the purview of the Attorney-General.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, then can I direct my question to the Honourable Attorney-General and ask him if he could assure the members of the House and the Manitoba public that this book that has been published by McMillan and Company is not on the newstands or being distributed in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Honourable Member for Roblin. I was engaged in a side conversation and I didn't catch the name of the book. I'm afraid I probably wouldn't be able to answer the honourable member in any event but possibly if he would repeat his question.

MR. McKENZIE: For clarification to the Honourable Attorney-General. The question was: in light of the reported charges having been laid in Ontario against McMillan and Company for the distribution of the children's sex book Show Me, I wonder if the Minister can assure the House and the province that it's not being distributed or on the newstands in our province.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just have no idea whether that book is being distributed in the province. I hear a colleague behind me saying it is being distributed.

MR. McKENZIE: Well then can the Honourable Minister advise the House if he's prepared to take a look and examine the possibilities of charges being laid in this province?

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

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, by leave I should like to make a couple of substitutions on committees.

I'd like to move that the name of Mr. McGill be substituted for that of Mr. Watt on the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs for purpose of consideration Bill 26 only, if that is agreeable to the House.

Secondly I would like to move that the name of Mr. Wilson be substituted for that of Mr. McKellar on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and would ask the Minister to confirm that many of the cars written off by Autopac are bought, repaired and sold again by private individuals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the procedures used in the auctioning of written-off vehicles are that the damages and the salvage value exceed the value of the car. Whether an individual if he so wishes to purchase the car in auction, wants to repair it and put it back on the highway, that remains the prerogative of the individual.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that some cars go through this process as many as two times.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if an automobile is repaired and placed back on the highway and is involved in a subsequent accident, the previous damages and the repairs thereto are considered in the final settlement of the next accident.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I direct my question to the Minister of Highways and would ask the Minister if he could confirm that cars written off by Autopac and bought by individuals find their way back onto the highways and streets of Manitoba without ever having to pass a safety check.

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

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye's question, I suppose that can happen and no doubt has happened in the past. But I would like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the programs through the Department of Highways and specifically the Motor Vehicle Branch - we have set up a pilot project whereby these vehicles have to go through a test before they're put back on the road and as I say it is only a pilot project and hopefully this will be expanded so that we can make sure that all these vehicles that are put back on the road after an accident can be inspected and given a roadworthy test of approval.

MR. BANMAN: A further question, Mr. Speaker, then to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that purchasers of these Autopac wrecks are not informed of what they are buying at the time when they purchase one of these written-off vehicles that have been repaired.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, if the member could tell me if they're buying these cars in Steinbach or not, perhaps I could trace to see whether the seller is advising the purchaser whether the car is in fact repaired or not.

MR. BANMAN: A final supplementary question to the same Minister then, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that late model cars repaired in this manner are not entitled to factory warranty.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce in his capacity as Minister for Transportation. In view of the statements made over the weekend by the Federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Lang, that a new proposal has been submitted by Ottawa to the Province of Manitoba, can the Minister indicate whether or not that proposal has been received and considered by his government?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce, Minister Responsible for Transportation) (Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the proposal has been received and we have considered it.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this proposal include the use of Saunders ST-27 aircraft on the proposed service?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the proposal does refer to the use of the Saunders ST-27 but it states very categorically that Mr. Lang, the Federal Government is prepared to only pay one-half of the originally agreed to price for those aircraft, which we think is a welching on the part of the Federal Government because this was discussed at length, was agreed to with his predecessor, it was agreed to by a Treasury Board decision of over a year ago and the Prime Minister of Canada did indicate that in his view the Saunders ST-27 should be utilized for this service and we subsequently negotiated that price. Therefore this proposal by Mr. Land is not satisfactory or acceptable to us.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the last statement made by the Minister. Has he then formally replied to the offer rejecting it, to the Ottawa Department of Transport?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Minister gave us very little time to reply but a wire is going out today followed by a letter indicating that we believe that the Federal Government is honour bound to purchase the ST-27s at the two million dollar figure, and secondly, that the CTC should not be the instrument to be used to select these, that this is a perversion of the role of the CTC.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley) . . . to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder if the Minister of Consumer Affairs could explain Section 121 of The Landlord and Tenant Act which allows . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: I wonder if the Minister of Consumer Affairs could explain Section 121 of Bill 139, the rent review process for this House.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for MDC. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House how many ST-27 planes have been sold by Saunders Aircraft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think in the neighborhood of eight but that would include two on which the purchaser proved to be very unreliable, although it looked good. The covenant of the Government of Canada looked fairly good but apparently it's worthless.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Of the six planes that were sold, can the Minister indicate to the House or tell the House what was the average price of each plane - not the two that he mentioned to the Federal Government but the six prior planes? What was the average price of each plane?

MR. GREEN: There were eight planes sold. Several have been repossessed. Certain purchasers did not even honour their contract to purchase so we were saved the cost of a repossession and perhaps they will subsequently buy them. The figures were between \$700,000 and \$800,000, that is my recollection. But the first planes that were sold to Colombia perhaps were sold at a lesser figure, I can't recall. But the figures were between \$700,000 and \$800,000. I think that the ones with regard to the Federal Government were originally sold for that figure as well. The additional \$500,000 came as part of the arrangements that were made for the Skywest operation and replacements. But, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference? The Federal Government didn't pay any amount so they haven't suffered any increase in price.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the average sale price was \$600,000 why was the Provincial Government asking a million dollars for the planes from the Federal Government?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't use the term \$600,000. I said between \$700,00 and \$800,000. I indicated that the planes were sold to the Federal Government for the same amount. The figure was \$1,500,000. There was subsequently negotiations with regard to replacement parts and other things, and specifications particularly made that were negotiated between Skywest and the Federal Government. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the Federal Government welched on the entire amount. If they would pay \$1.5 million for the original purchase price then the honourable member would have an argument. But they haven't paid a cent.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: . . . to the Minister of Education. Could the Minister explain why after all these years the \$1,500 to the Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation of Manitoba has been withdrawn?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): I'm not clear, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable member is referring to the current fiscal year or the one commencing April 1st.

MR. WILSON: It's the year coming up. They've just been notified they've had their grant withdrawn.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall the complete listing of all the grants. But that will be in the House during the debates of my Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: In addition to the previous question. I indicated there may be lower amounts with regard to the Government of Colombia, with the initial sales. But I believe that the figure that I'm using, around \$700,000 to \$800,000, is the amount of the purchase price of the planes. That doesn't include any money paid for bribes to the Federal Government to purchase the planes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Education. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister might now wish to withdraw his statement that the MGEA did not intercede on behalf of a number of senior employees in his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would then clarify or indicate a denial of the statement in Saturday's paper by Mr. Halliwell of the MGEA indicating that several meetings were held on this matter including meetings with the government.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any such meetings. I have reported to the House on the action which I took in my office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he indicate, in reference to the Skywest proposal, what the offering price of the Federal Government now is for the purchase of the Saunders airplanes.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable member didn't hear my reply to the Member from Brandon West. I indicated that they're offering one-half of what was previously agreed. In other words they're offering \$1 million.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these particular aircraft were built with specifications worked out in great detail and in collaboration with the staff of the Federal Department of Transport including advanced avionics, radar and many other facilities that are not normally found on the other aircraft that have been sold.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering the fact that we probably have a few Saunders aircraft hanging around those hangars in Gimli, is the Minister prepared to accept that response?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it would be pouring salt on the wounds to give a cheaper price to the agency which itself ruined the company in order to get the price down.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the bills on the Order Paper in the order which they appear.

BILL NO. 16 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please. Bill No. 16 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 16 on behalf of the Progressive-Conservative Party to assure the government and the Minister that we support the contents of this legislation in principle and are happy to see the improvements in the area of compensation benefits and the proposed extensions of coverage contained in the legislation.

There will be reservations with respect to some aspects of the legislation in various quarters of the economic community, but in principle as I say we feel the legislation is worthwhile and certainly recommends itself to this Assembly.

The Minister, in introducing the bill for second reading, spent considerable time detailing some of the different aspects of the proposed amendments in respect to those having to do with extensions of coverage under the Act. We have no hesitation, Sir, in saying that that is a good move. In respect to those having to do with the upgrading of benefits we say similarly that these are worthwhile steps.

We would like to pose to the Minister the question of whether or not there should be some machinery built into the legislation for annual review and updating of permanent disabilities whether they be partial or total. Whether this should take the form of a cost of living adjustment, a cost of living arrangement that is built in to that section of the Act and thereby built in to the permanent disability compensation awards, whether total or partial, we would leave to the consideration of the Minister and further examination hopefully by the committee when the legislation reaches that stage. It might be possible to handle the problem and the problems associated with increases in living costs in that manner where workmens compensation awards are concerned or it might be that in those categories of permanent disability, Sir, that some machinery for annual review would be the best method and the most practical method to follow.

There are no questions in my mind but what certain elements and sectors of the industrial community have and will continue to have some reservations about the propositions contained in this legislation, Sir. One group in particular is the Injured Workers Association. I would like to say for the record that I am pleased with the steps the Minister is taking in terms of giving fuller and wider recognition to pre-existing conditions in the area of industrial accident and injury and I think that the proposals contained in the legislation will produce considerable relief and benefits for injured workers in that sphere.

But I would caution the Minister, if he needs any cautioning - he's probably had the same kind of reaction expressed to him as I have had expressed to me - that there certainly are groups and the Injured Workers Association is one of them that would like to see the Province of Manitoba going even further in this field than the Minister is doing at the present time. That, I concur, is not financially and legislatively always possible. But I think we should recognize for the record that the steps the Minister is taking probably meet with more satisfaction from me than they do from the Injured Workers Association itself. I suppose, Sir, that the key respondent here is the Injured Workers Association, not the Member for Fort Garry who fortunately, at least up to this point in his life, does not qualify for as an injured worker. There is no telling what may happen in the wars and onslaughts of politics in the future but thus far, Sir, I have escaped that fate and so my response is not as important as that of the Association itself and the Association has considerable misgivings and reservations about the extent to which the Minister is moving in this direction of recognizing pre-existing conditions. I'm sure that the Minister will find that through our responsibility as the opposition we will carry some of those reservations and some of those arguments to him at committee stage.

BILL 16

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

With respect to the provisions for extending the assistance given injured workers under the statute, once again, Sir, one can only say that it is a step that is progressive, a step that is helpful and beneficial to the work force and the work community of the province and we concur in it. I note by the Minister's own description of the provisions that this will free up the assistance officer provided already by the Department of Labour under the Act, to operate in a much freer capacity and a much freer sphere in interceding on an injured worker's behalf. That will of course relieve the load of many others in the community including perhaps some who are not fully qualified to do this kind of job, relieve them of the load that they have been attempting to carry in the past. I think it is a much more successful and practical method to expand the scope of that kind of assistance worker in the manner provided under the legislation.

The benefits announced for widowers and the equalization in terms of the approach of the legislation towards males and females is similarly a worthwhile step and receives our support.

Sir, the one area in which I would want to caution the Minister to a perhaps more intensive degree is in the area in which he and his colleagues propose to extend the coverage of this Act to other elements of the work force in the province. I believe the time has come and the government is responding accordingly to the extension of the Act to volunteer ambulance personnel which would provide persons in that field with coverage that they deserve and will put them alongside in equality, the categories such as fire-fighters, volunteer fire-fighters and workers of that type in the province. But when it comes to extending the coverage to the agricultural industry, here, Sir - as I am sure the Minister knows - there are a myriad of questions and a myriad of possible problems which are going to take pretty conscientious attention in order to come up with a reasonable program.

I know that the Minister stressed, and I was pleased to see that, in his remarks the other night in introducing the bill for second reading that it is not the intention either of him or his colleagues at this time to extend the coverage of the Act to the agricultural industry. Extension of that kind would await proclamation of that particular section of the Act. In case the Minister suggests that that particular part of his remarks was perhaps relatively unimportant I want to say to him that that particular portion of his remarks was extremely significant in my view and should not be glossed over lightly. Of the things the Minister said in introducing the bill for second reading the other night that section of his remarks is as important as any other because the matter of bringing farmers and farm workers under the Act does produce, as I have said, a wide ranging number of problems and a degree of difficulty and perhaps tedious paper work for many farm operators, many agricultural operators in the province that must be thought through very carefully.

For a major farm operator I think there is little difficulty that one can envision in extending the act to agricultural workers because the major operators in most cases already engage in a pretty sophisticated bookkeeping operation, Sir. But for the small farmer, and he must indeed be the key person and the backbone of the industry to whom we are looking when we are considering that industry and any legislation having to do with it, to that small farmer the prospect of extending the provisions of this Act really carries the difficult promise of a very heavy additional workload of paper work and bureaucracy where he is concerned. I think that there are avenues here where there could be extreme difficulties with respect to the enforcement of the Act, with respect to equity for all farm workers and with respect to the fairness to the farmer himself.

I ask the question rhetorically at this stage, Sir, for example, as to how do you keep certain things from becoming rip-offs in an area such as this that we are discussing. How do you keep them from getting out of hand? I just pose the example for example of temporary workers doing a lot of work in beet fields or grain fields or whatever which requires heavy strain on their backs; a lot of stooking, hoeing, whatever. The result can often be a number of difficulties with respect to their backs, a number of back injuries real or imagined and these can be long drawn-out, costly cases in the field of workers compensation as the Minister well knows. Probably that

BILL 16

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) area, the area of back injuries is one of the most difficult and tedious and intangible when it comes to the work of the Compensation Board in terms of making fair decisions and trying to compensate persons equitably. So that's an area and I relate it particularly to the category of the seasonal or temporary worker, that I think can pose a grave difficulty for farm operators particularly of the medium and small kind. The result of the kinds of example that I am suggesting to you, Sir, is a discouraging amount of paper work and a discouraging amount of trouble and I think the tendency, the reaction in many cases is the human reaction in many cases is the human reaction of throwing up one's hands and saying there is little that one can do about keeping control of this situation. As a consequence it gets out of hand, out of control, and this is where the whole provision can be exploited and abused and the kind of rip-off situation that I have referred to can occur.

So I underline for my own reference and the Minister's, his assurance that there must be considerable further consultation between himself and his colleagues and leaders of the agricultural industry in this province before the Act can be extended into that industry. I know there have been talks already between the agricultural industry, the Manitoba Farm Bureau and others and the Minister of Agriculture and their colleagues. I don't know to what degree those consultations have reached a conclusion or a near conclusion but I would hope that there will be no hasty government action taken in this area and that the Minister is prepared with his colleagues, as he suggested the other night, to sit down again and again and again if necessary with the agricultural industry to work these problems out and see how the legislation can be applied to that industry.

One thing one has to keep in mind continually with respect to legislation applying to an industry of this kind is the wide diversity and the seasonality of the agricultural industry itself, particularly insofar as part time farm labourers are concerned and the Manitoba Farm Bureau has made that point in submissions to the government. I hope the point is well taken by the Minister and his colleagues.

One other related reservation that I have is in the area of exemptions under the Act where the agricultural industry is concerned. Once again I refer to some of the discussions that the Manitoba Farm Bureau has had I know with the government. The Farm Bureau and others have pointed out that there are certain circumstances where certain employees should be exempted under this legislation if it is to be extended to the agricultural industry. For instance I know the government has had it pointed out to them that certain farm employees are in fact farm managers and that they should be eligible for exemption under the legislation. I know the government has had it pointed out to them that certain labourers, for example, are only capable of limited duties because of some form of handicap or other or because they choose to work at what might be considered, in the words of the Farm Bureau, to be less than full capacity. Farm labourers of that kind I suggest, Sir, should be considered as categories for exemption under the legislation.

So I put those caveats on the proposed legislation as it stands before us at the present time. I commend those considerations to the earnest study of the Minister and suggest to him that we will be hopeful of continuing intensive consultations on his part in that area so as to come up with solutions that will make the Act, if it should be applicable to the agricultural industry, workable and viable and reasonable in that industry. Aside from that, Sir, I repeat that the principle of the Act finds us in accord; we respect the extension of benefits and coverage and the widening and the recognition of pre-existing conditions in the area of injury and we would like to see the legislation to go forward for speedy consideration by committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I wish to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member mind if other members speak first?

MR. PATRICK: No, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

BILL 16

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have had an opportunity to review this legislation on many occasions and I couldn't help but rise to my feet on the basis of the very flippant and casual way the Member for Fort Garry approached the problems being raised by the Injured Workmens Association. For somebody to take that attitude obviously he has never suffered an industrial accident. To take that attitude also, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that somebody has never had the difficulty of attempting to have a case brought to a just conclusion before the Workmens Compensation Board. To take that conclusion, Mr. Speaker, also indicates that the person has never been in a financial position where his total dependence and the food and lodgings for his family and himself depended upon a successful conclusion of that effort before a Workmens Compensation Board.

That, Mr. Speaker, is some of the problems that are presently being experienced by those people. I myself personally have gone through those kinds of problems and have handled many cases on behalf of people who have experienced problems with the Workmens Compensation Board. For somebody to suggest that it's a relatively simple thing, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not.

Whether it is through ignorance or for whatever reason, people are not adequately prepared from the time that they are in school or in high school for the many Acts and the amount of legislation that is being passed in governments throughout Canada and indeed throughout the world. We base our education system on the premise that every person who is attending school is going to become a university professor or a doctor or a lawyer or a dentist or some other profession where this legislation will not be required. But that is far from the case. The vast majority of the students in the school system today are going to become workers and are going to be subject to the laws of the land including The Workmens Compensation Act. Not only The Workmens Compensation Act but The Employment Standards Act, The Fair Employment Act, The Human Rights Act and a number of other Acts that people who are presently in our school system will have to live under and work under in the years to come. Yet we don't prepare them for that act at all. It is only at the time that they become injured that they become aware that an Act indeed exists.

How does a person who has not been prepared to understand the many Acts that are going to affect his working life, how is he prepared for that? We know that he is not and yet the first time that he is injured on the job then he is required to know and we haven't prepared him for it.

One of the pre-requisites for obtaining workmens compensation is to immediately report that injury to your employer. Now there is a number of schemes in just about every plant or mine in Manitoba that will penalize in some way or grant gifts or watches or additional leave of absence or whatever, to supervision, if they can run a successful shift over a period of time so as to reduce the number of lost-time accidents on that shift. Look around the city where you will see signs outside of industrial plants saying this plant has worked for "X" number of days without a lost-time accident. It is good that plants are operating without lost-time accidents but how are they achieving that goal. They are achieving that goal by attempting to advise the employees not to report accidents. Then if it is, in the case of a back injury, it may bother you, it may not. But when the time comes that you are unable to get out of bed or you are unable to work as a result of an injury that you did not report three or four weeks ago or a month ago, then you're going to have a problem in establishing that you have a claim in the first place, particularly if there was no witnesses to the accident that occurred, or the fact that you lifted something beyond your capacity or whatever the cause, you slipped on the floor.

Then when a person gets into that situation where he cannot establish that he had an accident, he has no recourse but to attempt to gain the assistance of the Injured Workmens Association. That's his only recourse at the moment. They're doing an excellent job on the part of those people who are so affected. But the problem is not as great for those who are affected as those who have gone through this whole process, who have neglected to report in the first place, mainly on that very subtle insistence of the employer not to report an accident so as to make his lost-time accident record that

BILL 16

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) much better. Those are some of the problems that these people are experiencing and the reasons why they're experiencing these problems. So we can't make light of those issues; we can't make light of the fact that there is an Injured Workmens Association. I think that it's an association that should be given every encouragement to continue.

Now also the Member for Fort Garry make reference to the agricultural industry. It's strange while we discussed the question of workmens compensation for people in agriculture regardless of what level they happen to be working at, whether they're hoeing sugar beets or the supervisor of those who are hoeing sugar beets. It becomes an industry in that sense but for any other purpose it is private individuals who are operating a farm with part time help. But then when one examines the industry - and I'll refer to it as an industry for the purpose of this Act - is that, you know, it's not unusual to hear of farmers suffering back injury or those who have been involved in farm labour suffering back injury. It's a common occurrence. You go to nearly every farm in this country and you'll find somebody who has had some kind of back or kidney problems related to his occupation. If anybody can tell me that they can ride a tractor across rough fields day in and day out and not have some problem with their back, I defy them. I'm sure that there's members sitting on the opposite side at the moment who have some difficulty with their lower back who are farmers.

There's not only the problem of the farm worker regardless of his capacity having difficulty with backs, but also there is the whole question of the host of pesticides and insecticides that people are subjected to and they are breathing and using on their hands without a sufficient amount of knowledge of the effects of having these insecticides and pesticides absorbed through the pores of the skin and so on.

What of the respiratory problems of those people who are involved in the farm industry whether they're part time or full time? Anybody who has worked on summer fallow and seen the massive and huge amount of dust that the farmer is subjected to breathing day after day after day, will know that not all farmers and not all farm help have the advantage of air-conditioned cabs. They are working on the outside as well.

Surely those kinds of problems should be given attention in this House and given attention in this legislation because it's not simply good enough to say, well they're an industry but they really don't want to become involved; they really don't want the protection. I believe that we have a responsibility to ensure that everyone who is a worker in this province has that kind of coverage and that kind of assistance and that kind of compensation if his occupation results in a loss of earnings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to also make several references to this particular bill and also mention some other areas of concern. First of all I'm sure the Minister is aware of one problem that exists and I realize that there must be a certain cut-off line when it comes to the benefits being paid to different injured workers, but sometimes it seems like rough justice.

I would draw to the Minister's attention the case of a certain gentleman in my area who was injured on December 20th and is still lying in the same hospital bed with a fellow who was injured only a short 12 days later and the compensation received by both of these gentlemen is substantially different. In other words the one got the new increase that we passed here last year and the other one who happened to have the misfortune of being injured only 12 days earlier is not receiving that increase. Now I understand, as I mentioned, there has to be a cut-off time but some of these people who then end up sharing the same hospital room and lying with the same people, both in the same condition - one guy's getting a little more because he got injured 12 days later than the other one. It's a very hard thing to explain to the people and they very very often don't understand what has happened to them.

I would also like to mention that the majority of the people in the agricultural community I think favour some kind of benefit for the people that work for them. I know in my area, which is heavily mixed farming, they do employ people, some on a year round basis and others on a seasonal basis. Some of the farmers have taken out private insurance which insures their workers and I would concur with the Member from

BILL 16

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) Fort Garry when he said that the farmers are interested in meeting with the government and setting up a type of program that would be amiable and possibly of benefit to both. They are definitely concerned about the people that they employ and in today's day and age when the costs are what they are, they don't want to see anybody go hungry or have other difficulties because they've been injured on the job.

Another thing I'd just like to mention here, and I note when the Member from Thompson is speaking he always seems to infer the "bad corporations". They're the ones that are really really bad on this thing and I'd just like to draw to the member's attention that I have a fairly large establishment, namely Loewen Millwork, in my constituency who are pioneering some of the sound equipment as far as loud machinery is concerned. They're a millwork plant and since they use planers and things of that nature, there's a fairly loud noise in the plant all the time. They've undertaken under their own recognizance if they want to call it that and have set up several insulated buildings around these machines and I think the Minister's department has been out there taking sound levels. I would just like to point out that this is one of the cases where industry, probably without being told, is trying to make some conditions better for the people living and working in that particular plant. So that there are still responsible people in this country and that not everybody is the villain that sometimes the member tries to paint us, paint us into the corner.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would also support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few points, make a few comments on this bill in support of my colleague from Thompson. Inasmuch as my honourable friend has spoke the last few minutes, that the corporations are co-operating, and I'll tell you why they're co-operating. Because it gets an enormous amount of pressure from people today that it never had before. To prove a point we'll go back into the silicosis situation and how did they get compensation for silicosis. It was a long tough battle and what happened this lady sat on the steps of the Legislature in B.C. for months and finally they agreed to do an autopsy on her husband to prove he had silicosis. We have written documentation of a man who committed suicide with silicosis because he couldn't learn to live in any other way. Over the times it's gradually worn down that we are getting somewhere through governments that are responding to this kind of advances from unions.

One thing that I'd like to ask the Minister - he doesn't have to answer it today - is reports, accident reports. Our doctors in Flin Flon and I imagine Thompson, Lynn Lake, these people - we don't get the very best doctors up there. They leave a lot to be desired. One fault they have is making out an accident report. Three, four, five weeks before any compensation comes in. They blame the government, blame the Compensation Board, it finally comes down the doctor didn't have time to make out that report. A ridiculous situation. I'd like to pass legislation then we'd have it - the report be made out the day of the accident - not three, four weeks afterwards. It takes two minutes to make it out but he can't be bothered. That's the type of doctors we have in the north sometimes, not all but some.

Another case that I'd like to press is a man who has worked in the crusher plant. The crusher plant is a place that crushes ore, it's dry. He breathes dust. We have a man up there working there for 30 years and the doctor says you'll have to stop smoking. You'd have to stop smoking. He has emphysema of the worst kind, bronchitis, pneumonia, anything, anything but an industrial disease. There should be some distinction put in these kind of cases, Mr. Speaker.

Inquests, there's another big farce. We have accidents that I know are criminal negligence on the part of the corporation and you hear of the inquest put off for months and months. I'll tell you what happens. They lose interest; people forget; it becomes vague so they are passed as accidental deaths on the part of this or that, the workman. This is how they evade the responsibility of that kind of a thing.

Industrial accidents, if we take a long look at those as I said before, and base them on actually what caused those accidents. False records of safety. They do it in

BILL 16

(MR. BARROW cont'd) Thompson; they do it in Flin Flon and Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids. A record of so many days without an accident. It's a complete farce, Mr. Speaker. We have doctors there if a guy lost an eye, they'd stick him in a . . . and tell him to go back to work, almost that bad. They go to work with broken arms, broken legs, they go and sit around the change house of some mines, some corporations. Anything but go on compensation. Or they have a light duty, a light duty thing. When they get a man who is hurt bad - go back on light duty. And after three or four days, a week, there's no light duty. He either goes back to work or he goes back where? This has to be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, it's come a time and the time is now to put responsibility on corporations to be a little truer, a little more honest and let's get this bill on the road and let's go much further. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjournment by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

Bill No. 17 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Have the matter stand please, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand please, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22 proposed by the Minister for Corrections. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand please, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. (Stand)

Bill No. 25 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Highways. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Could I have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 29 proposed by the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Could I have this matter stand also, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34 proposed by the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stand)

The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for Civil Service, and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer honourable members to Page 13 in their Estimates Book. Resolution 29(a), \$383,100--pass? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . we went through the Order Paper so rapidly, my advisors I don't think have arrived from the Civil Service. I don't want to preclude my honourable friend from speaking but I do want to point that out. I do want to if I can --(Interjection)-- a matter of very very important brief discussion with my Deputy Minister. I'm trying to stave off another strike but . . .

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would consider a question or a comment or two from myself while he is awaiting his staff people to come here. This is a question that concerns me that I wish to raise at this point, one that I'm confident the Minister is capable of responding to without the help of staff.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

I would like to remind the Honourable Minister and invite him to pass some comment on the general state of affairs of MGEA at this particular time. In the light and in the area that I'm referring to, their general state of affairs, is how are the affairs of the Manitoba Government Employees Association as such going internally. A year or some two years ago perhaps there was a fair amount of discussion generated from within the MGEA with certainly the impression left in some of their statement that there was some dissatisfaction within the MGEA, the rank and file that is, with the job that the executive members of MGEA was doing in representing them as their bargaining unit. If you recall, Mr. Chairman, I made some comment at that time - it was in a somewhat heated debate with the Honourable Minister about who perhaps might be in the wings to displace the MGEA as the bargaining agent for the civil servants of the Province of Manitoba. There was a fair amount of agitation by such groups, other responsible labour groups, CUPE to name one. I believe even the United Steel Workers of America were interested in representing the Manitoba Government Employees Association, as their bargaining agent.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not my intention to revive that debate, I simply ask the Honourable Minister to give us a general comment. Has this subsided within the rank and file of MGEA? Have the present executives, management of MGEA, restored that apparent lack of confidence that seemed to be there. I'm not suggesting that it was there but certainly a year ago or two years ago there was a fair amount of active agitation going on within the MGEA with respect to their acceptance or non-acceptance of MGEA as their bargaining agent.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that since that time or certainly in the last twelve months I have heard nothing more to indicate that there is still this unrest apparent in the rank and file of the Manitoba Government Employees Association. So my question to the Minister is simply this. For a very brief, Mr. Chairman, State of the Union address on behalf of the MGEA, is MGEA here as the totally supported, you know, bargaining agent for our civil servants or is there still some continuing, you know, problems within the Civil Service as to who should represent them as their bargaining agent?

I, Mr. Chairman, make no hesitation in suggesting the support and the endorsement that I have for the kind of work that the managers and the executive of people have been doing on behalf of the Civil Service through the Manitoba Government Employees Association, and do not see reason to change simply for changes' sake. But there seems to be, in fact if I remember correctly even a person by my namesake, one Garry Enns, that was particularly involved in agitating for a change of representation. I believe it was CUPE, the party that was at that time being considered fairly seriously at least by a certain segment of the Civil Service of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would like to give us a brief editorial comment on the internal affairs of MGEA. I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that I'm out of turn in asking for that. He is the Minister who represents MGEA in this Chamber. I think any time there is the suggestion of changing bargaining agents for such a significant and large group of employees it certainly has to be noted with some interest and some concern by all members of this House. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Honourable Minister replies, I wonder if I could just draw to the attention of the honourable members that the Municipal Affairs Committee is meeting. There seems to be some misunderstanding. Some members are leaving here thinking that it's the other Committee of Supply but it's Municipal Affairs Committee that's meeting.

A MEMBER: To consider the Brandon bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To consider the Brandon bill. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, of course my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, realizes that I'm not privy to what goes on internally with the Manitoba Government Employees Association. He incorrectly said that I was the

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Minister responsible in this House for the MGEA. I don't think he meant that because of course I'm here as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, answering for the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba and not for any particular trade union. I'm sure that my honourable friend would not expect me to be knowledgeable of what internal, if there is any, internal fighting there may be going on even today within the MGEA. I can indicate to my honourable friend that I appointed a conciliation officer to look into a matter of dispute between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and their union, a union that is within - let me put it this way - the Manitoba Government Employees Association is the employer of a certain number of people in another union and I've been asked and have had a conciliation officer appointed, who has made a report to me, to try and settle a dispute between the MGEA and their employees, unfortunately without success. But that's really an aside. The only area that I do know where there is a conflict within the MGEA is between their employees and the MGEA as an employer. Whether the President of the MGEA has the full confidence of the membership, of course, I'm not in a position to know and I'm sure my honourable friend would not expect me to.

My honourable friend mentioned a couple of years or so ago there was a considerable amount of dissent within the MGEA and I'm sure my friend remembers the reason for that was the unanimous award that was brought down by an arbitration board in respect of a collective agreement of a couple of years ago. At that particular time there was a considerable number of the Civil Service who were dissatisfied with the terms of the binding arbitration and felt that maybe CUPE or some other union would have made a better deal on behalf of the Civil Service.

Now the fact of the matter is that insofar as the point raised by my honourable friend as to whether or not the Manitoba Government Employees Association have the full support of their membership or not, the fact of the matter is that there hasn't been a change as of yet in The Civil Service Act which makes the Manitoba Government Employees Association the statutory bargaining agent for the Civil Service. So whether or not support is there internally may be questioned.

Now a request has been made to the government to repeal or abolish The Civil Service Act. I might say that they know, at least the executive knows, from conversation with myself as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, this is under consideration. I have assured them of that.

But after the statutory provision establishing the Manitoba Government Employees Association is repealed, and this is what they're requesting, whether they would be subjected to rating by other groups in the trade union movement, I simply can't answer. The Manitoba Government Employees Association are now affiliated with the Manitoba Federation of Labour and I believe also with the Canadian Labour Congress. But once the statutory right of recognition as contained under The Civil Service Act is removed - and as I indicate that's at the request of the Association - they can be subject to rating because they won't have the privileged position that they now enjoy. While it is true that generally speaking under the Constitution of MFL and CLC there are no rating provisions there - although CUPE is a national union - but there are a growing number of unions who are not affiliated with the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress that may raid the union we know as the Manitoba Government Employees Association. So then in that case it would be up to the membership within the component units as to who their representative should be.

At the present time the members of the management team, negotiators, and the negotiators for the MGEA are in the preparatory stages to consider a new collective agreement. As a matter of fact I believe the first meeting will be taking place tomorrow. That will be under the present Civil Service Act where the MGEA have the right by the statute of being the representatives of the employees. So I can't really, Mr. Chairman, go any further than just outline briefly to my honourable friend, as to whether or not the membership likes the President or not or there may be a substantial number who do not. Of course that's an internal matter which I cannot answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Minister for delineating for me a little more clearly his specific responsibilities and I accept of course his notation that he does not speak for MGEA here as such. But he does point out in his explanation I think a matter that falls very squarely on his shoulders and under the hat that he wears as a member of the government and the Minister specifically charged with the overall labour responsibilities, and that is the question of is he, as a member of that government, considering revoking of The Civil Service Act as it now stands. I appreciate that he has given me the kind of traditional position of any groups negotiating about any matter, that subject matters are under consideration are open for discussion.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that whether the Minister wants to accept this or not, a decision of this kind, to revoke The Civil Service Act which presently places the Manitoba Government Employees Association in a specific category, to revoke that is in itself an expression of lack of confidence or of a hope for a change of some kind or other with respect to the relationship that the government has with the MGEA.

I would ask the Minister to consider whether or not he is not now prepared to indicate, you know, in somewhat clearer terms the government's position about the possibility of revoking of The Civil Service Act and thus removing any statutory and special privileges and rights that the Civil Service of Manitoba now enjoy through their association with the Manitoba Government Employees Association who in turn have this status as a result of statute of The Civil Service Act. It would seem to me that the government on a major item such as this must have some position on it. It must walk into the bargaining table or negotiating table with a position on it. Now whether or not that position can be maintained or held as a result of sincere and honest bargaining is another matter and one that I'm not pursuing or pressing the Minister for an answer on. I think it's not unfair to ask of the Minister and ask of this government a preference, if you like, or an attitude that they have now with respect to the present legislation governing the Civil Service in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, I really didn't mean to get into this any further, other than to solicit from the Minister the general view of what was happening within the relationship of the civil servants, particularly in view of some immediate or past history. I believe that the Minister owes us some Notices of Motion or notices of intent or notices of what's happening in this area without transgressing on the acceptable and normal kind of negotiations that take place.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will leave in the minds of some people anyway, any suggestion at this point of his willingness to revoke The Civil Service Act as it now stands, as an admission of some kind or as an invitation of some kind, that this government is prepared to make that kind of a change in the hope that a different kind of relationship will be established between the Civil Service of Manitoba and the government of the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: It's rather difficult, Mr. Chairman, for me to be precise in answer to my honourable friend. I don't think I have the habit of "ducking" questions in this House. As a matter of fact sometimes the reverse is true and I get myself into difficulties.

The fact of the matter is however that we do have a Civil Service Act at the present time, that the Manitoba Government Employees Association are the statutory bargaining agent for the Civil Service who are under collective agreements. Of course I'm sure my honourable friend recognizes a considerable portion of the civil servants are not subject to the collective agreement due to the managerial and supervisory capacities. I'm sure my honourable friend's aware of that.

In regard to whether or not there will be a repeal in its entirety or a partial repeal of The Civil Service Act is a matter that's under consideration by the government at the present time. Because there is in addition to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, which is peculiar to the Civil Service as such, another Act called The Labour Relations Act and one of the clauses of The Labour Relations Act states that that Act is

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)subject to The Civil Service Act. The request has been made to remove from The Labour Relations Act reference to The Civil Service Act which in effect would mean that The Civil Service Act is not the prime Act but The Labour Relations Act.

Now my honourable friend is aware I am sure that some months ago I indicated publicly by way of an advertisement and formal letters of invitation to management and labour groups to make representation before the Industrial Relations Committee as to what should or should not be provided for in The Labour Relations Act. The Committee on Industrial Relations met shortly after its establishment by the present House and heard representations for several days by representatives of labour and management, among which group of representatives were representatives of the Manitoba Government Employees Association making a request for the removal in The Labour Relations Act reference to The Civil Service Act that I have just mentioned. Now then at the conclusion of those hearings of representation, the Committee agreed that the representations were ceased at least for the time being, and that I gave an undertaking as the Minister of Labour, wearing that hat at that time, that the representations that were made would be given the consideration of the government and that legislation would be forwarded in due course.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to my honourable friend it would be most improper for me, in answer to his request and I can understand it, in answer to his request to give some information now as to what the government is going to do because it is a very important part, I would suggest, of the deliberations that will have to be taken into account when government makes its mind up. All that I can say to my friend, I'm sorry that I cannot say to him this afternoon that the government will or the government will not, either repeal partially, entirely The Civil Service Act or will repeal the section of The Labour Relations Act which gives The Civil Service Act precedence over The Labour Relations Act. No I can't do that, I'm sorry. All I can say to my honourable friend--(Interjection)--Pardon? Yes, that's right. I'm not in the habit of giving sneak previews and again I say to my honourable friend, the matter is under consideration. I can give him this assurance and the members for the committee this assurance, Mr. Chairman. I hope that it will not be too long before we will find on the Order Paper notices of amendments to these Acts. It is under the active consideration of the government at the present time and an assessment is being made of the representations that were made to the Industrial Relations Committee. I'm sorry I can't be any more helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pick up with the Minister a topic that he and I exchanged a few interesting words on last year where I think myself and the then President of the New Democratic Party were categorized in the general term of "ranters and ravers" and I would only want to comment I suppose that it shows that sometimes a little ranting and raving goes a long way. I would like to in effect compliment the Minister on the fact that since that period of time the government has moved in some direction towards the establishment of affirmative action programs for the hiring of civil servants and particularly in respect to the employment of females in the Civil Service. I would say that that perhaps shows that from time to time some nudging, if not ranting and raving serves its purpose.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that that has been a fair degree of major step that the government has undertaken and I think it's now only incumbent upon members of this side to raise the question at this point as to what do we do next. I know that the Minister always gets frustrated when we're always not satisfied but I think it is our role to suggest to him that now that he has established the operation of committees, I believe, in each of the departments to develop affirmative action programs, one of the questions I would like to raise with the Minister at this stage is really how operative those committees are and to what degree are they functioning and to what degree are they actually implementing any specific changes. In some very general checking that I have done, Mr. Chairman, I have discovered that while some of the committees have been set up, several of them have never yet met. There may be extenuating circumstances why they

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . haven't. In other cases I am sure some of the departments have proceeded but I think that it would be helpful to members of this side of the House to have a progress report on the achievements to date of the committees themselves and what kinds of steps they are undertaking to redress some of the inequalities in both employment standards, pay scales, job classifications and I guess the primary issue, the opportunity of women in the Civil Service to achieve more of a balance of senior positions and managerial positions. Because I believe the figures, as we saw them last year, were about two percent or less than two percent perhaps of those in executive positions were women, the rest were all males. I would like to know if there has been any changes since our little debate of last year in redressing that balance, or at least in indicating what steps the government has taken to indicate the progress that these committees would bring about.

In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that one thing that is absolutely necessary if this affirmative action program is to work, is to have somebody acting as a watch dog over it, to provide for a continuing commentary upon its achievements and upon its workability within the Civil Service. I know that in the past members of this group have recommended to the Minister as well as many outside organizations that there be an Advisory Council on Women in the Province of Manitoba established, with one of its chief functions to observe, comment and criticize perhaps the progress that is being made in the public service among many of its other activities. I think up to this point the Minister has rejected these proposals or recommendations for what reasons he may have and I would be interested actually at this time to listen to his reasons, because I think the existence of an Advisory Council on Women and the equal rights of women, particularly in the public service, would at this particular time fill a necessary role in the program of affirmative action. It would provide one form whereby the individual initiatives or lack of initiatives in the different departments and agencies and Crown corporations and universities and community colleges could be assessed so that there would be some yardstick that would be applied to the developments in each of these areas. It would seem to me that that kind of role that the Advisory Council plays in the Province of Ontario and on the Federal level has been a very worthwhile one, a very salutary one from the point of view of maintaining of measurement, some assessment of achievements of this affirmative action program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would want to underline and stress the need for such an Advisory Council which I am sure could be populated at no cost to the government. I think generally that it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, the Minister feels that it may cost a few pennies but I gather that the request coming from some of the women's organizations in the province have offered that they would be prepared to undertake this activity on purely a voluntary basis which I am sure would be acceptable to the government at this time. So the necessity of an advisory council would be the first point I would want to raise.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, and maybe it's a more substantive one and that is when it comes to the exact ways and means of achieving a more equal balance in employment opportunities one of the things that seems necessary to me is staff development, providing the opportunity for upgrading in education and upgrading in skills. Because, Mr. Chairman, I think unfortunately our educational system still, for whatever its own reason, is too often geared for streaming women for certain kinds of occupations which oftentimes tend to be clerical in nature and males for the professional-managerial side. The only way that that transition from one to the other can be made is if there is the opportunity for remedial training or staff development or extra training. I recall with interest, Mr. Chairman, that in the last report of the Civil Service Commission, and this would include both men and women, there was a total of 28 educational leaves which seems to be an awfully small number for a Civil Service, I guess if you took the total number of 13,000 which is the largest employer, it seems to me that is an awfully small number of people who are actually being encouraged to leave the service for a while and upgrade their educational standings by taking additional university or community college programs or whatever the educational requirement may be. I guess I'm more

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)curious why there's such a small number and I would use that curiosity to lead me to the next point, to say that if there is to be a very major effort in the affirmative action field it would seem to me that would have to be accompanied by some pretty major efforts in the educational upgrading where there would be a very major incentive offered to women in the Civil Service to go back to school to achieve other kinds of professional upgrading in order to get the paper credentials or the necessary requisites in order to be able to apply for more senior positions in the Civil Service. This number doesn't seem to correspond with that kind of need. So again, Mr. Chairman, I would raise with the Minister the issue of the kind of staff development, upgrading program that is generally available in the public service and perhaps more specifically ask if there should not be a special kind of educational upgrading program made available for women so that those department which are attempting to rewrite the imbalances that have been existent in the past, would be able to do so through the means oftentimes of sending their staff members for additional training or education which would seem to be a necessary complement to any affirmative action program.

So, Mr. Chairman, those would be the issues I would raise now. I think there is an additional issue that goes beyond that and one that was raised last year and I would again ask the Minister for clarification. Perhaps it might better belong in the discussions of the Women's Bureau, but I raised the issue with him last year about the ILO 1972 Convention, asking not for the equal pay standard but for equal remuneration on the basis of job evaluation. Because again the thing that disturbed me last year and I don't think it has changed all that much and that is that the wage scales between male and female in fact are widening in our society not growing closer together. They in fact are growing increasingly wider disparities between them. It seems to me the only answer to that seems to lie in the kind of initiative that the ILO was promoting in its 1972 program which was remuneration based upon evaluation. I think I raised that with the Minister last year. It would seem to me again that would be applicable both to the public service and certainly in the wider element of women in the work force generally.

As I pointed out last year, Mr. Chairman, I think it is still true that if the government has accepted this as I believe it has as a major commitment and as a priority then the leader in the field should be the public service. I think it can set standards and set directions that the private sector would then be required to follow simply because of the comparison. It would seem to me that the performance of our own public service should be exemplary in this respect and should be taking the initiative in all respects so as to provide - in effect showing private sector employers what should be done. I think this should be not just true with the departmental lines but also with the whole range of activities supported by public funds, particularly the educational areas, the hospitals and so on, those that receive full time operating grants from the Provincial Government.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are the issues I would like to raise in relation to the position of women in the public service and in the auxiliary agencies and adjacent Crown corporations and operations that are funded by the Provincial Government and perhaps the Minister could inform us to what is happening in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we will get into really the type of inter-change we had last year. I recall on a number of occasions my honourable friend and I had some a very pronounced differences of opinion as to what was being done and what was desired. I have no intention and I'm sure he would accept that, of getting into that type of discussion.

I listened with a great deal of interest to what he had to say and particularly I am intrigued with his reference to the ILO and a presumed change of basis of definition of equality in employment of male vis-a-vis female and I am sure, as members of the committee know, it wasn't too long ago we did change our Employment Standards Act or The Equal Pay Act, which is now part of The Employment Standards Act, to change from the previous definition "work of similar nature" whereby male and female then had to be paid equally. We changed that to similar to use the phraseology, "substantially the same"

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)or something along that line. Now we have a new approach and this is the approach of the ILO that women and men should be paid the same for work of equal value.

Well I respect my learned friend and his expertise in his chosen field of endeavour but I would like to receive from him a clearcut definition of what is meant by equal work of equal value. Matter of fact, I did on one occasion raise this question with a number of delegates who had attended Geneva Conferences and I have also raised it with a number of other people as to what exactly "work of equal value" is. And here again we get back to the area of substantially the same, where we had difficulties previously, as to what was meant by substantially the same, and work of equal value is judgmental in my opinion in any case. So it's pretty hard really, what I'm trying to say is that it's pretty hard to clearly define that application of equal work of equal value because of the judgmental factors and I extend an invitation to my honourable friend because of his expertise in this particular area, if he would give me a clearcut indication of what it all means. Because quite frankly and quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, I am seeking earnestly and sincerely a clearcut definition. I haven't been able to receive it from the Federal advisers or anyone else as yet and I extend an invitation to my honourable friend to do that.

Now when we get to the question of the ways of achieving a greater balance in employment for women in the Service. You know that isn't quite as easy as it may appear on the surface. It has been tried in some areas that in order to achieve this we should establish a quota system in employment in the Civil Service, or in employment generally. We don't have to just deal with the Civil Service although of course that's what we're answerable for here in this Assembly. But in industry as well. They've tried it in some of the states in the United States and it has failed and failed miserably because you can't simply turn around and say, well for every man that's working you should have a woman or establish a ratio of three to one or five to one like you do apprentices to mechanics. I have yet to find, I have yet to find any jurisdiction where they have been able to achieve what the request is applying in its reasonably broad sense, equality in employment for women.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether my honourable friends on this committee have observed the number of advertisements that are in the newspapers, particularly Saturday's, and I want to say that I'm glad that the Commission and the advertising agencies of the Civil Service now have a caption in all of their ads, "We invite invitations and applications from male and female alike." So I don't know whether my honourable friend would admit that that's a wee teensy weensy little step forward but it is part and parcel of the approach that we're attempting to make, belatedly maybe true. But I do want to say to my honourable friend that I have checked over for a long time the sex, without discrimination of course, the sex of the applicants to senior jobs, particularly senior jobs, and it really, Mr. Chairman, is appalling to find out that despite the number of additional graduates from our colleges and universities who are female, the relationship hasn't really become evident in the percentages of applications for employment in the Civil Service. It's not easy, it's not simple and I'm sure my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge will recognize that as well.

The question legitimately has been raised as to what are we doing ourselves insofar as the Civil Service is concerned in the field of equal employment. I do want to stay to that for a moment or two before we get into the other aspects of educational leave. We have established a sub-committee of Cabinet dealing with equal employment opportunities within the Civil Service. If memory serves me correctly the Premier is the Chairman; I'm the Vice-Chairman and my colleagues the Honourable the Attorney-General, I believe the Minister of Consumer Affairs - I may be wrong with the complete list - together with representatives of the female employees, some of the female employees such as the Lorna Leader Elias who is charged with the co-ordination of the career planning within the Civil Service; Mrs. Mary Eady, the Director of the Women's Bureau. There's Miss Joy Cooper of Planning and Priorities Secretariat and I believe there may be one or two others. We meet from time to time to consider ways and means by which and through which internally we can achieve greater employment opportunities for women.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

I get into difficulty, Mr. Chairman, from time to time ---(Interjection)--Pardon? Constantly, constantly. I do get into some difficulties Mr. Chairman, because when I look at the question of employment, equal employment opportunity, I go beyond what is the desire of the fair sex normally and say that as far as I am concerned any approach to equal employment opportunities should take into consideration the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the older citizens, male and female of course, in the main and others. Now I do, Mr. Chairman, say to the committee, I get heck quite frequently because I sense that there is a desire for us to concentrate solely or in a major nature only with the equality between a male and female. Well I'm such a type of person that believes in equality I believe in total equality for all of society and not just one sex or the other.

Now how we're going to achieve all of this is one of the objectives that we have in government. We have established within the government a program of a co-ordinated effort planned for equal employment thrust and by way of a New Service Bulletin issued under my name or over my signature, on October 3rd of last year, there was quite a list of areas that we were going to endeavour to put a major thrust in to achieve training, upgrading and better and equal opportunities for all concerned.

What I was trying to infer, Mr. Chairman, a moment ago of where I get in dutch sometimes with the women because I add other groups, I just want to indicate to my honourable friend where I get into dutch and it's referred to in this statement - if I may just one sentence, Mr. Chairman - these groups designated the target groups by the Task Force include the mentally and physically disabled; people of native ancestry; the socially disadvantaged; the over-forty age group and women. I got "hell", if I can use that expression, Mr. Chairman, because I linked a number of others with the use of the definition or word "women." We can continue this later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. According to our Rule 19(2) I'm interrupting proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour and shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on Private Members' Hour, Resolution No. 7, proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews has eight minutes left.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, the Resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is another in a series of resolutions that the honourable member has proposed on housing. The honourable member has spoken at great length and with many words on housing, as he has spoken on virtually every other subject that has come before this House.

The honourable member might like to refer some time to a quotation from Shakespeare. Shakespeare once said that "Brevity is the soul of Wit," and the honourable member is not exactly noted for his brevity.

I would like to take exception to what I feel are some irresponsible and rather insensitive statements that the honourable member made in his presentation on the resolution about Saunders specifically, Saunders Aircraft and Manitoba Forest Products in The Pas. He claimed that we were pouring money down the drain in these particular projects and I think that particular statement requires a tremendous amount of gall, after what we know about the performance of the Federal Government. The Federal Government in 1969 closes the Gimli Air Base. At the same time that it's involved in an ARDA-FRED Program to rejuvenate the Interlake, it closes the Gimli Air Base and removes something in the nature of 1,000 jobs. And it was abdicating its responsibility in this region, in this community. The Provincial Government in order to compensate for the failure of the Federal Government moved in, first in support of a private company, and finally because of the problems of that private company, had to take over Saunders. And I think in many ways that failure of Saunders was not entirely regrettable.

We did, this government did make a valiant effort to try to provide a high level of employment and a high level of skilled employment in the community of Gimli. And we did for a number of years. Now it cost money but it cost less money annually than the air base used to cost the Federal Government. And of course that annual payroll was never regarded as a loss by the Federal Government. So in many ways I think that our failure is not entirely regrettable. It was a valiant effort to maintain employment in Gimli.

The role of the Federal Government I think is almost despicable. They pulled out of this community and they have continually, continually failed to make any comparable contributions to the development of an aircraft industry in Manitoba, compared to what they're prepared to do in Toronto and Montreal. They're prepared to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to support the aircraft industries in Toronto and Montreal, and one sometimes wonders whether there isn't a pretty cynical political calculation that enters this kind of a decision.

I couldn't quite understand the honourable member's comments about CFI and the Manitoba Forest Products in The Pas. He states that we have been pouring money into the venture. I assume then that he wants us to close down the operation or if he doesn't I would like him to be a little more specific, a little more clear on exactly what he objects to at The Pas. I should remind him that the Tories have been telling us for the last couple of years that we're making a profit at The Pas. The Honourable Mines Minister doesn't agree but the Tories tell us that we're making money with Manitoba Forest Products at The Pas.

I'm also a little unclear as to exactly what the honourable member is proposing when he talks about the province, instead of putting money into Saunders and Manitoba Forest Products, should be putting the money into investing in servicing trunk lines, infrastructure for new housing projects; he talks about incentives to developers. Now exactly what is he proposing? If he's proposing grants, gifts of money to developers, then I think this government will certainly not agree with him. This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government does. It gives grants to industries, and this is a very nice way of doing business, they give money away and then they never show losses but the money is spent regardless.

Now the problem with giving incentives, with giving grants to developers, is that

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) I don't think you really have any guarantee, any real guarantee that you're going to hold down housing costs. I think this is not an effective way of holding down housing costs. The policy that the province has followed up to now, I think has a better guarantee of keeping stable housing costs, at least on a segment of the market, and the segment of the market that I'm referring to is the segment built by MHRC. That housing cost is fixed and stable and will not rise appreciably in the years to come. If that land, that housing, were given to developers, I think there would be no real guarantee that you could hold down housing costs. And not only, Mr. Speaker, have we fixed housing costs for at least a segment of the market, but we've made money doing so. And this is one thing that is not generally known: The housing that we built in 1970, 1971 for \$10,000 a unit perhaps, is now worth 20 and \$30,000 a unit, so the Province of Manitoba, and the people of Manitoba have realized a capital gain on this program. We have made money with our housing program. And I wish . . . Mr. Speaker, I only wish that every other program that the province has been engaged in had done as well as we've done in our housing program. That housing not only is fixed in its cost, relatively fixed in its cost to the province and to the people who occupy it, but we have made money for the people of Manitoba in building that housing. Am I out of time?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up.

MR. JOHANNSON: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to speak on this resolution but I just can't let some of the remarks go by of what the Honourable Member for St. Matthews had to say. He seems to take credit, and he's completely satisfied that the government's done a great job as far as housing is concerned, and in my opinion the government has done a very poor job, they have failed. Because I listened to the First Minister on many occasions in the first and second year when he came in this House after they won the election, and he said the people that we want to appeal to is the poor, the unfortunate, the ones that haven't got the education, the ones that haven't got housing; that's the ones that we're going to solve the problems, we're going to do something for them.

I tell the Member for St. Matthews that not only . . . that the government hasn't solved the problems for those 1,600 families that live in the area close to the railroad tracks, that we have so many reports done in this province that we would do something for these people, the government hasn't solved the problems for them, but today in that inner core, Mr. Speaker, we have people that are not receiving good education and haven't got education; we have people that have no housing and very poor housing; we have people that have no job opportunities and no jobs available, and, Mr. Speaker, we haven't got any training program at all for these people, and the fact is instead of what we had eight years ago, or six years ago, we have four times as many people in that area now. And the member knows it, we have four times as many people and they're the same ones, not only the same ones but there's added. There may have been training, there may have been housing, but I'm talking specifically about the people right in the centre core area that had great problems six, seven years ago and many times the First Minister used to get up in the House and say, that's the ones that we have to help, that's the ones that we have to do something for. But the problem is --(Interjection)-- No, the families, many of them are living in their own homes, many of them are renting. So what I'm saying, the government has done very little for those people. And I agree there's been a lot of public housing, and I don't argue with the public housing that has been built. In fact there wasn't enough built because if you try to get somebody into a public housing, somebody that really needs to get into them, you're told that you have to wait, because there's 500 or 400 on the waiting list. So I know that there's a demand and there's a need.

But what I'm saying to the Member for St. Matthews, there are serious problems and you haven't solved the problems. And the problems that we had six years ago, they're four times as great now for a certain sector of the people in the city. I'm sure the member knows that. So the problems have not been solved.

The member talks about keeping the air base open, and I'd like to be specific

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . with him now because it is the NDP policy in Ottawa and in this province that all bases in Canada should have been closed, all army and service bases should have been closed. In fact there was a resolution from the Member from - I forget the constituency, I believe it was Rivers - at that time when the Rivers base was being closed and he had a resolution and he wanted an appeal from all the members of the House in Manitoba to have the Federal Government leave the base open. The Member for St. Johns he took a very strong position, he says I'd like to see every base closed in this country; we don't need any bases. Now the Member for St. Matthews is arguing why was the base closed in Gimli. If there was no need for bases to stay open in certain areas - many of them have been closed all across the country - so surely the member cannot make an argument that you have to keep a base open when there's no use for a base. He said that's why the jobs were lost. Sure the jobs were lost but to talk about why the base wasn't kept open, well that's a change in philosophy because I've seen some Hansards from Ottawa where the NDP members continually have been pushing to close the armed bases all across the country. Now this member seems to have a completely different philosophy, he says, even if there's no use for them you should keep the Armed Services and Air Force bases open. I believe that's his attitude because he says, "Why did they close the base?" Now he says --(Interjections)-- Well, he says, the reasons the base should have been kept open, to employ people. But, Mr. Speaker, does the member not know that only a very few people were employed from Gimli in that base, very few. We had to bring them from Edmonton, from CAE; we had to bring them from Winnipeg; we had to bring them from Great Britain. Very few people from Gimli, right from Gimli, are employed in that place because I was there, I went through the base, I've asked the people, how many are employed, and now for the member to say what they had to do to keep the base open for the people of Gimli, that's not right. That's false because there was a shortage of people, there were something like 50 or more I believe brought from Great Britain, and there were people brought from Edmonton, there were people brought in from Winnipeg from CAE, so to say that it was strictly for the people at Gimli, the employment opportunities in Gimli, that's not true for the people in there.

Now to talk about, it was the Federal Government that was totally responsible for the Saunders Aircraft to fail, everybody in this House told the government six years ago when they first went into it that it's going to fail. It had no --(Interjection)-- If you want, I'll dig up the debate. Five years ago they were told that it was going to fail. (Interjections)-- You were told that. When major aircraft industries all over the world, all over the world, the major ones with a lot of capital and many many years of expertise behind, that have difficulties and have --(Interjections)-- That's right, that's right - and have failed and have difficulties, and have difficulties today with billions of dollars investment in them, and here he's talking about an airplane that firstly when it was developed wasn't even air pressurized. How can you market a plane that's not . . . You know if you were going to develop an air industry, surely you would have got the best technical people, the best engineers to advise the government. --(Interjection)-- You went with something that wasn't marketable. That's where the difficulties were, and maybe it's improved lately but to say that, you know, the Federal Government's responsible when major, major aircraft industries all over the world were in difficulties five years ago, in serious difficulties that governments had to bail them out, and here he's talking about keeping employment in Gimli and it was because the Federal Government didn't buy two planes or something that's why it failed. That's not true, that's nonsense, that's even silly.

Now the member talks about, you know, the money, that's \$40 million. You know, if you would have put \$40 million into housing in this province or into Home Repair Programs on older houses, you'd have really done . . . or put services in, sewer and water, and then you'd have no housing problem. That's what we're talking when you can put something into service, into land assembly. Then you'd have no housing problem at all, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in my opinion, the housing problems are only as serious because there was shortage of lots available in the city for the last four or five years. And that's what brought on the land, or the housing --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, will you keep that member in check, please, because he's distracting my . . .

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)

When you're talking about lots: I've mentioned in this House before that service lots are sold in Minneapolis for \$7,500 each, fully serviced, they're sold for that in Seattle, and they're sold here between \$18,000 to \$30,000 a lot, Mr. Speaker: So for the member to say that it's the Federal Government's responsibility because they've put \$40 million into aircraft at Gimli and it failed - strange that four years ago they were told by most members of this House on the opposition side that it's not going to work; that you were going into something at the wrong time, when all major aircraft industries were failing all over the world.

So really, Mr. Speaker, when the member says, you know, they've done such a great job in housing, I would have to disagree. I know more houses were built and I give the government credit for that, and I know that they've been mostly in the public housing. They would not talk to anybody in the private sector, and the Minister said so himself, and I think that's the failure of the government because I believe if we had difficulties with legislation, municipal legislation, I believe if the Minister or the Premier would have met with some of the city council, with the private developers that are holding quite a bit of land around the city, land adjacent to the housing developments where you can connect the sewer and water almost immediately, and I'm sure he could have said, look we have problems, we want so many serviced lots on the market, and if you speak to these people I'm sure they'll be receptive and you can do something. When the Minister says I have never talked to the private sector, I will not talk to the private sector, I'm not prepared to talk to the private sector, well, Mr. Speaker, how, how will you provide housing or how will you have private sector react and provide housing when you need, when there's a great demand.

So I can't just accept what the Member for St. Matthews has said. I know houses were built but, Mr. Speaker, in the inner core area there are more people today than there were six years ago, many more, who still haven't got adequate housing, who still have not got facilities or education potential, who still haven't got jobs and still haven't got any retraining for jobs which they desperately need. The problem was only 25 per cent as large eight years ago or six years ago than it is today. It's fourfold now. So the government shouldn't be so happy and satisfied that they've solved all the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put these points in the record and I did not intend to speak until . . . to retract some of the remarks of the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the big problems facing the smaller towns and villages in rural Manitoba, of course, is serviced lots. And when we're looking at the cost of what services now cost, we find that most of the areas can't float that large a loan because they are already bearing quite a heavy burden. And this in turn then does not open any new serviced lots for people to build on. I know in particular in the Town of Steinbach we've experienced a little bit of a building boom in the last number of years. We used to be building 30 to 40 houses a year and all of a sudden we're building 200, and we're running desperately short of new developed lots.

The problem that we're also facing is that we seem to be caught up in so much red tape with regard to zoning and all kinds of other things, that when a lot finally does come onstream, and it takes as many as two to three years because very often you're dealing with three or four people in the same parcel of land that you're trying to get a registered subdivision on, by the time you finally get that through the surveying costs and legal costs and the different costs that have added up mean that the price of that lot is up to \$5,000 or \$6,000.00. Now that really is unacceptable because that does not include the services because the services are put on the lots on a year to year basis either on a 10, 15 or 20 year debenture.

But I think another thing that we've done in the last number of years is we've raised people's expectations when it comes to housing to a very very high level. Most people now when they're moving into a certain area demand pavement, curb, street lights, they want all the services, not tomorrow but right away. So what that has done is that that has added to a built-in cost that we have to pass on to the consumer, namely, the

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) people buying the lot. This also has again put a certain amount of pressure on the people developing, and as a result in the smaller areas there haven't been the type of developers that have been wanting to come in and do all the services at once.

So I think to a large extent we are involved in a time when people want to move into a house with all the services; they want the house totally finished, and there's very few people who want to get into a new home and do some of the things themselves, and in that way help cut costs. But we have definitely raised our expectations as far as housing is concerned.

Now I was reading the other day that a group had done a study with regard to Montreal and Toronto and they noted that the serviced lots in Montreal were about half the price of what they were in Toronto. And one of the conclusions of the report was again the lag time taken by the municipal, provincial and different governmental bodies involved in the registering of subdivisions increased the lag time by quite a bit which then again meant that when finally you did have a certain subdivision coming onstream in Toronto, you could command a much higher price than in Montreal because of the red tape involved. So here again I think is another example of what happens when we force people or applications, and that, to cross too many desks of bureaucrats and whatever. And I think a certain amount of cutting down on the time that this takes would definitely bring down the price of serviced lots.

The other problem in the smaller villages is that some of them that do have lagoon systems or sewage treating systems as well as water systems find that they are about at capacity right now, and that any expansion of any more serviced lots within that community would mean substantially large expenditures as far as that community is concerned. The residents of the area realize that this expense will have to be borne by the community at large and there is a definite reluctance on the part of this community to go ahead with a massive public works undertaking. So as a result they are sort of trying to contain the growth to where they are right now. I would suggest that if anybody has a chance to talk to some of these Mayors and Councillors from these areas they would give you a very very accurate evaluation of what is happening.

I'd like to just briefly mention something that the Member from St. Matthews mentioned about the government making money with regard to the increase in cost of housing, and I would just caution the member on that because I think that's a false sense of making money. If we would project that we would say that the government should continue to sort of profligate inflation because they'd be making money on it, and I think maybe that's the fallacy on this argument, because what we are looking at, is we are looking strictly at what your dollar buys, in other words, replacement value. So if you have somebody that has purchased a house in 1968 for \$10,000 and a real estate man comes up to him and says, "Listen I can get \$30,000 for your house," the guy goes and looks a bit bug-eyed and he says, "Man, I'm going to make \$20,000 on this." I just had a case the other day where a fellow signed up he was going to sell his house, then he went out to look for a new place because he thought, man I'll be able to buy quite a bit with \$30,000 because I only paid \$10,000 for mine, well what happened? He went out and he found that he couldn't even replace his own house for \$30,000.00. So this is the sort of false sense of economy that we're creating, because what we're really saying is, no matter what the money is that we are spending on a particular facility, it's the replacement value that costs. It's what your dollar will buy. So I don't think that anybody that's going to try and make money on inflation . . . basically what you're doing is you're trying to hedge yourself against inflation; that's the only thing you're doing, you're not making any money on it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the serviced lots as far as I'm concerned is one of the biggest problems that we'll be fighting in the next little while and that isn't only in the large urban areas, as I mentioned also in the smaller rural areas, and that everything should be done to try and get these things onstream as fast as possible. The more serviced lots we'll have the more owners will be involved in the thing and the pressure will be on them to sell it, because you're not going to sit

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) there for years and years with serviced lots paying those extra frontage taxes and hoping to recoup that. It's something that most of the people that are good businessmen won't want to do. They'll want to put these lots on the market and of course as we increase the supply I think it'll drive the price down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections)(Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I intend, and I want to be brief but the motion has me a little somewhat confused in that if I thought that this motion might alleviate the problems which the Member for Fort Rouge addressed himself to in his presentation, I might be inclined to support it, because really the argument of who did what to whom in 1492, really doesn't solve the problem. The kind of thing that, you did it, no I didn't, yes I did, and all the rest of it really doesn't alleviate it.

Either the Member for Fort Rouge is unaware or chooses to ignore the fact that we have a capacity as an agency of the Crown that can do that which he said should be done in his remarks, but not in his resolution.

His resolution, Mr. Chairman, by resolving something we hope to have some action that, as if this House had control over all of the items that were listed in his paragraph relative to the resolution, in that it controls loan funds and all the rest of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of progress, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that the resolution be amended. The proposed Resolution No. 7 be amended by deleting everything after the first paragraph and that the following be added:

"AND WHEREAS decent affordable housing should be a matter of right rather than economic fortune; and

"WHEREAS the fiscal capacity of the government of the province is not unlimited;

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House urge the government to ensure that its expenditures for housing be channelled into those projects and programs which directly help those persons least able to acquire decent shelter by their own resources."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise primarily to exchange Shakespearean proverbs with the Member from St. Matthews. The one I would apply to him would be the one of "Beware of Men who Speak with Sound and Fury signifying Nothing." I think that that perhaps characterizes what his stance is in the House is more often than not. So while I take with some consideration his admonitions about brevity, surely he would be quite prepared to accept the one which applies more directly to his own stances and other incidences in this Chamber, and I think Shakespeare probably had him in mind when he wrote those immortal words.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we brought in a while back concerning the establishment of a Department of Housing was done so for a reason, and that was that we felt that over the past two or three years various efforts have been made to try to alter and change the fairly narrow almost ideological point of view this government has towards the housing issue, where they have with almost a sure-line steadfastness seen the housing problem as being one in which the building of public housing was an answer.

The point that we try to raise in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, was that housing is a product of a number of forces, the availability of land, the availability of labour, the availability of money resources and capital, the availability of the right kind of decisions being made at different levels of government in relation to building codes and regulations and tax laws and property assessments and building and zoning ordinances. The question of the connection in relationships between the private and public sectors, the development of new sectors of housing. In other words, you have to treat housing not as a single line, you know, one-dimensional, if we put more public housing on the market approach we'll solve the problem, which has been the characteristic of this government, with something that has to be done with a great deal of fine-tuning and with a great deal of understanding and comprehension of all the elements that are brought in to bear to produce enough housing.

I think that the point that we are trying to make in this resolution was simply

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) this: That even at the present moment the responsibility for making decisions relative to housing are separated into a number of departments and agencies within the government. That it is not just Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation that affects the housing market, it is the Department of Labour, the Department of Co-Ops; it is the Department of Finance; it is the Rural and Native Housing Programs, the Department of Northern Affairs, whereas each and every one of them has had a little bit of the action, and that as a consequence we haven't really been able to focus in terms of a total approach to the housing problem; haven't been able to get something that under which circumstances do you pull the financial levers, do you change the tax laws, do you do something with land, do you do something with labour to bring it together.

So instead of approaching it from a really an outdated kind of unequitable logical point of view that was designed back in the thirties when the Americans in fact, those great spokesmen for capitalism were bringing forth public housing, much of our public housing policy was borrowed from them. It was picked up here and it was written into the various manifestos and it was promoted by social organizations to the point where now it has almost acted as a blind or as an obstruction to the creation of a more adequate housing policy to suit our own time and our own needs. So when we talk about these forms of housing we're not saying, do away with MHRC, or replace it, as the Minister of Housing has suggested, we're saying, let's just bring together those different parts of the government into combination. If you want to retain the facilities of a Crown Corporation to act as a line agency to deliver certain housing units, fine. But don't do that to the exclusion of other things; don't assume that you're going to solve a housing problem purely and simply by the means of public housing, because you're not, and you won't.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we haven't, because I keep coming back, and I realize that the Member from St. Matthews has heard it many times, and I keep saying he's going to hear it many times again until we get a proper housing policy in the Province of Manitoba. And that is simply that you can't solve the problems by that one-line approach, that you have to in many cases apply a much more effective tax position; and I know the Minister of Mines and Resources has talked in the past about land value taxation the Henry George principle. I think that's something that should be considered. It should be looked at. It should be assessed as to whether that would be a more effective means of changing the housing market, of reasserting land values. But that's something that MHRC is not in the business of doing and therefore the proposal doesn't come forward.

If there was someone responsible for the whole area of housing and able to look at things in a different way, as we're saying, I want to achieve certain kinds of units for these kinds of needs: Do I achieve it by investing government capital? Do I try and eliminate the blockages in the labour market? Do we change? Do we move into a land value tax system? There's different kinds of formulas that might be applied, and that's what we're asking for, is simply to, because housing has become such an important fact and a social utility almost, we're beyond this stage. We recognize now the housing market has changed so very differently than it was 15, even 10 years ago; re-recognizing as we go through the hearings on the Rent Stabilization debates, that in effect the rental apartment market for medium or lower income housing is almost virtually non-existent. They can't build any more with the kind of costs they're doing. So that's one part of the market that's already pulled out. How do you replace it? Do you replace it like building a lot more public housing? That's the answer of this government but it's the wrong answer. I'll tell you why it's the wrong answer, because you're taking an awful lot of very scarce public capital and utilizing it and not getting the number of units that you could get if you used the investment in other ways. And that's the argument I'm trying to make. We're not trying to tromp you. The Member from St. Matthews in his defensiveness about a public housing program isn't able to understand that you take a certain amount of capital and you can use it for different purposes and different ways and get better results.

The one thing that I would make of this case, Mr. Speaker, to the Member of St. Matthews, that one of the real problems with public housing is that it's discriminatory, that it doesn't help all those who are in need, it helps only a select few. I would suggest

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) that the public housing program that we presently have in the Province of Manitoba is only going to help maybe 10 or 15 percent of those who really have housing needs. My point is, take the same amount of capital and see if you can multiply it, see if you can use your public investment to widen the base of housing availability.

That's the point of the argument, and that gets into the whole question of money management. It may be, Mr. Speaker, for example, that you'd get a greater expansion or multiplication of that public money if you started going into public lending, to credit union societies to provide second mortgaging on things: Government still retains the capital, it gets an interest back on its money, has an investment, but it's helping families to buy housing that can't happen now because there is a gap, for example, in the AHOP program. The Assisted Home Ownership Program now provides a limit I believe of in the province of what? - \$43,000, I guess, is it? Many people's incomes, even with those kinds of interest reductions of the Federal Government, can't afford the down payment equity. A second mortgage at a low interest rate at eight percent would give them enough to do it. You put them into the housing market, you're going to get your money back, you can use it for other purposes. That's the kind of argument we're trying to state. Just take the basic existence of public capital and use it more wisely; use it to get a broader base housing approach; use it to extend to a much wider range of the income groups.

Because one of the problems, Mr. Speaker, you'll find is this: Is that if you exclusively concentrate on low income housing, on social housing, whether it's purely public housing . . . , you're going to set resentments for those income groups who are just above that level. They're saying, why is the Federal Government and the Provincial Government putting large amounts of money into public housing when I only make \$1,500 more and I'm getting no help for anything. And that sets up divisions in the society. It sets up the kind of conflicts and cleavages that racked the First Premier's own constituency back in 1973, when the switch was turned off, it was turned off for good political reasons because a lot of members in this House were taking heed because of public housing projects. And one of the reasons they were taking heed because they weren't offering anything else to income groups who were just a couple of notches above them - but if you were providing a balanced housing approach that approaches it from different avenues to provide incentives.

The Member from St. Matthews says, how? Well, I'll give him some examples. The kind of example that's now operative in British Columbia and Ontario where the Provincial Government will apply either purchase of land that we'll lease back then for the building of a single family home, either by contractors or by individual builders or the owner himself; or they will provide a second mortgage on that land that's recovered in the cost. The Home Ownership Made Easy Program in Ontario is an example again of public capital being used. No one's wiping out that capital; no one's taking it away from public resources, it's returned and they get an investment back, they get money back on it but it's being revolved, it's turned around, and it's being used to bring people into the housing market who otherwise wouldn't be there, but they're investing the money into land and not just simply doing it in public housing projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the reason why you need a Department of Housing and that's why I address it to the Minister of Corrections. We're simply saying that because the housing market has so many levers that have to be pulled, you need someone looking at it in a more comprehensive sense, in a sense that it is able to provide the kind of combination of efforts that will build upon one another.

One of the major problems we're facing now in the province, Mr. Speaker, is the shortage of labour in many areas, that we find in the industry that will provide repair and renovation of older homes is really very miniscule in the City of Winnipeg. One of our problems in getting a good major recycling of older homes is that we haven't developed a proper labour supply. So that takes you into the area of manpower training, it takes you into the area of making sure that the unions and the labour codes are designed to facilitate that kind of happening. That's where a Minister of Housing can make a real impact, he could go to them and say, look you guys, we've got to do something. As it is

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) the responsibility is now divided one against the other, and there isn't any coming together of the requirements to get a proper supply of labour into the housing renovation market to make sure that older homes are repaired properly and effectively. At the same time, as we pointed out in resolutions that we brought before this House last year, is that one area itself in the repair and renovation of older homes provide an opportunity and potential for the training of unskilled young men and women to go into a work area that's presently not available to them. So you would not only create something helpful in the housing area, but you could do something in terms of unemployment and low skilled workers, who represent about 15 or 20 percent of our unemployment rate in the downtown core area of Winnipeg. But again you need someone who is responsible to do it. And the point we're trying to make is that Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation's terms of reference are too narrow to allow them the kind of scope and outlook that would bring together that kind of activity.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Matthews again gets up to defend the Saunders Aircraft, and all the rest of it, and says, look we're doing a wonderful thing. What I was trying to say was this: that provincial governments across Canada I guess from about maybe 19, oh the mid sixties through to maybe a year or two ago, went through a curious period of phantasmagoria, a kind of strange strange malady overtook them, that they all wanted to build monuments of economic development. They were all going to be big builders. They were going to put these massive projects to work to show that we could create jobs. Well I think that fortunately, Mr. Speaker, that malady is now dissipating. I think we're now coming back to our senses and realizing that perhaps the best kind of economic investments that governments can make is not to go into these sort of will-o-the-wisp projects where you take vast amounts of money and try to get the quick-rich kind of deal where you build a big factory and everything moves. We could've --(Interjection)-- Yes, we've got Bricklin cars in New Brunswick and Saunders Aircraft in Manitoba and Heavy Water Plants in Nova Scotia. You know, every province, no matter what their political affiliation, went in for this kind of investment of public moneys designed to get economic development going, and almost invariably, Mr. Speaker, they went broke, they went busted, they didn't succeed. I think some of the smaller investments made through MDC have been useful ones but that kind of great, sort of extravaganzas that we went through, were simply a waste of money.

The argument I was making in my introduction was this: That particularly in a time when we have a shortage of capital, when the squeeze on the public capital and of private capital in the next ten years is going to be so extreme, that we must have very careful stewards of how we use that money. And I was simply suggesting that one of the primary economic investments that could be made by this province and other provinces, would be to begin to look at how it could begin redeveloping and retooling the basic service structure of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting statistic in the Bank of Canada report last year, for 1975, which pointed out that in full term the amount of investment, capital investment into things like roads and sewer lines and trunk lines and water mains and aqueducts and all that kind of basic infrastructure that makes a community, Sir, has decreased by 10 percent over the last year, while the population has been going up and everything else has been going up, public investment over the years has been going down.

Now that is the kind of problem and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we're living off the investment of our forefathers. We're mortgaging ourselves very desperately. And I'm simply saying, let's take that same amount of capital that we've been investing in Saunders Aircraft and formerly in the CFI, let's take that same amount of capital, that nice \$80 million a year that comes in from pension plan moneys, from CPP money that we get at a low rate of interest, the kind of money we're selling bonds on, let's start investing in our communities. Let's start taking a look, for example, at the downtown area of Winnipeg, if you look at the Capital Works report, that they just published, the basic lifeline of this city is wearing out in the downtown core, the sewer lines and the roads in the older area can no longer sort of increasingly bear the sort of heavy concentration of building that we want to put on it. It's wearing out; it's slowing down, and

RESOLUTION 7

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) we're not putting any money back into it. As one councillor said to me, you could stand on Main Street and throw a bowling ball down it and it would follow a groove all the way down to Polson Avenue from the corner of Portage and Main. Because simply we haven't been careful about replacing and recycling the basic lifelines and life cycles of our communities, small and large. We've been throwing our money into these other kinds of things.

I'm just saying that in retrospect, that's where we should be putting our money these days, in the land and the services and transportation systems that would then provide the economic sort of framework that governments should legitimately be providing. And then if that provides the base in which private investment can then follow, if they have good schools and proper transportation and good services, then that becomes in many cases the best incentive for private investment that you'll find.

And that's the kind of argument we're making because you know, you go up to Thompson, Manitoba, and ask Inco why is it that you're running 20 percent below capacity in many respects, they say, they can't get stable workers, the work force is turning over. And I'll tell you the reason why - both the manager and the union told me - it's because they can't get enough housing up in Thompson. They can't get the kind of housing they need up there and it's hindering that economic development. The Member from La Verendrye just said the same thing about some of the smaller towns and communities, it's a lack of housing and the kind of services that go into them, that would provide them good accommodation that would support growing industry.

That is the kind of investment priorities we're asking for in this resolution. And we feel that a Department of Housing - it's simply a mechanism, there's no magic to it. It's simply the means by which we could get that kind of assessment made of those sorts of needs so that public capital wouldn't simply be always put into a public housing approach and ignore or treat the others in a secondary fashion. And we're simply saying the time has now come that housing is so important to our economy, it's so important to the needs of the people, that we have to upgrade and improve our housing performance overall. And perhaps the best way of doing it is combining the different parts of the Provincial Government which now deal with housing, bring them together and therefore get a much wider more universal approach and therefore a wider universal housing program.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

MOTION on the Resolution as amended presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Call it 5:30? Since we have decided to call it 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee of Supply at 8 p.m. with the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.