



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 70B

8:00 P.M. Tuesday, May 29, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 29, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — FLOOD CONTROL AND EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Page 80, Resolution 110, item 1 — the Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, in part of the supper hour adjournment, the Honourable Member for Elmwood asked about some specific details with respect to helicopter rentals. I can indicate to him that the Emergency Measures Organization had on standby rental three Jet Ranger 206 helicopters, seating capacity one to four passengers, at a charge of \$270 (sic) per hour. That is exclusive of the Army helicopters that were used and I don't have the details of them. The bills, we don't expect to be submitted till some time in September. There was one large Chinook helicopter and another model, a Huey, (?) I'm told, but I'm not familiar with the Army or Armed Forces terms. —(Interjection)— Okay, but I'm attempting to answer the questions that the honourable member asked; provide that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I'll defer if he wants to ask a question on the same subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: A few questions here, Mr. Chairman' \$207 per hour for the three helicopters; does that cover the three per hour or is it 3 times \$207.00?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: 3 times . . .

MR. DOERN: Each helicopter is \$207 per hour so that's \$621 an hour. Were they rented for 24 hours a day?

MR. ENNS: They were rented on standby basis. They had to be available on a 24-hour basis during the emergency efforts of the floods.

MR. DOERN: Does that mean then that on a per day basis the helicopters cost \$621 an hour times 24 hours?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, only flight time.

MR. DOERN: Flight time. And can the Minister indicate what the average usage of the helicopters was?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have as yet not received actual billings. That information obviously will become public knowledge when the billings have been received and will be paid, but I'm not in a position to indicate what the actual flight time and flight hours were.

MR. DOERN: So we can expect a breakdown of that in the future, but I would observe that if the three helicopters were taken on a sojourn up and down the Valley, I assume that . . . I don't know how many hours that would take to go from here to Emerson return, but it would be several thousand dollars to make one flight, an inspection flight, eh?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's observations are reasonably

MR. DOERN: The other question was, did the government use the Government Air Services for similar inspections? I assume that if the intent of the Minister was to take a party from here to Emerson and back, in terms of viewing, that that could have been done with a government aircraft. Was the Government Air Services used at all, or extensively, for these purposes?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the flights were seldom arranged for simple viewing. There usually were other attendant duties that were carried out, whether it was to meet with the Chief at the Indian Roseau Reserve at the time that there was difficulty being experienced in the evacuation of the Reserve, or to meet with municipal officials at Morris, or to touch down at Emerson and to establish contact with Armed Forces personnel there that were perhaps — and that is not all that public knowledge — fighting one of the most dangerous situations during the flood, where in fact the dykes came very close to being breached.

Under these circumstances, fixed-wing aircraft were of no avail. In fact, Mr. Chairman, early on in the flood-fighting process, we banned fixed-wing aircraft from flying over the area because of the rather dangerous situation that you develop when you have helicopters flying in a restricted area with fixed-wing aircraft — two aircraft flying different patterns, different modes; and members will recall that there was a general ban placed on fixed-winged aircraft flying below 3,000 feet in the Red River Valley for those reasons.

They were not general viewing trips. I mean, we had trips where the Governor-General decided — the former Premier of this province decided — that he wanted to express his concern and visit certain communities. We had trips where the news media wanted to be appraised and evaluate the situation, and we thought these to be legitimate exercises. Particularly so, when reports were totally erroneous in the eastern press about the situation. The eastern press had one-third of Winnipeg under water, manhole covers flying 1,500 feet in the air, no dykes holding, the Winnipeg floodway not working, all ring dyke communities being totally inundated; and that was of a concern to this government in terms of the impression that it left with the rest of Canada.

And so, when the opportunity presented itself, when upwards to 25 or 30 members of the media — the national media — wanted to view the situation first-hand, I make no apologies for making that available to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: And when Mr. Clark and his party made their tour, were these the same helicopters used?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I answered that question in the House, when I lose my luggage, when Air Canada loses my luggage, I blame Air Canada. When Mr. Clark loses his luggage, everybody in this country blames Mr. Clark. I would ask the honourable member to accept, I'll ask the honourable member to grant Mr. Clark enough credit that he would not impose on public tax money for that kind of a trip during a campaign. The two similar type helicopters were used from Mid-West and one Aero-Trades, but were rented and hired by the national party for that particular purpose. I might say, as the CBC network hired a helicopter for the same purpose, as the CTV hired a helicopter for the same purpose, there were in effect, five helicopters that buzzed around on that particular day. One hired by the CBC, one hired by the CTV and three hired by the National Progressive Conservative Association and supported earlier.

MR. DOERN: You know, I'm so excited by the preliminary part of the answer that it's hard to strip it and try to get down to the content. My question was very simple and that was, "Did the Clark party use these three helicopters or any of them?"

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that question. These helicopters were painted brown and yellow, but I don't know how many helicopters Perimeter had that were painted in the same way. If I say that Mr. Clark did not use one of these helicopters, I might well be made out to be a liar. All I can tell the honourable member as I tried to tell him is that Mr. Clark's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . party and the National Party paid for the use of their helicopters.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then he can't answer my question.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, then let me answer the question a little differently.

MR. DOERN: Well, then perhaps I could repeat . . .

MR. ENNS: The former NDP Premier of this province, when he travelled at public expense and followed the NDP candidate through the nursing homes of Birds Hill, that was at public expense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: That was at public expense on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the members wait until the Chairman recognizes the member? Order please. (1)—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: The Minister of Government Services — would he confirm what he just said, that he's accusing the Governor-General of crass-politicking?

MR. ENNS: I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I would like the Minister of Government Services to clarify his statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

A MEMBER: Come

MR. PARASIUK: What do you mean, come on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

A MEMBER: What's the matter with you?

MR. PARASIUK: You tell that to him — what's the matter with him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PARASIUK: Take some Valium or smarten up and don't make such comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would request the Honourable Minister to withdraw his statements.

MR. ENNS: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of withdrawing the statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to refer the Honourable Minister to Rule 321 of Beaudesne, refer him to 321, Item 3. The Speaker has to definitely protect from attack a group of individuals commonly referred to as those of high official station. The extent of this group has never been defined. Over the years it has covered senior public servants, ranking officers of the Armed Services, the United Kingdom High Commissioner in Canada, a Minister of the Crown who was not a member of either House, and the Prime Minister before he won a seat in the House.

The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order . . . with the interjection of the Honourable Member for Transcona, that a point of order is being raised. And the point of order that is being raised is whether or not a statement that I made is to be challenged or not, and I suggest to you that a Governor-General of Canada that has some 22 million Canadians to serve, finds it convenient to be in his home constituency and to follow within 20 minutes or half-an-hour the NDP candidate's tour of senior and elderly citizens' housing in his own constituency, I call that politics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: I call that politics, and if the honourable members choose to argue about that, that's fine, then their judgment of politics is different than mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would request that the Honourable Minister retract his statement.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I won't retract that statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. PARASIUK: I wonder if I could ask the Chairman to bring this to the attention of the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the indulgence of the committee until a ruling has been established on this, please.

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

MR. PARASIUK: I believe that the Minister is out of order, has attacked the Queen's representative and should be reported to the Speaker. And I ask that the Speaker . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on the same point of order.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, I sat here prior to the Honourable Member for Transcona's entry into this debate, to be accused by the Member for Elmwood that our Premier was out there in crass politicking in his costume, as he calls it . . .

MR. DOERN: I didn't use that word.

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. ENNS: Yes. It is crass politicking to concern yourself about the flood victims and about the flood situations when it comes to my Premier and the Premier of this province, and I made a similar suggestion that I accept the fact that the Governor-General was here on private business to attend the funeral of two aunts, among other things, but I say to him that it was also very political for him to be involved in the midst of a campaign to be walking through the senior citizens housings and personal care homes within half an hour of the NDPs visit to those same homes. Now that is a matter of interpretation. We live in a political world, and I do not detract and not withdraw those comments.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to comment on the continuing outbursts of the Minister. He has made some unacceptable allegations about the Governor-General. He has been asked to withdraw those statements by you as Chairman. He has refused to do so. Committee should be adjourned and this matter reported to the Speaker for his instruction and advice on this question. There's no further purpose in sitting in this committee to listen to further outbursts and further infractions from the Minister. He knows exactly what he's doing. Mr. Chairman. This is neither an outburst nor an accident.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask the indulgence of the members of the committee for a brief recess while we establish the legality of the position.

Order please. I call committee back to order. I'd like to refer members to Rule 41. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, upon reflection on some of the comments that I've made I'm prepared to acknowledge that the Governor-General, the former Premier of this province was, in the same

way as my Premier was, expressing his concern and compassion for the people that were involved and affected by the flood and that his ancillary attendance, whether it was at his aunts' funerals or indeed at visiting some of his former constituents did not constitute politicking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank the Honourable Minister. Item 1.—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, in his announcement with respect to compensation for flood damage, to describe how the proposal for assistance on diking around farmsteads is going to be viewed and handled. I believe the announcement was 75 percent to a maximum of \$10,000 in terms of diking assistance and I wanted to know whether it will apply to areas where flooding has occurred on, for example, the Fisher River or its tributaries and/or whether that will . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time, please? The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes. Whether it will apply to areas, as I indicated, on the Fisher River or other watersheds that happen to flood, and whether it would entail expenditures or assistance where farmers had previously constructed dikes at their own expense and now would require some either further work on them and/or the building of new dikes. I have several constituents who previously were flooded, did do some constructing of dikes at their own expense, now require some further work on them, whether they would fall into this type of an application — would fall into the category of the Flood Assistance Program that he has announced.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Order-in-Council that was passed — and if the members haven't got copies of that, you know, it's available to them and I will see to it that they have these copies — indicates that, in anticipation of a further special project, and in fact, those were the words used by federal authorities when they were conferring with provincial authorities about attempting to address themselves to not simply repairing the current damage but to in fact make moneys available to prevent future damage, whether it's by outright moving of buildings or raising of buildings or of ring diking or providing paths for individual farmsteads. We have every reason to believe, and I say this in a non-partisan way, the last federal government gave us the indication that that kind of program would receive high priority and we have every reason to believe that that priority will not have lessened any since the election of a new federal government. But the answer is, to the Honourable Member for St. George, is that these kind of programs would apply to all of the flood-prone areas that have been designated in that Order-in-Council, which goes considerably beyond, of course, the Red River Valley. It names specifically the river basins, the Icelandic River, the Ochre River, the Fisher River, these river basins are all named in the Order-in-Council and I will make it a personal point of making sure that the Member for St. George has that list. And that list in itself is not necessarily complete. Indeed, if there are further ones that should be added to it, they could well be added to it in supplementary amendments to the Order-in-Council.

MR. URUSKI: I thank the Minister. That's the very point that I was making. The specific instances that I have were along tributaries or waters adjacent to the east branch of the Fisher River, but they were not exactly flooded properties on the Fisher River. They were adjacent to it where drainages were backed up as a result of the high level of the Fisher River and they were flooded as a result of that. One family which, as I indicated, or two families, had previously constructed ring dikes around their property, but they were not sufficient for the flood of this year. As a result, the ring dikes failed and buildings and granaries and homes were flooded, and who will determine whether or not the moneys should be spent on the ring dike or raising of the buildings or whatever? Under what way will the program be administered, in what way? Should the people go ahead now and build those ring-dikes, or should they make application to have the property inspected, and then a determination will be made whether these ring dikes should be built, or raised, or whether the buildings should be raised instead of having the ring dikes built? That's sort of the specific questions that I'm raising from the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just to quote from the Order-in-Council, I say, "And whereas it is deemed expedient and advisable to provide financial assistance to various municipalities due to flooding during the spring of 1979, the Minister therefore recommends that financial assistance be extended

according to Appendix B."

And Appendix B includes a very long list — I won't read them all, but you know, the Brokenhead River, Cooks Creek, Bunn Creek, Norquay Channel, Kings Drain, we come down to the Fisher River. And we were talking about basins, you know, that I would imagine would follow into that.

Now, in terms of the second part of the question that the honourable member talks about, the appropriate procedure would be that, and we are, I think, understandably correct in this, that we require that Water Resources establish appropriate levels; in other words, we will not accept and pay for diking systems that are not acceptable to Water Resources' established levels. So that the procedure should be, the application should be made through the Flood Disaster Board, Mr. Elswood Bole, and his Board. A Water Resources engineer will set the levels, or the specifications of a particular dike-work to be undertaken, and then it would qualify under this Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: For 75 percent. . .

MR. ENNS: For 75 percent, up to a maximum of \$10,000.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I came in a bit late. Are we discussing, under this item, the Emergency Measures Organization as well?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, we are not. I must inform the honourable members that the Emergency Measures Organization and its operations have already passed consideration by committee under the then stewardship of the Attorney-General's department, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to refer the Member for Transcona to Page 80, Resolution 110.
The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to ask the Minister what staff are administering the expenditure of this money.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this is essentially the staff of the Emergency Measures Organization that have heretofore been housed in the Department of Municipal Affairs and only recently have been transferred to Government Services. Mr. Jack Miller is the Director of Emergency Measures Organization. He is located in Building 15, I believe, in the Fort Osborne Complex, and essentially the moneys that we are discussing here are the kind of average dollars that have been required for moneys that have been specifically directed to flood protection, not Emergency Measures Organization as such, that over the span of years have shown as an average figure.

Now, the member is also well aware that this year, of course, that is a totally nominal figure. There has already been passed a very substantial additional Supplementary Supply Bill for some \$5 million to cover the costs of the flood, and of course we haven't seen the last of that figure yet.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The reason why I was asking questions about the Emergency Measures Organization in relation to this amount — and I know it's a general figure that's put in there as an entry into the Budget so that you can add to it later because you can't guess; I can appreciate that.

MR. ENNS: If I may just interject, not to interrupt the honourable member, it's much like the kind of arbitrary figure that's put in for firefighting, for instance, in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. We have no idea what the figure may be, but a figure is put in there to cover kind of general administrative expenses.

MR. PARASIUK: The reason why I asked the questions regarding the staff — and I assumed that these were going to be both discussed together — is that often this amount is determined or influenced by the extent to which you've got firefighting forces in place, the extent to which you've got, conceivably, staff in place to co-ordinate effort, when effort is required. And I have heard

to the effect that the staff of the Emergency Measures Organization had been reduced, and I'm wondering whether there was any change in the number of the staff on April 1st, 1979, as compared to April 1st, 1978, because that has very great importance to this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister. Before the Honourable Minister proceeds, I'd like to caution the member that EMO has been discussed under Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think, what you were about to say, is that the organizational structure in terms of staff and operations has already passed through Committee consideration and, secondly, I was then not the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures Organization. I am not in a position to answer the honourable member's questions.

MR. PARASIUK: When was the Minister made responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization, because I believe that the discussion of Estimates and the Emergency Measures Organization Estimates took place after the Minister was made responsible. I believe the Minister was made responsible April 1st.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Estimates of EMO have already been passed. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to ask the Minister then if he felt that a reduced staff in the Emergency Measures Organization was sufficient to handle the spending of this money, the administration of the spending of Item 1 on Page 80, namely Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this money in no way covers those expenditures. Those moneys were provided for initially and were discussed under the Estimates of my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Those same moneys have been transferred, staff positions have been transferred to the Department of Government Services. The moneys that we are now talking about is simply a nominal figure for actual flood emergency fighting cost. The purchases of the first, you know, 100,000 sandbags, if you like, or the purchase of the, you know, of the first whatever in terms of potential flood costs that we face annually in this province. We don't always have, thank goodness, floods of the proportions we have had in this last year, but we always have some floods on lesser streams and lesser tributaries in the Province of Manitoba. And this figure should not be confused; it has nothing to do with the administration or the personnel of Emergency Measures Organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. — the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, the statement says it provides and includes municipal flood grants, departmental flood expenditures, the Manitoba Flood Assistance Board and other related expenditures.

Now, the point about this is that we are really discussing, under this item, not just the tip of the flood control spending and the emergency spending, rather we're discussing the entire program of flood control and emergency expenditure. Not just the enabling amount put in this item, but indeed the whole effort, and I've raised this point quite specifically. I think it's a very good opportunity to the Minister responsible to allay those rumors that there was not a decrease in staff in the Emergency Measures Organization between April 1, 1978 and April 1, 1979. If he chooses to avoid that, fine, he can do that. But at the same time I think this is a very good opportunity for him to quell any of those rumors that might relate to the Emergency Measures Organization Program, of which this is the expenditure or programming part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of congratulating and commenting on the excellent job that was done by not just the permanent staff of the Emergency Measures Organization, but by the hundreds, and they were literally hundreds of civil servants of virtually all departments of government, whether they were in the departments of Finance that had extra time to do in terms of working out financial arrangements, meeting with Ottawa officials on short notice to discuss possible expansion of programs; whether it was water control engineers; whether it was highway engineers; whether it was agricultural representatives that were transferred from different parts of the province to assist in the movement of livestock; whether it was my colleague's the Minister

of Health and Social Development officers, who moved in to do duty above and beyond the call, if you like. And, Sir, if there is one bright thing one can say about the flood, was that the civil service performed in an exemplary way in meeting the needs of the people that they serve, as we serve, and I can't indicate at all that the staffing of EMO in any way interfered from carrying out that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that this kind of co-operation extended beyond the immediate government civil service. It certainly was evident from our associated and sister agencies, such as Manitoba Hydro, or Manitoba Telephones, who worked in many instances 24 hour shifts to maintain communications, to maintain services, in all what has been demonstrated in this past month as being a very efficient use of the public service to provide the maximum convenience in a very unfortunate situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, thank you. I note that the Minister, as he can, avoided the specific question regarding staff changes from April 1, 1979 as compared to April 1, 1978 and he deflected the question by congratulating the civil service, and I think that was a nice point on his . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will say it once again. But Mr. Chairman, I would ask the honourable member to at least acknowledge that (a) I was not the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures Organization at the time their Estimates were being discussed, and I'm not prepared to put myself in a position where I speak from lack of knowledge to determine yes, or no, whether or not there's been a reduction or an increase or whatever happens. All I can indicate to him is that from the time that I have been responsible for Emergency Measures Organization, the Organization has worked well, and that is being attested to by the manner and the way that the whole crisis was met and the kind of general support, and indeed complimentary support that we received from municipal officials throughout this crisis. So it's not a question of avoiding the Honourable Member for Transcona's questions; it's simply that I can't answer them. I'm not in a position to answer them.

MR. PARASIUK: Was that a point of order, Mr. Chairperson?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was a point of clarification, not a point of order. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I wish the Minister would provide a point of clarification with respect to my question in that I still don't know the exact date that the Minister assumed responsibility for this program. Could he let me know when that was?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the dates have a way of all swimming together in all this water. I would have to defer perhaps to my colleague, the Honourable Attorney-General, as to when he gave up the responsibility for Emergency Measures. Can you help me Gerry?

MR. ENNS: The question is, when were you last the Minister for Emergency Measures Organization and when I did become one?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I observed the flood coming some time before the Honourable Minister of Government Services. The actual date of transfer was April 1st, I believe, but I can confirm that the Estimates of the Emergency Measures Organization were handled and questioned during my Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: If in fact the Estimates were discussed when the Minister of Municipal Affairs was in control of the program, then I won't go much further in it, although I do think that it is important that the Emergency Measures Organization do have a sufficient comp . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'd like to refer the Member for Transcona to the fact that the Estimates of EMO have already been passed. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I think it's important that this program be administered as well as it can be, and in order for that to happen there has to be a sufficient complement of staff. I wanted to comment further on the Minister's points regarding the response of the civil service to a crisis. I think they responded superbly, and I think that there's a tendency on the part of people to attack civil servants, to imply that they are a bunch of parasites, to try and argue that we should reduce them, that we can cut back, that somehow all activity in Manitoba could best be done by as few civil servants as we can get away with; and what we've experienced in a need of crisis was a civil service that responded above and beyond the call of duty despite a number of attacks on it over the last 19 months, and I commend them for their effort.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn for the supper hour, I was asking the Minister questions in regard to the advance warning. Mr. Jarvis is quoted as having said that operations to move the grain out of the flood areas were hampered by an 11th hour prediction, that flooding would exceed the 1950 levels, and I wanted to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that some criticism has also come from the United States to that effect of the advance warning, could the Minister advise if, and when, the Wheat Board was notified that there was an impending flood as serious as 1950, or any serious flood, when this notification went to the Wheat Board.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect I'd like to defer to my colleague the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, who wasn't present prior to the supper hour adjournment but who now is with us to indicate to the Committee precisely the kind of actions taken by his department and the kind of contacts that have been made with the Wheat Board with respect to the movement of grain out of the threatened flood area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, the initial contact with the Canadian Wheat Board by individuals from my department and from municipal officials started taking place some time at the latter part of March and the early part of April. That there was in fact somewhat of a concern by our officials in the department and the elected municipal officials, that there was in fact a lot of grain in areas that could be affected by flood water and of course as the prolonged spring or the delay in the melt of the snow took place it became somewhat more of an urgency. But the initial contact with the Canadian Wheat Board was at the latter part of March and the early part of April and the indications at that particular time was that they weren't taking it in the immediate urgency that it developed into, but in fact there was concern shown in the very early stages.

I might also indicate that the report that was received was in fact that the majority of the rolling stock was tied up at the Lakehead in fact wait on the opening of the waterway and they didn't have available to them the rolling stock. However there are reports coming through at this particular time that the railroads did have in fact some numbers of cars that were available to move that particular grain out of the valley. So I think when we are reviewing and looking at the whole past, how it developed, and what was available, I know the rail companies will be able to report what was available. I know that there were a lot of volunteers, a lot of farmers, people from outside the flood area moved in and really assisted in moving the grain out of the flood stricken area by truck and to other facilities. I think it was the major criticism, you don't have to go too far into the Red River Valley or talk to too many municipal people, that the major criticism — and I had an urgent call from Mr. Syd Reimer, who is the disaster leader in the field, contacted me early one morning in desperation trying to get some cooperation from the Canadian Wheat Board to move in with cars to alleviate some of the problems — because in fact the major concern at that particular time was that there weren't flood permits to go along with the grain that was being delivered to the elevators. We saw elevator company agents working 24 hours a day; truckers pulling in with grain out of areas that they had to be towed out of — muddy yards and over municipal roads — to save the particular commodity that they were saving. And their number one concern when they got to the elevator was the fact that there weren't any permits along with those truckers. A real urgent matter which was being blockaded by the paper work again. I'm sure that that can be verified by talking to Mr. Syd Reimer, and many municipal officials; that if the Member for Ste. Rose would look at the whole story that he in fact would be a little more enlightened, and read some of the papers that are reporting where the actual criticism came.

After, in fact, the urgency became more apparent and the fact that it was the nature of a flood that we were going to be faced with, there was good co-operation from the Canadian Wheat Board, but there was a reluctance in the early stages to move. I don't think that you have too much long-term

knowledge of the Red River Valley, most people are familiar with the problems year after year in these particular areas, that there should be some kind of a program that will assure the farmers that they can move their grains out of that particular area on an annual basis and that in fact we aren't continually faced with this kind of a situation.

And Mr. Chairman, if the report that I heard, coming from the Member for Ste. Rose, from before the supper hour, that in fact it was the feed grains that were plugging the system. I wonder if he is aware of the fact that the area east of the Red River is a consumer of feed grains, that there are more feed grains fed in that area than are produced. You know to say that feed grains are moved out of that area into the system to plug it so that they couldn't move grain out of the flood area is a total misleading of this Committee, because it is a net importer of feed grains in that area. So, I don't know who he is trying to fool or mislead, that in fact there has been some kind of other problems that have stopped the movement of that grain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his reply indicated that — he didn't give me the exact date that the Wheat Board was notified that there would be an emergency — I believe he said the early part of March and the early part of April. He mentioned some people in his department had notified the Wheat Board and he also said that municipal people had notified the Wheat Board. So it seems that the Minister is not giving us any indication that his department took the leadership in notifying the Wheat Board. When they were notified — he said the early part of March and the early part of April. I would like to know what the date was and who did in fact, from his department, notify the Wheat Board that there was an emergency? And the Minister has just said that I had misled the Committee before the supper hour. I don't know how he could say that unless he got second-hand news from some of his colleagues, he wasn't here. Maybe he should have been here because we were debating a very serious question of moving the grain in flood areas. But what I did say, Mr. Chairman, was if there was any shortage of cars it may have been caused by feed grains being tied up transporting feed grains, and that the Wheat Board had diverted as many cars as they possibly had available to them under the circumstances. But the Minister hasn't really indicated when the Wheat Board was notified. It seems to me that it's the Wheat Board that notified the Minister that there might be a flood up there and they issued 500 flood permits before the Minister even notified them that there could be a flood. So now I'm asking the Minister to clarify when he notified the Wheat Board that there could be a crisis?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is in receipt of a report that indicated, as I indicated prior to the supper hour adjournment, that as of the 22nd of March our flood forecasting committee was still relatively confident about minimal flooding and, indeed such areas north of Morris, the river being contained within its banks. Now the Minister of Agriculture just indicated and put on the record that in the early part of March, and I am aware of it, this happened the first week of March or the last week of February, that discussions were taking place with his department about the possibility of serious flooding in the valley. Now, I think referring to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, it wasn't until — and that's a problem that I'm wrestling with and this government is wrestling with — it wasn't until the latter part of March that predictions of 1950 flood proportions were made available to government. But the Minister of Agriculture indicated that early in March he was sitting down with the Wheat Board to discuss the potential problems of movement of grain, pardon me, it was the latter part of March, which coincides with the first initial time that we got the warning as government, about the magnitude of the potential flood that we were facing.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had the floor . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the Chairman's prerogative to recognize who he wants. The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify for the record. I believe I indicated that my department had contacted the Wheat Board the latter part of March. There was a direct contact from my office to the Canadian Wheat Board in the early part of April, but I don't have the exact dates with me, but they certainly can be provided. As I say, I don't want to go back and overly criticize them. After the urgency was identified then there was a move to facilitate the people who were trying to move the grain out of the Red River Valley. But it took a continual prodding by municipal people, by our Agricultural Department, and by me, to keep bringing the urgency to the attention of the Wheat Board and the people who supplied the rolling stock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, well the minister is saying that, at least he appears to be saying, that there was an ongoing communication with the Wheat Board on the urgency. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would table all the documents, the letters that were written to the Wheat Board, as to how many requests were actually made to the Wheat Board, or whether it wasn't the other way, whether the Wheat Board was writing to the minister and bringing it to his attention that it was time to move grain out of there, rather than the other way around. Were the railways notified, or is that left up to the Wheat Board, Mr. Chairman, to . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Agriculture his Estimates are not under consideration. Would the Member for Ste. Rose address his remarks to the minister in charge of flood control.

MR. ADAM: I am addressing myself to you, Sir, as the Chairman of this committee, and I am referring to the movement of grain out of the flood areas, and I'm asking questions of whether we might have been able to improve the method of which we did a very commendable job of moving many many bushels, three million and some bushels of grain out of the area — 75 percent of the grain — but I'm just questioning whether we could have not improved this situation still more, albeit that a good job was done in moving whatever was moved. I'm just saying, where could we improve this? And I'm asking a question as to, are the railways involved in this emergency?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, with every respect, I think we've had this discussion on a fairly wide latitude. It involves the greater question of transportation and movement of grain. We're dealing with a fairly specific item here of some \$300,000 involving actual flood costs. I think that the kind of questions that the honourable member is asking for are legitimate questions that he can ask the Minister of Agriculture for, or an Order for Return in the House, or indeed ask him those questions in the House. I cannot answer nor is it quite appropriate for me to divert questions of this subject matter through me to the Minister of Agriculture. Those are policy matters in terms of movement of grain. We're dealing here with the actual flood costs, costs associated with the flood, and I would ask the members' indulgence to perhaps contain their comments and their concerns in that area.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on that point, it's difficult for committee members to ask another minister that's sitting on the side. This minister is responsible for emergency measures, and what has been done in the flood, and that is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Estimates of EMO have already been considered, and it is also my impression that when a subsequent bill was introduced for additional flood control money or damaged money, it was introduced in the House and subsequently passed. I personally, as Chairman, fail to see where it relates to the amount that we are considering right now. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, are you saying then that we cannot discuss the loss of grain in the floodway?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm suggesting to the Member for Ste. Rose that under the EMO Estimates, was the area where these items more properly would have been considered. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, could the amounts that we passed in the House, the \$5 million, that was for preliminary costs involved by the municipalities, where it could be identified on the short-term. Is that not correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is also my understanding that at that time debate could have taken place as to whether it should have been allowed or not. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that both sides of the House and every member of the House supported the initial amounts requested to compensate municipalities, I believe. Does the minister have any estimates of what the total costs will be? An estimate of what might happen?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, it would be premature to attempt to put a figure on those costs. I can only indicate by example that the 1976 flood, which was of a lesser proportion, the cost to the Provincial Treasury at that time, in the order of some \$16 million.

MR. ADAM: Yes. I think the United States, North Dakota and that, they made some preliminary estimates as I suppose the minister would be doing now if he gave us a figure. If we said \$30 million, would that be an over-estimate?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, if called upon, and I want to state it very emphatically and clearly that it would only be a very rough guesstimate, and one that's non-supportive of any factual information. As it now is starting to be compiled by Mr. Elswood Bole of the Flood Disaster Board, and some very preliminary information that I have as Minister of Highways, in knowing that some of the damage that was done to provincial road networks, not knowing the bill that affected municipalities will be bringing forward to cover the costs, restoration of municipal roads and municipal bridges, culverts, etc., but I would suspect that the figure could well range from the \$30 to \$40-45 million range.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, it would require warrants then to provide funding — is that . . .

MR. ENNS: It will require a supplementary bill, if we're in Session, or a special warrant if we're not in Session.

MR. ADAM: I wanted to ask another question as to whether — maybe the Minister would know — whether or not the Garrison Diversion would increase the flooding? Would that increase the flooding or is there any way we could find out?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, regrettably, thanks, I would suppose principally to a totally irresponsible and horror scare store that was perpetuated on the public by CBC radio, the Garrison Diversion, while it has many implications for concern for Manitobans, this is not one of them. The concerns that we legitimately have about the Garrison Diversion are when sprinkler irrigation waters used in the growing seasons of July, August and September, and the consequent leaching of biology and chemical pollutants into river basins other than the . . . in the sense that the project involves the river basins of the Souris and of the Red, the Jamestown areas. that these would add undesirable pollutants to our river systems.

But I'm sure, to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, he understands that in terms of adding flood waters, nobody, but nobody in North Dakota irrigates in April or late March. And so there is not the question of adding additional flood waters at this time. This is the kind of impression left that gallons of flood waters would be pouring across the border as a result of the Garrison Project, it simply is totally irresponsible and totally untrue. We have serious concerns about the effects of the Garrison but the concerns do not involve the outright addition of diversion of waters into our river systems at a time when our river systems are in flood stage.

Our concern about the Garrison is how the sprinkler irrigated acres, of which there are several hundreds of thousands, there are some 230,000 acres of land that are to be sprinkler irrigated by the Garrison Project that lie within the Souris River basin, and eventually some of the waters will leach and bring undesirable pollutants and chemicals into the Souris River basin. So that's a concern; I'm not minimizing that concern, but it is not correct to imply that the Garrison Project, as such, will add to our spring flood problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Before I recognize the Member for Ste. Rose, could I caution members of the committee that we're getting totally off the Estimate that is before us; the questions that have been raised and answered should be related to the Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Just to set the record straight, in view of the Minister's reply to my question, I wasn't referring really to irrigation as such, but rather whether or not there would be any drainage systems that would affect the spring run-off which would in effect, be damaging to the Red River Valley as far as . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of short questions and then some major policy ones. One of the smaller items, but nevertheless important that came out during the flood was the shortage

of sandbags and some of the scrambling to locate sufficient sandbags. I have a number of questions I'd like to put to the Minister, the main one, I suppose, being why couldn't they have all been obtained in Manitoba, in the following sense: Could it not have been possible to stockpile sandbags, are there certain types or varieties that could be stockpiled, and given the possibility of a flood, could it not have been anticipated that there either was a requirement or that there could be a requirement, in which case it would have been advisable to stockpile sandbags in the short run.

There is no doubt that if we could have placed the entire order within the province, it would have been beneficial to the local economy there would have been some new jobs, there would have been ; some additional profits to local manufacturers, and there's no question that there are firms within the province that can, I believe, and do, make sandbags. So I just ask the Minister that as an initial question, and perhaps he could also give us a breakdown, even if it's in general terms of the number, the percentage, that was obtained within the province, within the country, and from the U.S., because I gather that sizeable quantities were ordered from the United States.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, sandbags are the kind of commodity that (a) you hopefully aren't going to have to use and require, but then also, particularly in the Great Plains country both this side of the border and the other side of the border have, over the last number of decades, interchanged. We use each other's stock. Sandbags have a life limit. The only criticism that we received was that some of the sandbags that we did receive had been in storage for too long and there was a significantly high percentage that were spoiled. But what I'm trying to indicate, in a general way, that there is a very good relationship and understanding of the movement of sandbags from considerable distance when the need arises. To be more specific, we had a million plus, 1,060,000 sandbags on hand prior to the flood. We utilized —(Interjection)— well, they were. . . I can't indicate how old they were, I would suspect that many of them were from the '74, '76 stock. We utilized, I am told, to the maximum the capacity within the province for production, and we produced 1,500,000 sandbags, 1,500,000 sandbags locally. At the earliest signs of the serious nature of the flood, orders were given to the local manufacturers here in Manitoba to produce all-out, and 1,500,000 sandbags were produced here in Manitoba for our own flood protection.

In total, including the 1,500,000 that I indicated, some 6,936,000, virtually 7 million sandbags were required or purchased in addition to the 1 million that we had in stock, totalling 8 million sandbags. We actually used some 6,076,000 sandbags, which now leaves us with a stock of some 2 million sandbags on hand to meet the next threat. So we have, you might say, improved by 100 percent for our position that we came into this flood, when we had a million sandbags in stock, we now have 2 million sandbags in stock. It would be my hope that we're not going to use them for 25 years. If that's the case, 50 percent of them will be rotten. Or if we use them 10 years from now, maybe only 15 percent of them will be rotten. It's that kind of a commodity.

But to answer the honourable member's question, those are the figures. Some slightly better than 6,076,000 sandbags were actually used. We are left with a carryover stock of 1,920,000 sandbags that we have on hand, and the particular point that the Honourable Member for Flood made was that we utilized, to the best of my knowledge, the total capacity of the Manitoba plant in producing 1,500,000 sandbags. I can indicate to the honourable members also, just in conclusion, that the costs vary between 26 cents to 39 cents per bag.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my other question there that the Minister didn't answer was of the, I understood, a million that was in stock, 1-½ produced locally, that would leave 5-½ million bags. Now, what general percentage of those were bought in Canada and what bought in the United States?

MR. ENNS: Well, we received one substantial shipment. I don't have the figures from Toronto, but I have indicated the major portion of the amount came from American cities and American points, many of them from the Mississippi region, which had just experienced serious flooding and there were communities along the Mississippi who, just like ourselves, had ordered sandbags and then found themselves in a surplus position and were able to respond to our call in need; their cousins in the north were in trouble. They trucked out the sandbags.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am now looking at an article here which, at that time — this was a couple of weeks ago, three weeks ago — indicated that there were about, according to the Minister being quoted in the Legislature, about 3-½ million sandbags were received from a U.S. distributor. So if my arithmetic is correct, that would leave a couple of million which would have been purchased in Canada, or were there any Canadian purchases or essentially the remainder were U.S.?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I beg the honourable members' indulgence if I haven't totally counted every individual sandbag in their origin. With me it's not a matter of national concern as to whether the sandbag was made in Minneapolis or North Carolina but I can indicate to him we did receive two substantial shipments from the City of Montreal and from Toronto. I would have to concur with the member's rough arithmetic that the major American supplier, who supplied the bags from as far south as North Carolina and Minneapolis, that roughly the other 2 million or 1-¾ million came from Canadian sources in Montreal and Toronto.

MR. DOERN: Just to conclude this point, Mr. Chairman. There was a range of costs that the Minister gave for the various bags and so on, did the American or the Canadian bags tend to be more expensive?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the difference in the price is essentially in the material used. The standard jute material, which doesn't have the same longevity, was the cheaper price at 26 cents; the poly-jute, which had a plastic component to it which lives somewhat longer, is the more expensive bag at 39 cents.

Mr. Chairman, I must also indicate that in the midst of all of this, in the midst of this, when I learned that for the last number of years, certainly all the years the NDP administration was in power, they were charging sales tax for sandbags I appealed to the Minister of Finance and he, in a compassionate mood, removed the sales tax in his Budget, as you are now aware.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass? The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— That's right, I hope that wasn't a veiled attack on Premier Roblin, who introduced that measure.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman. It could be considered as whatever kind of an attack on successive series of NDP Finance Ministers, including the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the former Premier, etc., who chose not to remove the sales tax, although a substantial number of sandbags were used in the 1974 and 1976 floods.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what the problem is with storage of these two types of bags? For instance, is it a case of good warehousing and if you had a normal, dry warehouse they would keep indefinitely? I mean, what is the problem in storage?

MR. ENNS: Labour.

MR. DOERN: Well, can the member expand?

MR. ENNS: Well, simply the cost of labour.

MR. DOERN: Well, there is no cost of labour, Mr. Chairman, if there is a storage facility. The bags are placed into storage. There is no labour charge until the point where the bags would be taken out, after X number of years. I'm asking what the problem is, whether it's a question of moisture or whether they just deteriorate under ideal storage conditions? Why do these bags deteriorate?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the bags tend to be bulky. Storage space costs money and subsequently they don't get stored in the most advantageous of places. I am told that the poly-jute bags can withstand storage considerably better than the former jute bags and hopefully that we can . . . The bulk of the stock that we have in the 1.9 million supply of bags that we now have are of that category and that they will in fact hopefully will store well.

MR. DOERN: My final question on this item, Mr. Chairman, is apparently the Minister indicated that about 10 percent to 15 percent of the 3.5 million sandbags received from a U.S. distributor proved defective — this was apparently said in the Legislature — and I'm just wondering there, what the problem was and I assume that the taxpayers didn't pay for that portion of the shipment.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to check to see as to whether or not an adjustment was made with respect to the purchase price. I'd like to believe it was, but that was due to the kind

of normal rot that occurs as a result of faulty storage cause.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to now deal with another question and that is the question of compensation for victims of flooding outside the floodway, and the question of whether they are eligible for compensation, etc. There is always a problem in this regard. I can recall in about 1967 or so I think there was some flooding somewhere in the term that you and I shared between 1966 and 1969 — our first term. I recall where there was some flooding in the Winnipeg area and there was a debate in the East Kildonan Council as to whether or not people who had, since the 1950 flood, constructed homes on the wrong side of the diking, and the Minister will recall in that portion of the city, Elmwood and East Kildonan, there was some permanent diking and nevertheless there was still some new construction taking place after 1950.

Then there was sandbagging at a cost of, I think, about \$5,000 or \$10,000 a home and then the issue came as to whether or not Council should pay for a bill of \$130-odd thousand or whether the residents should be billed. As usual, there was a big debate. There is a lot of pro

s and cons, and in the end the municipality and/or the province paid for it. I assume it was the municipality. And you're always running into this type of a problem as to whether we should be expropriating these homes that are in very flood-prone areas, whether we should be preventing and blocking the construction of homes in flood-prone areas, which to me is common sense but it can be a complicated matter. I draw to the attention of the Minister some articles in today's paper that happen to appear on this very topic, based on some Council meetings of the City of Winnipeg, both articles in today's Free Press.

A question, for example, of whether people on Turnbull Drive are eligible for compensation and the Works Commissioner, Bill Finnbogason indicated there is still some confusion about whether residents outside the floodway can claim compensation for property damage under the Manitoba government program.

And then there are other questions. But let's just take those initially. Are people like the residents on Turnbull Drive eligible for compensation, and does the Minister have a policy to recommend to the Legislature or to Executive Council about new construction of homes and buildings in flood-prone areas. Because that would seem to be the height of folly, to allow that continuing problem, with continuing compensation, ad infinitum.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in the Order-in-Council that was passed with respect to compensation, Item 4 indicates that in anticipation of signing a special cost-shared program with the government of Canada to reduce future flood damage, the amount of assistance allowed in respect to the moving or raising of buildings or the protection by the construction of dikes, or the outright purchase of buildings and housings within these flood-prone areas, we're hoping that kind of a program can be introduced at this time which we call a flood reduction type of a program in terms of ongoing and future damages.

Both the federal government and the provincial government agrees that the recurring costs involved in the repair to damaged structures just doesn't make too much common sense. Mr. Chairman, it's not within my immediate area of concern, it will be shared undoubtedly by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs, we have since 1950, within the Water Resources Branch, the authority to rigidly control building permits for building in flood-prone areas. What has happened since that time is that that authority has been left in the hands of municipal governments, and without being overly critical of municipal governments' handling of this matter and being all too sensitive to the problems that they face in terms of granting building permits to persons that particularly want to acquire some property that, four, five, six years, seven years, looks to be all right, but in fact has proven to be imprudent to build in these areas.

And so the government is giving serious consideration to, if you like, withdrawing that authority from municipal governments, and indeed, accepting responsibility for the issuance of any future construction and building in these areas that we know from our all too tragic history that are subject to repeated floodings.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Minister correctly, I think he's on the right track in that regard. I think the temptation always, by governments, is to be too generous, always to be too generous when it comes to compensation.

MR. ENNS: Particularly Conservative administrations.

MR. DOERN: Right.

MR. ENNS: We're constantly being accused of being too generous.

MR. DOERN: That's right. And so I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that I think if the municipalities are lax in this regard, then it's up to the province to crack the whip, because otherwise, they are going to be continually approached, the province will be continually approached by municipalities to pay for, foot the bill, for what might be regarded as weakness on their actions.

I give you an example again, a fresh example of where you had yesterday, in the city of Winnipeg, the okaying of a 42 acre subdivision in West Kildonan, in which a large portion of the residences will be constructed on land that is now below the 160 year flood level. And it mentions in this article here that despite warnings from staff, Civic Environment Committee recommended council approve it, a new subdivision and private home construction in the Red River floodplain, without primary dike protection. The saving grace, I suppose, is that it mentions that the developer is supposed to be required to protect the homes by raising the level of the land with fill, or extending the primary dike system. That's supposedly the protection. But what if the developer fails in some way, builds inadequately, and then the whole area, 42 acres of houses, is flooded — and I know what's going to happen, and so does the Minister. The residents will then pressure the municipality and the province and probably, in the last analysis, will receive compensation.

There is also a quote here from Councillor John Angus who said that the Rivers and Streams By-Law should deny construction approval for buildings in the floodplain, and then there is mention here about how in St. Norbert new homes cost \$130,000 to sandbag and clean up; how lots along Kilkenny Drive are being advertised as ideal building sites in Fort Garry, but future owners will be denied building permits by the city because of possible flooding, etc. etc.

So I'm just saying that I think some pretty clear direction and some guidelines should be issued by the province. Otherwise, I know what happens and you know what happens. After the flood, a few years later, councillors weaken, approvals are given, and you're into a vicious circle.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the Honourable Member for Elmwood's support in this matter when it's brought before the House, if indeed it is brought before the House in that way, but I happen to concur with the honourable member's feelings and expressions of concern in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Member for Rock Lake. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I wanted to ask about the question of municipal sharing. What is the government's flood compensation formula for municipalities? Is the province and the federal government picking up 100 percent of flood costs, or is there going to be some kind of a sharing as there was after the 1950 flood when there was a 50-50 split between the province and the municipalities?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there has been an increase in the sharing arrangement. On specific items such as replacement of municipal roads, bridges, culverts, the sharing formula was previously established at 87 ½ percent paid by the province, the remainder by the municipality. That has been increased to 100 percent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, that's only one area. There are a score of areas that I assume will affect the municipalities. The Minister gave us one. Are there other areas of compensation where the municipalities are expected to make a contribution?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources passed that Order-in-Council, it is public knowledge and I, in co-operation with my colleague, the Minister, will undertake to see that the member receives a copy of that spelling out the details.

MR. DOERN: Then I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the municipalities are being asked to cost-share certain features of flood damage.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a cost-sharing involved. In the main there has been an upping of the provincial sharing, in the case of personal losses where the formula maybe called for 60 percent of the allowable limit, that has in most instances, been increased to 75 percent; in some of the instances, as mentioned, where the formula called for 87 ½ percent by the province, the remainder by municipalities, in some instances have been increased to 100 percent, but there still remains a number of items which are being cost-shared with the municipalities.

MR. DOERN: Are there some requests that have been made to Ottawa — and I assume that — maybe it's a new ball game now with the new government, I don't know. But let's say up to now, under the Liberal Administration, are there areas of compensation that were requested by the province that were refused by the Federal Government? I'm aware of the fact that the Premier sent a letter asking for support about a feasibility study, a cost benefit study, on long term flood protection for the whole of the Red River Valley, that they wanted to look at communities outside of the Red River Valley, the point the Minister raised about raising present structures outside dike communities, etc., federal participation and cost-sharing in a program to improve diking of farm dwellings, and so on and so on — the Wheat Board, and seven points that I see in the Premier's letter that he gave to Prime Minister Trudeau. My question though is, was there any area that the province was turned down in, anything that comes to mind that we're told is not acceptable or ineligible?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we are proceeding, as the Order-in-Council indicates, in anticipation of arriving at an agreement with the Federal Government on a special project that will reduce future flood costs. I'd have to indicate that indications from the Federal Government at this time are that they would be shared on a 50/50 basis. The province is not entirely happy with that particular arrangement because the members will be aware that, under the present cost sharing formula, once the province's costs exceed the \$5 million, we are on a 90/10 percent sharing formula, so we believe that hopefully, with the assistance of such honourable members like Jack Murda, Jake Epp, and others, who will be prominent members of the new administration and who are within the flood-stricken area, that perhaps we'll be able to convince the new forward thinking, aggressive, positive administration that is about to take over the reins of leadership in this country, thank God, that that formula may be improved upon, because if it isn't improved upon, then there will be almost the incentive to stay with the present formula in terms of provincial costs.

If we are currently getting 90 cents on the dollar cost-shared by the Federal Government to just continue repairing a flood stricken home, and they're just offering us to resolve the problem, which both the outgoing Prime Minister and our Premier agreed to, made common sense to try to resolve, we would look forward to something better than a 50/50 cost sharing arrangement. So those are the kind of negotiations that are currently under way, hopefully that they'll be resolved favourable to the province's position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services, I guess the present policy is that Manitoba will have to foot the bill for 100 percent of their cost. Do we have an estimate of their costs. And secondly, is this an item that the government is hoping to get cost-shared?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while it's correct that we are being billed at 100 percent of additional costs that the Armed Forces personnel incurred as a result of their assistance during the flood, it's not really quite accurate in the sense that they do pay and pick up the costs of much of the operation. We end up paying for the additional out-of-pocket expenses, if you like, for food, for additional operations of vehicles, for fuel, additional equipment costs, but we're not paying the salaries, for instance, of the some 500 people that were assisting us in the flood; we're not paying for the administration of the very capable management that we were able to avail ourselves of during this period of time. So it's not, in fairness to the Federal Government and in fairness to the Armed Forces, it's not entirely correct to indicate that we are left with picking up 100 percent of the costs. I'm also advised that the province will not receive the bill for these services until about some time in September.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, in the 1950 flood there was a listing of damage, and one of the areas was costs born by Manitoba Telephone System and other publicly-owned utilities. That was a figure of \$1.5 million. Does the Minister have any estimate of what kind of damage was done to telephone or hydro lines?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in the presence of the Minister responsible for Telephones, I hesitate to give an answer. I can only indicate that the Utilities performed in an exemplary fashion in keeping the communication lines open, keeping Hydro service available to the ring dike communities. There was a problem with individual telephone circuits. A large number of telephones at different times were non-operable, but by and large the Utilities met the challenge.

MR. DOERN: Maybe I could then ask the Minister responsible whether he'd care to comment on

what sort of damage was suffered by the Telephone System, as an example?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe that the question is out of order. The questions have to be directed to the Minister under consideration and the question is out of order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: If I may call upon the assistance of the Minister responsible for Telephones to answer that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL(Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I'm aware of some amount of damage that occurred to telephone lines during the recent flooding. One example of damage that occurred was the telephone lines between Morris and Rosenort where a floating railway line left its embankment and floated across and into pedestals that were in place for the underground telephone lines, causing water in the system, so that these were not repairable until the water had returned to more a normal level. So undoubtedly there were cases of special damage that occurred to the telephone lines in the province, and the Telephone System did perform above and beyond the call. During the flood service they provided staffing at Emergency Headquarters and anticipated many of the requests for extra services and for radio telephone services where normal land lines were out of commission.

The member, I think, asked whether there would be any internal billings for these damages. I'm not able to say in any definite way whether or not that will occur. I have been given no indication up to this point that it is the intention of the Telephone System to make any special billings to the Manitoba Government for the repair of these damages, but there may very well be some cross billings in this respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Minister that if there are costs to the system then I would assume they should be billed to the province, and I assume then that the province would also submit those bills to the Federal government and be eligible maybe to the extent of 90 percent funding. I see no useful purpose in the systems absorbing those costs, because I assume that those costs are eligible for federal compensation. f

Mr. Chairman, I also think it should be noted again that the Ministers are continually praising the Civil Service, at least today, for, and the word exemplary has come up again and again, and I think the record should show that at least today that the Ministers are praising the Civil Servants after 18 months of attacking them and decimating them —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask all members of Committee to direct their remarks to the item under consideration? The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you for calling the government to order, Mr. Chairman. The last general topic I have, Mr. Chairman, is about the future, about what new measures will be undertaken to prevent a repetition of the damage incurred under the 1950 and now the 1979 floods, holding aside all the other floodings that occurred in between. Of course we should be concerned with them as well but in particular the major floodings that we have suffered in this province and the millions of dollars that have been incurred by both provincial taxpayers, municipal taxpayers and the federal taxpayers as well.

I wonder if the Minister could make a comment? During the flood there was an impression created by the Minister at one point, I believe him, possibly the Premier, possibly other members of Cabinet, but I recall a clear impression that there was going to be consideration given to the construction of a new floodway or series of by-passes around the towns in the Red River, the suggestion being that what was done for Winnipeg and Portage, etc. could be done for these other towns. I wonder whether the Minister could comment on that? Was this just sort of a top of the head reaction? It has been stated by some people in the business that the fact that the land is so flat in certain areas doesn't make river diversion projects feasible. I suppose anything is technically possible, I'm sure. No doubt in my mind that you could in fact construct a floodway from here to Emerson either in a straight line or around the various towns, etc.; that this is technically possible, there's no question of that; economically, that's another question. But there was a suggestion made and I ask whether the Minister might expand on this. Was he just thinking aloud when he said this or is he seriously proposing a series of floodways or by-passes around the cities and towns in the valley?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it would be irresponsible for me at this time to engage in any speculation as to what can or cannot be done. I think what the First Minister indicated in some of his statements, that in view of the importance of the Red River Valley economically speaking to the province, in terms of the destruction and the economic loss to our community, that just as that realization was faced after the '50 flood and the tremendous damage to the city of Winnipeg, that some significant, you know, and serious study ought to be given the question as to whether or not there is a resolution to it. And I really can't say anything more to that subject matter.

I would add one further comment though, that the government is also very much aware that the Red River Valley is not the only part of Manitoba that is in flood difficulties from time to time, and that the government will in this general overview look at what can be done in terms of resolving the problems in such communities as Carmen, that have now received all too repetitive flood situations, Gladstone, Westburne on the White Mud River, the problems that are also associated with the Souris River. These are the kind of situations that I think that any responsible government would want to acknowledge and review, and I must indicate to the honourable members of the Committee that those reviews are currently under way.

But to speculate on what possible solutions could be found for the major flooding problem in the Red River Valley would at this time be idle gossip on my part and would not aid to any solution of the problem.

MR. DOERN: I would again ask the Minister, though he is sort of backing away from this point, but I ask him again whether he didn't intimate this in the past month or two, or am I mistaken when I say that I received that impression?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to back away from what is a welcome debate. It's been proven in the past that a Conservative administration has the imagination and the courage to surmount what seems to be unsurmountable obstacles, such as preventing a flood for the major city of this province, protecting half a million people of this province. We were laughed at in the latter part of the 1950s, and in the 1960s when we spent \$60 million on Duff's Ditch. Now I would not want to leave members of this Committee any false impression that we don't have the courage and don't have the imagination to resolve the flooding problems of any others that we face in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there are a number of reviews now under way —(Interjection)— Well he did indicate that there were studies and or reviews now under way in regard to prevention of floods, etc. Is this not what he indicated?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of clarification, I'm saying that the government and the Minister responsible is reviewing government policy as to whether or not it can apply to, or changes ought to be made, where flood protection ought to be provided in cases where existing cost benefit ratios for instance aren't inducive to undertaking that work, but that should not be confused with the actual engineering studies, or feasibility studies about any particular flooding problems.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, just further to that last remark of the Minister about the consideration of cost benefit studies, it's my understanding that the policy of the previous government was that whatever the criteria were for flood control measures having to do with those cost benefit figures were applied evenly across the province and to all communities and municipalities. Is the Minister now telling us that that policy of treating all communities equally is now under review?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, any change in that policy would, as you would expect a responsible government to do, would be applied equally and evenly and fairly to all affected communities.

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

MR. WALDING: I am asking the Minister if that policy is under review at the moment.

MR. ENNS: Yes, it is.

MR. WALDING: So it might well be that if there is a change in policy that this present government would be prepared to treat one community in a manner differently to another.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, at this hour I would hate to impune motives to my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, for deliberately distorting my words. I suggested to him that the policy that established the cost benefit relations is under review and that if there is a revision made in that general policy that any change in that general policy would then be applied equally to all communities. There would be no change in the approach to all communities. There has been a problem in terms of applying the existing formulas that establish cost benefit ratios and whether or not they take into realistic account today's costs and the disturbance and the inconvenience, today's land prices, today's values of goods and services and disruption of business. Whether or not that cost formula should be changed, that is the review that is currently taking place in government, but it would not in any way affect the approach that the government, if they indeed adopt a different formula as to how it would apply to any and all communities so affected.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the clarification. The question that I had asked him was whether the policy of applying the criteria evenly across the province was under consideration and he told me, yes, it was. He then went on later to explain that it really was not and what they were reconsidering are the criteria that would, in fact, be in effect. And I have no quarrel with the government taking that reconsideration of the situation. But as long as I have his assurance that whatever the criteria are that the government decides on or continues or changes will be uniformly applied across the province, then that answers the question and I have no problem.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for St. Vital doesn't want to take my word for it, I would ask the Rifleman to answer for me.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has referred to someone else, I would point out to him that I raised the matter because of questions that were asked in the House of his colleague, the Minister of Mines. I'm not sure whether the answers given had adequately answered the question that was posed. And the question that was posed in the House is exactly the one that I had posed to the Minister tonight, the uniformity of applicability of standards across the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one more question here, so we can get this department through to assist the speedup. There have been meetings with American authorities in the last week or two. I just wondered, there is talk again in the Premier's letter about participation in federal-provincial U.S.-Canada feasibility and cost benefit studies. There was a meeting in North Dakota or Minnesota recently. Can the Minister give us a capsule report on that meeting, what was achieved and whether there will be further meetings? Was the federal government the main . . . was it under their aegis that Manitoba participated or was it our province and their state, and what happened there in particular?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the meeting that the honourable member refers to was a citizens' meeting, if you like, not under the auspices of either the federal government on both sides of the border. The particular reference made by the Premier in the letter to the Prime Minister was simply recognizing that the Red River, being an international river, that the agencies of the Joint International Water Commission ought to perhaps be called upon to review the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I just have one more question. The line that was opened by my colleague from Elmwood, there. He was suggesting that any damages by Hydro and Telephone sustained by . . . Well, we know that the rail lines, there will be some damages there. Would it not be desirable that these costs be included, so that the province would not have to bear the entire cost but rather it would be cost-shared on a wider base? I'm just wondering if this happened in another province in some other jurisdiction, whether or not this would apply. And it seems to me it would make

good sense and good judgment that these costs suffered by Hydro and Manitoba Telephone or any Crown corporation would be included in our costs, in order that we could cost-share with the feds. rather than by ourselves.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there are certain formulas that have, over the past number of floods, been applied. I am advised that basically the same formulas will apply again. Essentially it involves for the payment of overtime services of any departmental people, government people, which I would assume would include Hydro and Telephone staff as well. It also includes, on a depreciating level. For instance, a road that the Department of Highways built ten years ago at the cost of \$1 million or \$500,000 and is now severely damaged to some extent, that on a sliding scale, depreciating the fact that the road is five years old, that there is compensation available to us from the federal authorities. In that sense, these kinds of costs are shared through the cost-sharing formula by the federal government.

I would have to, though, take the question as notice in terms of specifically how they apply to agencies of the government such as Hydro and Telephones. I tend to agree with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that they ought to be. They are very legitimate flood costs. Whether it's a government department or a municipality or Manitoba Hydro, it's a cost to Manitoba taxpayers if, in fact, we can't bring them into the same sharing formula.

MR. ADAM: Just one further question; that will be the last one. The Minister said a little earlier that there would be 100 percent compensation for bridges, etc. Does this take into consideration the sliding scale, as well as the . . . You know, like a culvert that has been in there for 30 years or 20 years and it is suddenly gone and it's worth about 5 percent of its original cost or 10 percent? Or, you know, 100 percent of the actual net cost or the replacement cost, its present value. I think the Minister understands my question.

MR. ENNS: Well, my advice to the honourable member would be, particularly if he is speaking of a specific instance, to put it in at 100 percent cost. I will then take it up with my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, and try and make sure that it is 100 percent. I don't know where to reach the Honourable Minister of Finance at this particular moment, but I will do my best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; Resolution 110: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$309,000 for flood control and emergency expenditures—pass.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the consensus of the members of the Committee that it is 9:55 and that we start the Legislative . . . ? Committee rise? (Agreed) Committee rise.

SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 59 of the Main Estimates, Labour and Manpower. Resolution No. 77, Clause 1.(a), Minister's Compensation — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, during the committee for Private Members' Hour, I was talking about the Minister's direct responsibility and direct involvement during the term of this government in the Manpower Section, especially in the Employment Services Section of the existing departmental structure. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that what I want to say has been said by myself and colleagues on a number of occasions. But the situation that this government, Mr. Chairman, and this Minister, don't seem to understand — or if they do understand, don't be willing to do anything about — is the fact that with the reduction in and elimination of some of the employment and economic development projects, especially in northern Manitoba, that in fact, will in the long run cost the people of Manitoba more money; let alone, Mr. Chairman, the serious problem in terms of just the humanness and the fairness in terms of government policy, and in terms of people who do not have a full opportunity or equal opportunity because of historical circumstance.

But, Mr. Chairman, even with those considerations being put aside, the government is still making a mistake if you look on it on a straight economic basis. And that is, Mr. Chairman, by reducing employment programs, by reducing economic development programs they are putting people in a situation where they are forced on to welfare or unemployment insurance. Mr. Chairman, if you look at the study of Thompson, if you look at the evidence of what happens in these circumstances,

the costs of all services that government provides increases. And, Mr. Chairman, we are looking in this Section, mostly at programs that are cost-shared with the federal government 60/40; and then we are looking at other services, some of which are cost-shared and some of which are not in the terms of increased policing costs, increased medical costs, increased social costs, etc., etc., Mr. Chairman.

And I think that this is one of the situations that this Minister and this government isn't aware of or isn't fully cognizant of. Mr. Chairman, when I've mentioned this before, and my colleagues have mentioned this before, I don't think the government has ever shown that that was not the existing situation, that was not the circumstance, that especially in the remote areas as programs were eliminated, as economic development projects were cut off, that in fact the other costs have gone up. And, Mr. Chairman, the other costs will increase to go up. The government and this Minister, or any of his colleagues, have not been able to say that that is not the case, because, Mr. Chairman, I think they are beginning to realize that that is the case, and certainly the evidence shows that that is the situation.

So what we've usually ended up with, Mr. Chairman, in discussing the situation in terms of economic development and employment creation with this Minister, is a situation where he always said, "Well, the people in northern Manitoba are not complaining. Well the people in northern Manitoba don't seem to be concerned about the situation and it's only those of us on this side of the House that seem to be raising our voices in concern about what is happening in northern Manitoba and in the remote communities. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues says, ask C. Smith. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that that is some reflection and some repudiation of the Minister's continuous comments, "Well, people don't seem to be concerned about it. Well, the people in the north are content; the people in the north are happy with the programs of the Conservative government." And, Mr. Chairman, I think that on May 22nd was one of the first chances that the people in northern Manitoba had a chance to indicate their feelings toward the Conservative government and the Conservative Party, and the kinds of programs or lack of programs that they've had in terms of remote northern Manitoba and, Mr. Chairman, in terms of northern Manitoba in general. And that is really the first opportunity where we've had a chance to test the Minister's statements: "Well, people don't seem to be that concerned; people in northern Manitoba are quite pleased with the direction we're taking. People in northern Manitoba like the direction of the Conservative government."

Mr. Chairman, that has been the general comments of this Minister. So the first opportunity was the federal election to let this Minister know and to let this government know how they felt about what was taking place in their communities; what was taking place in northern Manitoba.

And, Mr. Chairman, what we saw within the Churchill federal constituency was a change about of over 7,000 votes. The previous Conservative incumbent in 1974 got merely 2,500 votes in that particular constituency; the New Democratic Party candidate in the federal election received 4,800 votes. So, Mr. Chairman, it is well over a turnover in terms of switching away from the Conservative Party to the New Democratic Party of over 7,000 votes. Mr. Chairman, that is, I think a pretty clear indication to this Minister and to this government that there is discontent; that people, in fact, do know what is going on; they do understand what is going on; and when the Minister stands up in this House and said that the people in northern Manitoba are happy with the programs of this government, Mr. Chairman, he can no longer stand up and say that. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the defeated Conservative candidate said that shortly before the election that the people in the remote communities are quite happy and he didn't see any change in their position, and yet, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the results in many of the remote communities, the incumbent Conservative candidate ran third behind the Liberals and the New Democratic Party.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that is an indication to this Minister that the programs, that the changes in priorities that this government has undertaken, that the changes in priorities that this Minister has emphasized are not acceptable in northern Manitoba, and Mr. Chairman, they're not acceptable in many areas north of No. 1 Highway, north of the city of Winnipeg.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, in this section of the department that I'm talking about, the Employment Services, the Economic Development section of the department, the other thing that I don't understand, Mr. Chairman, about this government and some of the elected members on the other side of the House, is that the Conservative backbenchers have not raised any concern about what is taking place. None of them have in fact spoken on this section even though many people in their communities are affected by what is taking place, Mr. Chairman, like the Member for Swan River or the Member for Roblin or the Member for Dauphin, and, Mr. Chairman, most of the members on that side of the House. Some of these programs that relate to more disadvantaged people or to young people, affect their constituencies, affect the people they are supposed to represent in their House, and yet they have not expressed any concern in terms of what is happening

with these programs and what is happening to the people in their constituencies as they relate to these particular programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is the situation that is difficult for those of us on this side of the House to understand, is that lack of representation and lack of criticism from members on that side of the House when in fact this department, this section of the department, is not doing the job that it was intended to do.

The other aspect, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to point out, especially under this Manpower Division, Mr. Chairman, especially under the Employment Services section and the Employment and Youth Services section of this department, is something that I've talked about before in terms of what has happened in terms of administration and management. And, Mr. Chairman, these two sections have been ones in which there were a number of senior staff fired by this Minister, or by his predecessor in some sections and, Mr. Chairman, where new people have been brought in in terms of administration and management.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one problem has been a lack of clear direction, a lack of knowing where they were going, a lack of knowing what was going to happen to the program. So in fact the production, the work, fell off. The civil servants in this department, because of that lack of direction, weren't sure what to do if anything in terms of delivering these type of services. They did not know where these sections were going and therefore they did not move in any direction.

And so what we have, Mr. Chairman, now, is a situation where if you look at this Minister's Estimates and other Estimates, you see under item 3.(d) and (f), Mr. Chairman, you see a number of administrative mistakes, a number of management mistakes. In fact, Mr. Chairman, probably some of the most severe bungling and mismanagement, and, Mr. Chairman, that's quite hard to match some that has already gone on since this government came to office, but you see some of the worst examples in terms of administrative bungling and bad management within these two sections within this department.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think that relates to the fact that a number of experienced people were fired; that relates to the fact that there was no direction given and there is still no clear direction being given to these sections; that the basic approach is to wind down, to do very little and at the very utmost to maintain things as they are; although as they are is not clear because there is not a firm direction being given. So we see the emphasis to go on to such things as a — I forget the name of the program, Mr. Chairman, the one for young people to develop their business entrepreneurship this summer; at the same time you see a reduction in employment and economic development opportunities where they are really needed badly in remote northern Manitoba, and where a number of programs that were so badly needed were in fact cut by this Minister and this government.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is one section where we've seen that, and where we've seen that the promotions and the administrative changes were not the most productive, were not the most effective, and where there is now serious management problems within these two particular sections of this department.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think is clear now, having reviewed this Minister's Northern Affairs Estimates, Civil Service Commission, and now the Labour/Manpower Section, is, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister just has too much responsibility in terms of what can be done, or what he is capable of doing. And so, Mr. Chairman, we see a case of what the Task Force Report called in northern Manitoba too much too soon. At least, Mr. Chairman, we see too much in terms of the Minister's responsibility. Too little, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what should be happening in northern Manitoba.

So that is another area. Another problem, is that the Minister because of the number of duties he has undertaken, Mr. Chairman, and he can be criticized for accepting those responsibilities that he was asked to do. But there is something called in management a level of incompetence, and certainly when you expand into four major areas of major responsibility, then that is too much for this Minister to handle; and maybe, Mr. Chairman, too much for any one Minister to handle, because of just the size of the work load.

And so, Mr. Chairman, some areas get neglected and the Minister is not fully aware of what is going on in some areas of his department. Mr. Chairman, perhaps that is why he has fallen into the trap of saying, "Well, people are quite pleased with our programs in northern Manitoba. People are quite pleased with our economic and employment thrust in northern Manitoba, even though it is very difficult to see what that particular thrust is." And that is why, perhaps the Minister is not able to keep in touch with northern Manitoba, and be aware of the feeling in terms of the effectiveness of this government's policies and this government's programs. —(Interjections)—

So, Mr. Chairman, we have now finally a contribution on this section from the Member for Roblin, and perhaps the Member for Roblin would care to stand up and tell the Minister his concern about some of the programs that affect part of his constituency, that in fact have been reduced, or in

fact have been changed so they are less effective now than they were in the past. And perhaps if the Meer for Roblin were in touch with his constituents, —(Interjection)— then he could explain that, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Manpower, in this case.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps he could give his Minister some advice on this matter, instead of speaking from a position of ignorance in this House, Mr. Chairman. He could speak from a position of knowledge.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are the problems and I think that within this particular section, within this Manpower Division, is the clearest summary, the clearest indication, of the neglect of northern Manitoba, of the neglect of disadvantaged people in the Province of Manitoba, of an unconcerned, disinterested and arrogant attitude of this provincial government in terms of the people of the province, in terms of the people of Manitoba, is very clearly evidenced in this section in terms of what has happened. In terms also, Mr. Chairman, of the management bungling and administrative bungling that has taken place. It is most clearly demonstrated within part of this Minister's responsibility, known as the Manpower Division, especially the Employment Services in the Employment and Youth Services section of this department. So Mr. Chairman, it makes it very difficult, it makes it very difficult for us, Mr. Chairman, to be able to properly consider . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm having trouble following the debate. I would ask that there only be one speaker at a time and let it be the one that is recognized by the Chair. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was in the process of briefly concluding my remarks, and the Member for Roblin, with his interruption, did cause some delay in the conclusion of my remarks, but in summary, Mr. Chairman, we see a situation in which a part of Manitoba and a part of the population of Manitoba, as reflected in part of these Estimates before us, where the indifference and the lack of concern, and I suppose you could say the cold-heartedness or hard-heartedness of a deliberate decision to ignore part of the province of Manitoba, to ignore part of the population of Manitoba, is most clearly evident. And Mr. Chairman, that is a sad situation that the people in northern Manitoba face. A sad situation that those persons and those great groups that need some special assistance in terms of economic development and employment creation; it is a sad commentary that this government has chosen to ignore those people, has chosen to abandon so many people in our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we conclude the Minister's Salary, there are a few items I wish to make a contribution on. Before I do start, there's a couple of questions that I threw out to the Minister this afternoon that he didn't answer. Perhaps over the supper hour he has had time to think about them and perhaps make a reply. One was the idea I threw out of the Workers' Advocate. If the Minister had any thoughts on whether this position should be upgraded to something similar to that of the Ombudsman to take care of people who have their trials and tribulations with the Workers' Compensation.

The second one was would the Minister be prepared to consider having an intercessional committee hear grievances and explore possibilities of upgrading and bringing further along, making it a better Act during the intersessional break of the Legislature? And I hope the Minister will at least put his thoughts on record one way or the other, what he thinks of these.

In the main, Mr. Chairman, we've enjoyed going through the Estimates of the Minister of Labour. I welcome the fact that we have a Minister who has quite an extensive Labour background. I guess perhaps maybe about the same length of time as I have, somewhere around 35 years in the trade union movement. Perhaps a little longer than maybe some of the younger members of his backbench are years old, and that's confessing a little bit to age.

I do wish the Minister well in his endeavours as the Minister in this portfolio. It's an important portfolio. Maybe members of his caucus don't feel that, but it is one that deals with the labour relations and the collective bargaining process, as we have seen it here in Manitoba and with the exception of last year it has been a fairly good record and a fairly good record for settlements of the collective bargaining process without the interference of third parties. In the main, I think we're able to elicit from the Minister when we started his department, that the majority of collective bargaining agreements that were brought to fruition in this province in the year 1978 were brought about without any work stoppages, without any external assistance from the department or anyone else. They were brought about by management and labour being able to sit down across from each other at the bargaining table and come to a mutual agreement.

What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure it disturbs my fellow members on this side

of the House is the attitude of some of the Conservative backbench towards organized labour. You know, we hear charges of the union movement not being a democratic movement, that it is controlled by so-called union bosses, who tell members when they will go on strike and when they will go back to work. Now, the Minister knows this isn't true. The Minister is a product of the trade union movement, just as I am. I believe he was president of his local at one time. I also was the president of my local, and I'm sure that the Minister had no more authority to tell his membership that they would vote for a strike vote, or go on strike, than I had within my union.

And when a union goes on strike, it is their last resort to be able to come to a collective agreement and it's a decision that's not taken easily, I can assure you and I can assure the honourable members of this House that many of you people may think that the union membership just votes willy-nilly to go on strike at the least provocation, I can assure you they do not, that it's a very serious situation when they decide to withdraw their services. It is not the function of the chairman or the president of a local, or even the president of a national or international union to tell the members when they will go on strike and when they will not go on strike. That is the prerogative and the function of the membership as a whole. They make that decision, and if we can just draw the parallel and draw to the Minister's attention and especially to his backbench

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

MR. McKENZIE: I ask the honourable member to stand up and name the backbenchers on our bench that are opposed to what he is talking about, the collective bargaining system, the unions, and their rights and privileges in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if that was a point of order or not. If the honourable member wants me to name members, certainly I can name members. I can name the Member for Gladstone, I can name the Member for Pembina, I can name a few more. —(Interjection)— And Roblin. You should have heard what you said last year. Read what you said last year about the trade union movement, about the union bosses, and about the people who were feather-bedding. Read what you said last year. And if the shoe pinches, it's too bad. Because that's what you said.

But I want to say to the Minister, and I want to say to the members of his backbench, that the bargaining unit at Inco in Sudbury, did recommend to their union membership that they accept the proposed wage agreement. But they have no authority to tell those people to go back to work. Those people decided, by a secret ballot, that they would not accept. Now, does that make that person a union boss? That he tells these people where they've got to go, when they've got to go, when they've got to go on strike, when they've got to come back again? What nonsense. That's absolute nonsense. And the Minister knows it. —(Interjection)— And the Member for Roblin knows it's nonsense.

But we have members on that side of the House who have said it on more than one occasion. If the Member for Roblin wants me to dig out his old speeches and prove them to him . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Dig it out.

MR. JENKIN: They may not be the most interesting reading . . .

MR. McKENZIE: You'll find it's not there, Sir.

MR. JENKINS: But they were there, and they were on the record. And some of them may not be on the record because you were making your speeches from the seat of your pants, which seems to be one of the places some of the honourable members wish to make most of their speeches.

And so I say to the Minister, he's going to have quite a job convincing — he's not going to have a job convincing members on this side of the House that the trade union movement is not a democratic movement, he's going to have his problems convincing you people over there. That's the ones he's going to have the problem with. And I wish the Minister well in his portfolio, as I've said before, and I hope that he'll be able to keep his caucus in check. Because I'm sure, before his term of office is up, as Minister of Labour, there is going to be pressure exerted upon him to intervene in labour disputes, and they'll come about regardless of whether you bring in compulsory arbitration or what. The Minister knows that Australia, which has had it for over 50 years, has one of the worst strike records in the world, taken over a period of time.

The fact that people were not allowed to withdraw their services, but they had to settle for compulsory arbitration didn't stop the Australian working-force people from going on strike. No way. And I say to the Minister that pressures will mount on him to intervene in the bargaining process. I think the Minister is well aware, with his experience as a trade unionist, that the best advice that I can give him, and I'm sure I don't have to give it to him, is to keep as even a hand as possible, not to lean one way or the other, when he's dealing with people in a dispute. But there will be, and I'm sure, we will see it, there will be pressure on the Minister, there has already been pressure, maybe not from his backbench, but given the attitude and the vote that members have already displayed on the Member for Inkster's resolution on the right to work under certain circumstances, and we now have before the House, for final deliberation and consideration by the members of this House, the absolute amendment to the Member for Inkster's resolution, this is the one, it's word for word what the Minister moved. And I hope — it's a much better amendment than was moved, I believe, by the Member for Burrows, much stronger, much stronger — and I hope that the Minister will be able to persuade the members of his caucus, when he eventually, some time or another, before this House is prorogued, unless the House later decides he's not going to deal at all with any of the private member's business that happens to be left over once we go into the speed-up motion, which will be this week some time.

But I think, if I gauge the Honourable House Leader right, I think he'll try and deal with the unfinished private member's business before the House is prorogued. And I hope when that resolution comes up that the Honourable Member for Inkster presented, and has been amended and sub-amended and amended, I don't know how many times, I think maybe if we were to take a look at it, perhaps it would be a record in this House for one single resolution to be amended, sub-amended, sub-amendments defeated and sub-amended and amended and sub-amended, I really think now we're at the position of a su--amendment prior to the vote on the final motion.

And so I would say to the Minister that his biggest job is to convince members of his caucus to vote for the amendment that we have presently before the House on that resolution, because it is his amendment, and they will be not voting against this side of the House, or the Member for Inkster, they will be voting against the Minister, because the Member for St. Matthews has moved exactly the motion, or the amendment to the motion that the Speaker had previously ruled out of order.

Oh yes, here we have — it's just been handed to me — copies of some of the debates last year during the Labour Estimates. The Member for Gladstone was one, the Member for Rock Lake was another, the Member for Pembina was another, the Member for St. James was another, the Minister of Agriculture was another, and . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Surely you'll get to Roblin, you challenged me.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I didn't have the . . . perhaps the Member for Roblin, as I said before, made his remarks from the seat of his trousers and they're not recorded.

MR. McKENZIE: You'd better withdraw your allegation, sir. He's charged that I'm included in this group that hates unions, hates collective bargaining . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: You're part of that group, you're part of that group, are you not member of that caucus?

MR. JENKINS: So the honourable member, well, it's too bad that he's not recorded because at least the things that I have here, and I didn't dig them out, but there are, as members knows, there are many things that happen in Room 254 in Committee that are not recorded. If everything was recorded in 254, I think it would be impossible to print Hansard. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, that's right. The Member for Inkster is right, the Member for Roblin did move an amendment that was ' subsequently ruled out of order by the Speaker, and if that was favourable to the collective bargaining process, then I have to be convinced by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

But I do say this, that the biggest task . . .

MR. McKENZIE: What a bunch of dreamers.

MR. JENKINS: . . . Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Labour is going to have in this House, is not going to be with members on this side of the House. The biggest problem he's going to have is with his own caucus and his own front bench because these are the people who are eventually — and I predict that if they do they will put the Minister in an untenable position and he will have

only two alternatives. One will either be to resign as a Minister, and he may even decide, if his position becomes that untenable, he may even move over on this side of the House. —(Interjection)— It's quite possible. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's quite true; that's quite true.

But I will give the Minister credit. So far his dealing with the Labour portfolio has been, I think, nothing that I can seriously criticize and I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt; I think that he will try to do the best job that he can do. But whether he will be allowed to do that job, that is something that remains to be seen in the remaining life of this Legislature.

And so I say to the Minister that I find him a reasonable man. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want you to realize that when we were dealing with Civil Service we had no Minister's Salary to deal with. But I will say this: Dealing with the Civil Service, that given the issues that they were, I will say this to the credit of the Minister, that he did come to this House and say that he would rectify a deplorable situation that had sprung up, partly under the former Minister, partly under his stewardship as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, the Minister has given his word that that situation will be rectified shortly and I am looking forward to the day that the Minister is going to do that. And I take him at his word. I have found the Minister is an honourable man and until he proves me otherwise, I am going to accept him at that. But I don't want to have to come back into this House next year and find out that the appointments to the Civil Service Commission are on a temporary basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have just been looking over the Estimate Book and I would believe the department under discussion is Labour and Manpower. Civil Service has been completed quite some time ago. I would direct the honourable member to please, if we can continue on Labour and Manpower, even though we're under Minister's Salary. I think we have allowed a little too much latitude. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: This is the Minister's Salary, Mr. Chairman, and under the Department of the Civil Service Commission there is no Minister's Salary. And so this is the Minister who is responsible for the Civil Service Commission. He is also responsible for the Department of Northern Affairs. Under that there is a Salary item, but under the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Chairman, I will refer you to your book — read your Estimates Book — there is no Minister's Salary. Now, if the Chairman wants to rule me out . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please, order please. I would direct the honourable members to Page 17 of the Main Estimates, Item 1, which is Civil Service Commission. The first item, (a), is Salaries. I allowed the latitude of any discussion under that point. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, before you rule I think that you had better . . . I would like you to consider the fact that that item, Salaries, is under every administrative sub-heading, that the first item comes as Salaries. But the Minister's Salary is a salary item which deals with the Minister's salary, dealing generally with his department. And I think what the Member for Logan is saying is that there always is a wind-up discussion on the Minister's salaries and this Minister's salary for the Civil Service Commission is located in the place in which his salary is located, that is under Manpower and — what is it? — Northern Affairs? No, there is a separate item under Northern Affairs, in which the general Salary item was discussed. But there wasn't for Civil Service, and if the discussion did not take place at this time then there would be no place to discuss the salaral item of the Minister under the Civil Service, except this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. I guess, as Chairman of Committee, I am not allowed to get into a debate but I can make a statement. When I was Chairman of the Committee when Civil Service was being discussed and debated, the first item, (a) Salaries was left to the last so that we could go back and discuss the item. I recall it vividly. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, as I say, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue the point with you. I have made the point. I think the Minister knows how I feel on the subject, and it is on record. And if the Chairman says that is what happened, I don't recall it that way. We can an agreement to disagree. He sees it one way; I see it another way. I accept your ruling. I won't deal with the Civil Service any more. I really have not that much more to say. As I said, I think the Minister now has to be judged, not just on this session, because I know his term of office hasn't been that long. But when next year rolls around we will have a better opportunity to judge what kind of a job the Minister has done, and I hope, for the working people of Manitoba, that he does a credit to the job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I would have not risen in my place on this particular occasion, on the Minister's Salary, had it not been for the allegations and the charges which the Member for Logan has alleged to me and the people of Roblin Constituency, that I have been so honoured to represent for many, many years.

I think that the record of strikes, of collective bargaining in Roblin Constituency is one that's as good as any place in all Canada. And if the Honourable Member for Logan wants to make an allegation and charge against me and the people that I represent — and certainly we have had strikes in Roblin since I have been the MLA — maybe the members opposite don't know anything about those days because they maybe have forgotten because of the problems we had with the Minister at that time.

But I ask the Member for Logan if he would be kind enough to withdraw the allegations and charges he has made against the backbenchers. He made a broad statement, but I hope that he will withdraw and say that does not include Roblin Constituency because the record of Roblin Constituency, the years I have served them, has been a pretty good one. And certainly we have collective bargaining going on there; it has gone on for many years. And I support the unions. I can support the collective bargaining system. I support their rights, and I support this Minister and this government that is before the Committee here tonight. I think that it's a very unfair charge that the Member for Logan has made, and I know what's likely going to happen if I don't stand up on my feet tonight and correct the record. They are going to use this in the next election campaign as a quarter-truth and a half-truth, which they have just done in the federal campaign. And I never, Mr. Chairman, thought I would see the Social Democrats stoop to the level of quarter-truths, half-truths. I used to think that maybe only the Liberals were those that were artists in this field of misguiding and misleading the people of our province in election campaigning, but now the literature is coming back and some of the brochures filtering into my office and others, we're finding that these guys over here have got many more new tricks that the Liberals never even thought about.

But anyway, before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate this Minister. He is a very able experienced man in the field of labour, and while I know the members opposite think that there's nobody with a Conservative card in his pocket that can deal with labour matters in this jurisdiction or across Canada, I suggest to the members opposite and the people of this province, this man has all the skills and all the ability, and he'll meet the challenges of labour and the industry in every sector of our community in this province, and I'm sure that everybody will come away better satisfied when they've had a chance to talk to him and meet him and understand what kind of a nice guy he is, and an understanding man. I think that he's done a great job. He's only been in the office a very short time. I think that the last election proves because of the millions and millions of dollars McDermott and the union spent, it proves again that it doesn't matter where you go — all the people in this country are not NDP, nor are they card-carrying union men. Card-carrying union men don't all vote NDP, it's split across.

And so there's certainly Liberals that have the ability to lead the portfolio of labour; there's Conservatives that have the ability and the dedication to handle the portfolio — this man here, I congratulate him. And I, on behalf of the people of Roblin constituency wish him every success for the future, and I'm sure that he's going to give the labour movement and the Province of Manitoba a new thrust in the years ahead, as long as he holds that portfolio, and I, on behalf of the people that I represent wish him every success.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Member for Roblin has put himself on the record. I will admit to being one of those, who over the 12-years-plus that I've been in the House, have got the impression that the Member for Roblin is not a strong friend of trade unionism or organized labour. But that is the impression that I got. I got it from time to time, from debates in the House, and I will admit that I cannot point to a specific paragraph, with the exception, more recently of the resolution that the honourable member put, which the Speaker rejected as being out of order, which appeared to say that you can have collective bargaining and individual bargaining at the same time with the same group of employees. And if anything is union busting that is union busting. But my honourable friend now says that he is a great friend of trade unionism, and he doesn't want us to go around Roblin constituency telling the mistruth that he is against organized labour.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I assure the honourable member I won't do that. I'll take the statement

that he is a great friend of trade unionism, collective bargaining and organized labour, and show it to the hard rock Conservatives in Roblin constituency. That's what I will do, I will not talk about the fact that the honourable member has from time to time, given me the impression that he is not a friend of organized labour.

I know that when the minimum wage was raised by the New Democratic Party I saw no one in greater fury and in greater agitation. And in talking about the fact that the grocery stores in Roblin constituency were going to have to fire all of their employees because of raising of the minimum wage that was advocated at that time by the New Democratic Party, I will agree that the minimum wage and organized labour have only a slight relationship to each other. But I will concede that there have been times when I, apparently from what the member now says, got the wrong impression, despite the fact that when I said that he moved the resolution that somehow you have collective bargaining but you be free to make a separate deal with any individual in that bargaining unit. And the member posed that as a resolution to be considered by the House that was ruled out by the Speaker, to the great embarrassment, by the way, because I saw the Minister of Labour clapping his head in agony when he read the amendment. And luckily it was withdrawn. But that's the kind of thing that led members on this side of the House to somehow misunderstand the Honourable Member for Roblin's position vis-a-vis organized labour, unless the misunderstanding is really on the member himself, as to what he understands organized labour to be.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to deal with trifles for too long a portion of the time that is allotted to me, so I'll go to the Minister of Labour, who I do, Mr. Chairman, want to talk seriously to — and I've done this in the House before, and I've done it with regard to every Minister of Labour — that it is a very difficult job, that the Minister of Labour is going to have descended upon him, if it hasn't already been descended upon him, a brief from the Chamber of Commerce which will advocate every retrogressive measure that can be imagined with regard to collective bargaining, and he is going to have that brief pursued by members of his group. And if he can withstand the kind of pressure that I say will be brought upon him, then I will congratulate him, Mr. Chairman, and I will congratulate him in advance, and he will be able to use these words in Hansard, as indicating that I said at the time that if he withstood that I would congratulate him. g, Because it's comin it's coming from the Builder's Exchange; it's coming from the Chamber of Commerce; it'll come from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and it'll come from a nebulous group who are not identified with any title, who by and large represent the anti-labour forces in the community. And if he can withstand them I will say more power to him.

I will say, with regard to the amendment that has been put by the Member for St. Matthews, and which the Minister of Labour first attempted to put, that I prefer it to the amendment that has been put by the Member for Burrows and that I thought it was going a little far. Excuse me, when I say that I prefer it, I am not being entirely accurate. I prefer collective bargaining and union security, which results from free collective bargaining rather than from legislation. But the labour movement in this province, and in Canada, for the most part, prefers legislated union security. And the putting of the Rand Formula, which the Member for St. Matthews has completely confounded as identifying the Rand Formula with the entire words of Mr. Justice Rand in arbitrating the Ford Motor Company dispute, rather than the formula which is identified by his name, which involves union security, which merely says that Mr. Justice Rand advocated that everybody be required to pay union dues, whether they belonged to a union or not. And the minister has changed that to saying they agree with the legislated union security, which requires everybody to pay union dues by legislation under the Manitoba Liberal Relations Act, and other forms of freely negotiated union security.

Now, the first amendment was freely negotiated union security, but adopting a principle of Rand's Formula, which I thought was as moderate an amendment as could be put, which I happen to favour over legislated union security, but the Member for St. Matthews, as the messenger of the minister, has brought in a recommendation that this Legislature endorse legislated union security as is now contained in the Labour Relations Act plus any freely negotiated union security.

The different words are that the previous amendment to the Act was, freely negotiated union "employee organization union security" and it was changed to "trade union security." Employee association security was changed to union security, which the word perhaps has a quicker meaning to many people.

Now let it be understood that freely negotiated union security means what the company and the management agree to. It's the kind of union security that the Builders Exchange made a concentrated assault on last year, failed, and then went to the Minister and said, "We want Right to Work legislation which will undo the freely negotiated union security that has been a feature of the Exchange and the trades for many many years."

Now I happen to agree with that, but I want the Member for Roblin to know that when he votes for that he votes against what has been commonly referred to and is being pursued by the Builders

Exchange as Right to Work laws. He is going to get up on his feet and tell the Builders Exchange, and tell all the "Right to Work" which really means right to union bust people that he is against what they are advocating.

Now I happen to think that the Member for Pembina, that the Member for St. Matthews, that the Member for Roblin, that the Member for Dauphin, —(Interjection)— oh yes, the Member for Neepawa, the Member for Rock Lake, really do not believe that a trade union should be able to negotiate with an employer and say that all persons working for that employer have to be members of a particular union or become members within a particular period of time. But that's what freely negotiated union security means and it's interesting that these people have seized on that phrase, right to work, at the same time as having a member of the group, headed by the Minister of Labour — and I respect this — say to the Exchange people, say to the right to bust union law people, that we are against what you are doing. And if the Conservatives say it I will be puzzled, but I will say more power to the Minister of Labour. He's been able to ward off the wolves and ward off the groups that will be descending upon him. I'll wait to believe it, but I am happy to hear that that is his present disposition because that is the effect of the motion that he has put. Right to work — but an endorsement of the union security clause in the present Labour Relations Act, plus an endorsement of freely negotiated union security in addition to that, because union security can be stronger than what's legislated.

My honourable friends I may have told this story before but I'll repeat it so that they understand it. In England there is no legislated union security. They don't know what a certificate is. They don't know these things —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member what they do with regard to union security — that the union steward walks in in the morning and says to the manager that that man over there did not pay his union dues. If he is here this afternoon, he will be the only one. And by the afternoon he has either paid his union dues or he is not there. And I want the honourable member to know that that doesn't work by legislation. It happens to work by what, an old fashioned phrase called solidarity and frankly I think that that has built far more trade unionism anywhere and everywhere in the world than has legislation. I happen to be a minority in terms of what is pursued by the existing union movement but it's not an unimportant minority, because when we had, I think it was Bill Iverson although I'm not sure, who appeared before Committee about three years ago, and we asked him whether the Labour Relations Act has helped or hindered trade union organization, he says that we did better off before.

So let the honourable member know that at least both those things, the legislative security that we presently have, and other freely negotiated union security are the subject of the motion which now should be coupled with the right to work, which we say means the right to obtain employment — and by the way it's interesting, Mr. Chairman, because the Member for Roblin is the one who moved a motion to eliminate from that Resolution, that portion of it which said that the Legislature urges the government to put in programs in the public and private sectors which would make it possible for everybody seeking employment to obtain it. You moved that out of the Resolution. I'm looking at the Member for Roblin, Mr. Chairman, through you.

In the Budget debate, and I don't have my speech handy at the moment, but one of the things that was said in the Budget debate referred to meaningful job employment for all citizens — and I wish I could take that phrase out of the Budget debate so you will not attribute it to Bolshevism because it was made by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Craik — and add that to the right to work, coupled with the statement in the Budget debate which the Member for Roblin ruled out of the Resolution, the right to work including as indicated in the Budget debate, meaningful employment for those people who are seeking to obtain it because that's what the right to work means to the average person, and that is why, to some extent, the Exchange, and the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and the Chamber of Commerce, have harped on a phrase which they know communicates entirely differently to people than the communication that they have in mind. Because if they agreed with that why did the Conservative Party get up to amend and vote against the right to work which would urge the government to implement programs in the public and private sectors, to see to it that those people seeking employment would be able to obtain same.

Did they did not say spend until there is no money left, which is a very unusual concept because the only time we could ever spend as much as to keep people employed was when we had nothing, and I referred to that before in 1935 and 1936 when we were dead broke, that's when we found the money to build the Salter Bridge and the treatment plant in north Winnipeg, and the Winnipeg Auditorium, and the fact is that if we had been wealthy, we wouldn't have had those facilities because we couldn't afford them. It's a rather bizarre anomaly about this great system that is advocated by honourable friends at all times. The fact is that wealth comes from the combination of human resources applied to natural resources, and any fuel or any system which can combine the two will create wealth, not destroy wealth. You cannot destroy wealth by putting a human being to apply his physical resource to a natural resource and create something. You cannot destroy wealth. It

cannot cost money; it can only create money.

It may cost money to certain people in whose interests it is that they make a hell of a lot and other people make a hell of a little bit, but it cannot destroy wealth. The application of human resources to natural resources cannot destroy wealth. If you don't believe me, ask Social Credit, because that is the dogma of Social Credit. Their only problem is —(Interjection)— Oh, well, who believes Social Credit? You have a Social Credit Government — you know, you have a Social Credit Government in British Columbia; you had one in Alberta; you had a tremendous amount of them in Quebec. There's only one problem. There's only one problem, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— That is right. There's only one problem with it, and that is that they will not hold prices. They will not hold prices, and therefore when they start their theories of distributing their social dividend on the basis that this will equate consumptive power with productive power, with productive goods, they forget that the price of those goods will go up and that they will always be chasing their tails.

But the theory that the only limit to the capacity of wealth in our society is the amount of work that human beings can do on the natural resources that we have, is so trite as should be agreed to by everybody. The only question is, how do you put the two together? —(Interjection)— Pardon me?

MR. JORGENSEN: By getting back to the subject of Labour.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are on the subject. The fact is that I want to tell the Minister that if he successfully will move only in the direction of seeing to it that the State does not come to the assistance of either Party, and that where he sees that the State is already assisting one or the other that the laws be so altered as to remove the State, then he will have, I tell him, support on this side of the House. Maybe not everybody, but he will have support. And I can prove it by telling you what I said publicly when Mr. Mackasey was handling the Post Office dispute. Mr. Mackasey handled the Post Office dispute in an entirely different way than it was handled last time last fall. Mr. Mackasey was prepared to engage in free collective bargaining. He got no order requiring people to work. He continued to let the people strike and he hired those people that wanted to work, and gradually there was some disruption, the Post Office didn't function properly for a while but Mackasey did not use the State to order people to work.

The more recent Liberal decision was that they were going to pass a law telling people to go to work, and if they can't get them to work they'll put their leaders in jail unless they tell them to work. And they did that. That's actually what they did. That's where they wound up. And I tell you, and I tell the Minister, that whoever would listen, I said that although I may not agree with the position that the federal government is taking vis-a-vis the contract, I do agree that they are engaged in free collective bargaining. That was when Mr. Mackasey dealt with the strike and people said he broke the strike. He negotiated. He didn't force anybody to work. Some people went back. The Union, I'm sure, was angry with him, but they went back.

The more recent one, which is the one where I felt that the employees had a perfect right to say that they will not work, interestingly enough the President of the CLC didn't take that position. He was very cool to the postal workers' position even though Parliament had passed the law ordering them back to work. And now it's come to the defence of Mr. Parrot, who seems to be a scapegoat in this situation, that we have to prove that we're going to send somebody to jail on the basis that presumably he can tell me to work, and that if he doesn't he's to go to jail.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a situation that's not going to resolve itself immediately, or indeed, I think, at any time in the future. The secret of freedom, and how one can trust freedom as being the most satisfactory way of bringing about stable industrial relations as against State imposed labour is one which I am sure will always be with us, and I will have no hesitation in saying that you will be able to indentify the free countries from the totalitarian countries, that in free countries it will be very, very remote that the State can impose the performance of labour, and in totalitarian countries it'll be easier. And you will then be able to, we find that a little bit more sophisticated, that the free countries will be the ones that are closer and closer to free collective bargaining, that the totalitarian countries are the ones that have more and more laws, telling you when you can work and when you cannot work, when you can walk down the street and appeal to your fellow man, and when you cannot walk down the street.

And thus far the Minister has not changed the laws which are vital in that area, and I am hoping against hope, regardless of my position vis-a-vis the Conservative Government generally, that he will not change that position.

I want to say to the Minister that he has a tough portfolio. I believe that he has an understanding superior to most of the members of his group with regard to the problems that can evolve in industrial relations, that he has an opportunity of being an unique Conservative Minister, or he can fall into

the pattern of Conservative Ministers of Labour that we have had in the past and we will be watching intently to see how he applies himself when the crisis comes in each of the areas where these matters manifest themselves in practical affairs as between employers and employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to set my honourable friend from Roblin's mind at rest. I have not been able to find — I have checked, and I want to withdraw the charge that I made. And I withdraw it quite freely. However, I shall be watching very closely when the Speaker calls for Ayes and Nays on the proposed Resolution, and the member then can set my mind at rest.

Now, the Honourable Member for Roblin, and I am not indulged in this, but it seems to be the fad set by his Leader, and it's unfortunate that he's not here, but I would say it if he was here, to attack our federal leader and our federal party about going around the country spreading half truths and half lies. All I can say to the Honourable Member for Roblin and to the members of the Progressive Conservative Caucus is that a hell of a lot of people in Manitoba didn't believe the half truths and half lies that you were going around spreading, because I think the results of the election here in Manitoba was one hell of a shock to you — one hell of a shock. And I say to you, and I say to your Ministers especially, get out of your ivory tower; get out there and talk to the people on the streets. —(Interjection)— That shows you, my friend, he was more worried than I was. But nevertheless, I think if you were to go and look at some of the promises that were made by some of the Conservative candidates, and the Conservative leader, that they would be stretching the truth far more than what were made by members of the New Democratic Party.

And if you're in a pique, it's your own fault. You're in a pique because what the people of Manitoba have told you, and have told you quite clearly. Your First Minister says, regardless of what the people have said in Manitoba, you're going to carry on. And I hope you do. I hope you do carry on with your program, because come the next election — oh well, there's our bird-brained friend over there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt my honourable friend, he probably has a few things that he wants to say and I don't object to him saying them, but I do believe that at the present time we're on the Salary of the Minister of Labour. And I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would direct his remarks to that particular portfolio, rather than what he is now discussing, which I don't think has a great deal to do with the Department of Labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: On the same point of order, I wish the Honourable House Leader would have taken the same attitude when his member, his backbencher, got up and introduced the topic of the federal election. Where was the arbiter, or the great defender of the rules of this House? I didn't object, and neither did any other member. Neither did the Chairman. —(Interjection)— All right, then you can object. And until the Chairman rules me out of order, I'm going to proceed. Mr. Chairman, am I in order or out of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rather than answer any questions, I'll make a statement. We are under the Department of Labour and Manpower and if I have allowed enough latitude to confuse the issue and allow the discussion on the federal election, I must apologize to the honourable members, because if I had been doing my job properly I should have ruled all members discussing anything but Labour and Manpower out of order. And I would suggest to the honourable members that we are on the Department of Labour and Manpower. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I will abide by your advice. It was not me who interjected the recent political election that we had, or the recent 6 weeks or 8 weeks of politics that we've had here cross country, into this debate. I didn't interject it, and I want that clear on the record and I want the Honourable House Leader to know that. It was not me that interjected it. It was your Member for Roblin and I was only replying to the remarks that he had made in the House, and I'm not going to leave it on the record that he can go around saying that we went around this country preaching half-truths and half-lies to the people of this country, because I think

that degrades the whole political process that we have been involved in for many, many years in this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I thought that we had agreed that we were on the Department of Labour and Manpower and I would suggest to the honourable member that we are on Labour and Manpower. I think the honourable member has made his point. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I have not too much more to say. I said it before, and we have again chirping from the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. If he has anything to say in the Department of Labour, I would welcome to hear any remarks he might have to say.

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

MR. PASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I don't want to make a long statement. I want to ask the Minister, since he wasn't in the House late this afternoon when I introduced the amendment to the Employment Standards Act, and since he is responsible for the administration of that Act, whether he is in favour of employees being forced to take lie detector tests by their employers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I haven't given the particular situation a heck of a lot of consideration up to this particular point, but I understand it's an issue that's being raised in the House and I'll be quite prepared to speak on it at the appropriate time.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I find that amazing in that the whole matter of employees being subjected to lie detector tests surely would be something that the Minister of Labour, who administers the conditions of work under the Employment Standards Act, surely would have been interested in. I thought that this was something that he would have paid some attention to. I do know that legal counsel informed him that this private member's bill was coming forward. That's what legal counsel does to every Minister when a bill is being put forward that may be of special interest to the Minister.

And I'm amazed that the Minister would get up and say, well, I'm not really acquainted with this. If he isn't acquainted with it, then it's high time that he did some investigations —(Interjection)— did some investigations into this matter, because it is a tip of the iceberg. Prospective employees have been forced to undertake lie detector tests — and maybe that's not the area of concern of the Minister of Labour, maybe that's more the area of concern of the Attorney-General or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs — but surely the conditions of employment of employees, those who are employees presently, is of major concern to the Minister of Labour.

I would ask the Minister if he has any statement to make on this or whether in fact he feels that he would be supporting this type of very simple Act, which basically says we will not allow an employer to take a lie detector test nor will we dismiss, allow an employee to be dismissed for refusing to take a lie detector test? Very simple, clear, precise amendments to an Act that he administers and I would think that the Minister should be able to give us a clear, concise response on whether he is in favour of that or not.

MR. MacMASTER: I have answered the member that when his particular resolution comes on the floor, and when I'm prepared to speak on it, I'll so speak on it, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. Then the Minister is not making any commitment to ensure that this bill is indeed further considered by the Legislature. He knows we're into speed-up, he knows that the majority of which he is part can kill the bill, and I would have hoped that we could have got an indication from the Minister that he is sufficiently concerned about this item to ensure that it gets full consideration by this House and is passed in the next two or three weeks that this House will sit. Because he knows that when we enter speed-up we don't have Private Member's Hour, and he knows that at the end of the Session it is the government majority that will determine which bills are brought forward from the Private Member's section at the end for consideration.

So I would have hoped that the Minister of Labour would have been sufficiently concerned about

this particular matter to make some commitment to us tonight. Obviously, he is either unconcerned about the matter or not fully enough informed about the matter to make a position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night I asked the Minister a question regarding the last item which was under consideration before we got to his Estimates. I believe he undertook to supply us with a list of the items contained within the Estimate, particularly for the Special Municipal Loan Fund, which was some \$5 million item. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he has done that. I don't recall receiving it myself, perhaps he sent it over to one of my colleagues, in which case I will receive a copy, I am sure. But if not, could the Minister explain when we will be receiving that?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, two or three things, one of which I was just asked and I will deal with, the previous question from the Meer for Logan in relationship to the Workers' Advocate. The Workers' Advocate does, in fact, take up the case of the worker who feels that he has been wronged by a decision of the Workman's Compensation Board. The Workers' Advocate does, in fact, assist in the procedures of the appeal system and works very closely and accompanies the worker, if necessary, and assists him in making his presentation. I am not challenging the knowledge of the Meer for Logan, but that is the procedure and that's the workings of the Workers' Advocate. It's a very activist sort of a role.

In answer to the Member for Rupertsland, I believe he was at another Committee Meeting or something this afternoon so he wasn't here that I noticed this afternoon because I wanted to explain to him that there are 65 projects under way in rural Manitoba under the Special Municipal Loans Fund. There are 75 projects under way in the City of Winnipeg, totalling just over \$5 million. I could read them off. They are encompassed, at the moment, within a fairly substantial document, which I am having them withdrawn from the maze of documents and a specific piece of paper prepared for the member outlining the projects. You know, there is in Gilbert, Minnedosa, Mossey River, Riverside, Ste. Rose, and it goes on for pages but there are a lot that have been completed within there and I intend to withdraw them or I can read them off now if the member wished, but there are 65 of them in the rural area and I am second-guessing that he would rather have the specific list rather than me read it off this evening, Mr. Chairman, but I will await his comments.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could undertake to supply us with that list, as he has committed himself to do, that would be satisfactory to us.

I would like to make some general comments, Mr. Chairman, on some of the things that have, perhaps, not been fully covered by previous comments this evening. In particular, some of the cutbacks in the programs in this department are a particular concern to me and I believe I could outline some of these and the extent to which there have been some very significant cutbacks.

For example, Mr. Chairman, in the provincial job office in the 1978-79 Budget there was \$180,000 budgeted. In that year that expenditure was cut to \$116,500, and this year we see in the Estimates for 1979-80 a further cutback to \$38,600.00. So it indicates to me a certain direction in which this government is moving and that is to take the government out of the field of assisting in the creation of jobs. The provincial job office was involved in a number of programs that were designed to assist in the creation of employment. For example, one of those was the Inner City Employment Program, the budget for that has virtually disappeared. The inner city staff that are left in the branch I believe are simply finalizing some of the projects that had been already established by the New Democratic government and are really not carrying on to do anything new.

The only project that I am aware of that was approved last year was a small amount to carry over final payment for a project that had been approved before the 1978 fiscal year.

So that that project, Mr. Chairman, that was designed to assist in the inner core of the City of Winnipeg where there are some special problems, particularly with a growing native population in that area that are disadvantaged and are requiring some special assistance and, in general, to assist that area of the city to develop economically. Well that program, Mr. Chairman, has simply been done away with by this government, which I believe is a very serious step backwards.

The Special Northern Native Employment Program which the New Democratic government established has been also virtually eliminated. In late 1978 the balance that was left in that budget of some \$600,000 was transferred to the Communities Economic Development Fund, but without any additional staff so that the Communities Economic Development Fund, I suppose, are expected to carry out some kind of program with those limited funds. It's very unlikely that any of the funds have been granted to date or that this program will even continue. I assume that the Conservative

government is planning to allow this program to just wither on the vine, as it has the Inner City Employment Program.

If we look at the Youth Employment Programs that are operated by this department, Mr. Chairman, here is another area of disappointment to us on this side of the House and to all Manitobans who are concerned about the problem of unemployment within the youth component of our society.

If we look at the budget comparisons, Mr. Chairman, for 1977-78, which was the year the Conservative government assumed office and were committed to a program that had already been established by the New Democratic government, there was an actual expenditure that year of close to \$6 million — \$5.8 million. For the following year, Mr. Chairman, they cut the budget by some \$300,000, their budget was \$5.5 million. For 1979-80, Mr. Chairman, that budget has been trimmed to \$5.4 million, a further decrease in the overall budget for youth employment.

Well, Mr. Chairman, someone indicated they had supplied more jobs. One of those jobs, apparently, is within the Progressive Conservative Party, which I don't believe was a new job at all. —(Interjection)— Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, we will bring further examples of mismanagement and corruption to the attention of the members opposite.

And, Mr. Chairman, we will see a further careful analysis, I'm sure, of the employment project that has been administered by the Progressive Conservative government which was explicitly directed by the Progressive Conservative government to not have any kind of monitoring, in fact, the Minister of Finance, I understand, in meetings with staff from the provincial job office of the day specifically instructed the staff that they were not to go out and monitor the Private Sector Employment Program. They were not to go out and ask any questions of anybody who had received a grant under that project. That's the extent of the management and monitoring of the Progressive Conservative management of that program. —(Interjection)— It's not an assumption; it's an absolute fact that the Minister of Finance gave that instruction to the staff of the provincial job office, that they were under no circumstances to go out and monitor that program; they were to keep hands off. And I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, they intended that program to not have any monitoring because they wanted the things to happen that have come to our attention, such as the moneys going to three or four firms at one location, moneys going to their provincial Progressive Conservative Association and so on. That's ' the reason they didn't want to have any monitoring, Mr. Chairman, they didn't want anybody to find out what was going on with that program.

The result is, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a significant decrease in the amount of funds that have been applied for youth employment in this province. There has been a significant decrease, practically an elimination of those programs that were designed to assist in the disadvantaged areas of the province, namely the inner core area of Winnipeg and the north of our province.

The New Careers Program, Mr. Chairman, is another case in point where in 1977-78 when the Conservative government took office there was an actual expenditure that year of over \$3 million for the New Careers Program. In the following year, Mr. Chairman, they cut that budget to \$1.7 million, and this year, Mr. Chairman, the budget is \$1.9 million, which is over \$1 million reduction from a program that was designed to assist disadvantaged people to obtain a useful productive career in our society.

So, Mr. Chairman, rather than adding to programs, rather than providing further assistance to people who require employment opportunities, this government has cut back and cut back seriously in areas where the need is the greatest.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that the Estimates process, as far as this Minister is concerned, when it comes to either one of his departments, whether it's Northern Affairs or Labour and Manpower, are a great disappointment. He seems to have been very successful in getting on the bandwagon of the First Minister of this province. When the First Minister said "restraint", this Minister said, "Yes, Sir," and proceeded to be the example of restraint, to provide an example of restraint for all his other colleagues in Cabinet. And I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons why the First Minister has awarded this Minister the added burden of the portfolio of Labour and Manpower in addition to the portfolio of Northern Affairs, because he has been very effective, it appears, at following the direction established by his First Minister when assuming office in this office, and that is of cutting back on programs. And in the areas where the cutbacks have been made, it appears that they are the areas where people are hurting the most, and that is the youth of this province, where there have been cutbacks in the programs designed to assist in the employment of the youth; cutbacks in the north of the province, where we had programs to assist in job creation in northern Manitoba, to provide permanent employment opportunities for people; and cutbacks in the inner city of the City of Winnipeg, where there are special problems; and cutbacks in special programs, like New Careers, which were designed to provide special assistance to specially disadvantaged people in the Province of Manitoba. And New Careers, I might add, Mr. Chairman, is a program that has been praised by other jurisdictions all across Canada as a program that

is almost the ideal in terms of its being able to be effective in taking a disadvantaged person, giving them training on the job, a type of training and direction that resulted in tremendous success for the dollars expended, a tremendous benefit cost advantage to the program.

Those analyses, I'm sure, are available to this Minister. I'm sure he knows the special programs that are in these departments and I find it strange that he wouldn't see the value of a program such as the New Careers Program, that he wouldn't see the value of programs such as the Inner City Employment Program, that he wouldn't see the value and hear about the value of the New Careers Program which affects people in his own constituency. I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that he wouldn't see the value of these programs and do something, as a Minister, to try to save them and to try to augment the funding that is available for them.

But, Mr. Chairman, I see with great disappointment that he is following the example of his First Minister, and that is to cut, cut, cut, and cut back particularly in those areas where people have the least opportunity and the least capability of being able to speak out and complain about the cutbacks. They've cut back in those areas where it is necessary for other people to be the advocates and speak out for people, rather than having the people in those areas speaking out for themselves. In spite of that, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure he has heard complaints from people in his own constituency about cutbacks in the New Careers Program and the Special Northern Employment Program. I'm sure he has recommendations from northern associations and groups, and individuals, and community councils, to please bring back additional funding for some of these programs, please reinstitute them because they're programs that are needed in the communities and in the disadvantaged areas of Manitoba.

But Mr. Chairman, I think the words that I'm saying in this House tonight, and the pleas of those who are in the northern communities and in the inner core of Winnipeg, and in the young people in the Province of Manitoba, are landing on deaf ears and/or uncaring ears, as is demonstrated by particularly the Minister for Economic Development, who scowls across at us at almost everything that is said in this Chamber. So Mr. Chairman, I don't have much hope for success in persuading this Minister and this government to reconsider, but I must say that it is sad for those who depended on these programs, and I believe some of whom even sincerely supported the Conservative Government and believed that they were being sincere when they said they were going to take all of the programs that the New Democratic Government were operating and not cut them back, but operate them better. Well, Mr. Chairman, we see that they have not lived up to that promise. They have disappointed those people, and they will continue to disappoint them from the looks of it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would simply end by pointing out that it is a very serious breach of trust, I believe, that this government has committed in terms of the way it's treated those people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could comment on the efforts or activities of his department in the field of safety, with respect in particular to the handling of anhydrous ammonia. Last Session we had considerable discussion with his predecessor on this whole matter, and one specific case in point was the accident, the serious accident at Paul's Hauling that occurred in Brandon, in fact over the years there's been more than one accident, but one did result in the death of the person, and it did result in a number of firefighters being hospitalized for a period of time. I'm talking about over a year ago now, of course, but nevertheless, I'm wondering whether the Minister is satisfied that adequate safety requirements are being fulfilled by Paul's Hauling in the City of Brandon, and indeed by others who are actively involved. I'm not talking about the farmers; I'm talking about the commercial depots where there's a concentration of this very dangerous — I know it's valuable for fertilizer — I'm not talking about that, but I do understand that it is a very dangerous chemical to handle. One has to be extremely careful, extremely cautious, and it seems to me that it's worthy of the Minister's attention, that he should be satisfied that any safety suggestions, any improvements made by his department for — suggestions made by his department officials for improved handling techniques, that these are being carried out by that company, and indeed by any other company.

Another element of this, I believe, is the identification of trucks that are hauling anhydrous ammonia on the highways. I had the privilege of talking to a person in the industry a few months back, and he's very active in the — his trade was to examine the gauges and the dials, the gauges that measure anhydrous ammonia as you take it out of the truck, and other equipment involved in controlling anhydrous ammonia, dials and so on. And he maintained that it was a very hazardous occupation that he had, and that, in his opinion, a truck going down the highway hauling anhydrous ammonia was more dangerous than a truck going down the highway hauling dynamite, and he said that, in his view, as a tradesman working in this area, and he had a number of close calls, in his

view, he said that there is cause for the provinces in Canada to more properly identify trucks so that all are aware on the highway that it is a dangerous cargo that is being carried over the highways.

And I suppose the Minister could say, "Well, this is really a matter for the Minister of Highways." Perhaps it is, but at the same time I do know the handling of it is under his department, and when there is an accident it is his officials that inspect the causes of an accident and do make recommendations for improvements. So I wonder if he could — if the Minister has something to say about this, whether he is satisfied that the department has in place adequate regulations and that the companies are living up to these regulations.

MR. MacMASTER: I think, Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate situation that did in fact occur over a year ago, I think has prompted a fair amount, a fair degree of education awareness of the handling of the particular chemical. I know that our department, before my time, expressed a great deal of concern as to whether in fact truckers and truckers' organizations were aware of the real danger of the product, and whether in fact they were following regulations, and I believe that the simplest way I can explain our reaction to it, though I wasn't specifically involved in it at the time, was that an education formula was implemented with the truckers and with the truckers' associations to make them far more aware of the fact that they just weren't dealing with something insignificant.

The identification of the trucks, I'll certainly take that as notice, Mr. Chairman, and it has its validity, and I will discuss it with the Minister of Highways and see what can be done in that particular area.

The Member for Rupertsland mentioned the inner city core projects, and I mentioned to him last night that there had been \$165,000 going already to the inner city of Winnipeg in relationship to some of their inner core programs, and that we were presently — I think he missed that point — presently carrying on discussions with the school division in Winnipeg in relationship to funding some of their particular projects.

He mentioned the Special Northern Employment Program, which of course is in CDF, and it's hopeful, and I think we all share that hope that, combined with the other agency, being CEDF, that the two of them, the two programs together, can provide meaningful assistance in the grant and the loan area to people and projects.

The member made reference to the Private Sector Youth Program where employment took place for over 4,200 young people in Manitoba, and made reference to the fact that there was problems with that particular program, and I make no excuses for the fact that there was a problem. I make no excuses for the fact that any particular program that's implemented, there are problems in the management of those programs. I've taken the liberty of reviewing the one that the Member for Brandon, the one that he implemented in '77, and I'm not going to go into great details of problems they had with that particular program, but there was problems with that particular program too, Mr. Chairman.

I think the thing that has to be remembered is that the effort is being made; you can always tighten up on your programs. I spelled out some of the procedures, some of the different approaches that the department will be following this year at the suggestion of myself in relationship to how we'll handle this program this year, but I don't doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this time next year there will be somebody someplace who can find a fault, that something didn't work exactly the way it was intended to work.

The '77 program implemented by the then Minister, I think, of Industry and Commerce, found faults with his when it was reviewed, and I would like to believe that if he'd been in office for another year or two that he might have changed some of the procedures with that particular program.

The fact is, getting back to what I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the effort must be made, and we're determined to make that effort. It happens that this particular program, through the method in which it's implemented, employs more young people. Now, I think that has credence. The fact that there's a fault or two with it can be corrected, and we are endeavoring to this time next year be standing in front of this House with as less a number of problems that is possible, humanly possible. But I suspect that there'll be a problem arise, as there always is with major efforts such as this, regardless of what particular government implements it.

During the course of my Estimates I have outlined some substantial increases, which I think bear repeating, and the members have taken note of them and, in some instances, in the majority of instances, have been complimentary in relationship to the efforts that the department is exercising. We've increased the staff in our Women's Bureau, which was a very important area. We've added six people to the Workplace Safety and Health Division, and I think that was extremely important. We've added two people to the Mechanical Electrical Engineering Department. We have expanded

the operation of the Fire College. We've added a person, an additional staff man year to the Pension Commission. We added five people to the apprenticeship training end of my particular portfolio. We hope, and I think all members share our hope, that the relocation programs pick up this year and do even more than what they've done in the past. And I mentioned just briefly this afternoon that the Selkirk Training Plant, we expect the trainees to — a far greater number of people to go through that particular program. And that's not all the details of the Estimates. I don't think we should be going through them all, but I think it's an indication of faith that I have in the department, and faith that this government has in the particular department that I represent, and the faith that we have in the work that we see needs to be done in the addition of staff in these particular areas.

MR. EVANS: Well, the Minister has made reference to some of the efforts that the previous administration had made in attempting to provide jobs for young people and others. I would like to ask him very specifically, could he give us an idea of, just roughly, how many young people, how many jobs were created under the Youth Employment Program in the farming sector? The Minister of Education gave us a copy of the form on request, and I think it said on the form that the employer, I believe, was to fill out a type of — or perhaps it was the potential employee, but no matter — it's a type of business, (a) farm, (b) other, which would make me think that a great number of the employers would be classified as farmers.

I just wondered if the Minister could, at this time, indicate in very approximate terms how many of those young people employed last year were working on farms.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I can't at this particular moment break all that out. There were 4,200 young people employed, and to break that specific number out would take a great deal of time.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well we can try to get that out of the Order for Return that was provided. But I would say this — and the Minister now realizes it — that whenever you have a program of this type involving the private sector, you have to be extremely careful that the program is fulfilling the objectives that you as a Minister or the government of the day wishes to achieve. Certainly the objective is to achieve jobs. But it's not just jobs. Surely it has to be jobs that would not have been created otherwise. Surely that has to be the objective. They have to be jobs that are additional to what the market, the labour market, would demand, if things were left alone.

And therefore, it is extremely important that staff be required to check all applications, to check as many — spot check, I'd suggest, sampling check — sample check as many of these approved applications as possible to ensure that the taxpayers and the spending of the money through this program are seeing new jobs created. And this is why — you see the program that we had that's most closely, perhaps, parallel to this program for the young people, Youth Employment Program that you are now administering, is the jobs in small business. That is the parallel. We had the jobs in small business. We did not approve moneys for 4,200 people. I don't remember what, it was probably maybe less than half of that. But the reason, I submit, Mr. Chairman, for a much smaller number, was that we had much more stringent eligibility conditions attached to the application. And also, we did have a fair-sized staff in Industry and Commerce to monitor this and to ensure that we were spending the taxpayers' money as wisely as we possibly can.

I agree with the Minister in his comment a moment ago that there are problems; you can't administer any program like this with without problems, I don't care who you are. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Well that's fine. That's fine.

And as I said, you can have more jobs under this program that you've had last year and this year because your conditions are less stringent.

And what concerns me is that there did not seem to be . . . And I don't know whether — maybe the Minister can answer this — whether this year you are ensuring that seasonal operators don't qualify. It's not that I don't want to see people employed in seasonal occupations. That's not the point. The point I'm making is that the seasonal business has to go out and hire people anyway. Ice cream vendors are good examples. I note on the Order for Return there are all kinds of ice cream vendors, or there were some companies that would be classified as ice cream vendors. Obviously, they are going to hire young people at this time of the year.

So if you're simply going to approve any application you receive from that type of business, you are not really, by the expenditure of that money — you can include those numbers in the 4,200 persons but you're surely not creating jobs that wouldn't have been created otherwise.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it's an illusion; it's an illusion unless you're very, very careful to monitor the program, to set the conditions down in the program to ensure that, to the best of your ability, to the best of your department's, to the best of the ability of the staff, that you

are bringing forth jobs, new jobs. We don't want to simply finance business or farmers to hire people they were going to hire anyway. And knowing the prudence of farmers in this province, I would think, well that is a very seasonal business and I'm just wondering how many of these farmers that got mocey under this program would not have hired young people anyway. I would ask that question very seriously, and I'd ask the Minister to ask himself that question.

This is the gnawing problem you always have in this kind of a job creation program. I agree with the Minister that the effort must be made because we have seen too many statistics of young people unemployed, too many young people unemployed in this province; we've seen too many people who are going wanting for lack of work, people who want to work and cannot find jobs.

So I don't object to the program, to the general objectives of the program. I don't believe anyone on this side objects to the general objectives of the program. And I'm not saying that what I was involved in previously was perfect, by no means. You try. I simply say that there seems to be, over a very lax approach that was taken last year to this whole thing, when you don't have sufficient people to monitor the program; it doesn't mean you want an army of policemen — I'm not suggesting that — an army of inspector generals or what have you, but you've got to have some staff because you're talking about a lot of money. You've got to have some staff to get out there and make sure that the money is being adequately or properly spent, to see that the actual people are involved where they're presumed to be working, and surely you've got to have, as well, adequate conditions to ensure that you are spending taxpayers' money to create jobs that wouldn't have been created otherwise.

And when you've got seasonal occupations there, I really begin to wonder whether you have truly created new jobs or whether you're just taking some money and subsidizing employers in hiring of persons that they must hire anyway, by virtue of the type of industry, the type of business that's involved.

So while the Minister and the government can boast that they provided more jobs than we did in a comparable program, jobs in small business, I submit that it's probably because of the fact that we tried to, as best as we could, ensure that we were directing funds to creating jobs that wouldn't have been created otherwise.

So I don't know whether the Minister can tell us whether farmers are included. Specifically, I'd like to know answers to two questions. Could the Minister advise whether farmers are eligible again this year, and No. 2, could the Minister advise whether seasonal enterprises are also eligible this year. By that I mean, a good example are ice cream vendors that are only open in the summertime.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, yes to both questions. Seasonal operators and farmers are eligible this year. We are hopeful, the same as others were hopeful in the past, that it is in fact additional work. We are asking employers to specify specifically that it is additional help that they're taking, and I think we have to, to a degree, trust the integrity of the people that are applying. We are having spot checks to an extensive degree this year, of which I outlined when we talked about this particular program.

The ice cream vendor bit was not only a problem faced by our particular government on our small business employment program, with the Youth Employment Program, but was also a problem, as is documented with the member who has just spoken, because there are records of the Dairy Queens getting their share of assistance under his program. So it's the type of thing that will happen. We're being insistent that it is additional help and we certainly hope that, in fact, that's exactly what it is.

The percentages that the member asked for, the numbers of rural jobs, I have not got the numbers but I have a percentage broke down at 35 percent of the 4,202 were in Winnipeg and 65 percent were rural, and of that 65 percent 19 percent were farm jobs. That's the best that I have at this particular moment.

But I notice also in reviewing the assessment of the program implemented by the same member that just spoke, that his people told him, the same as my people are telling me, that it is terribly difficult, if not impossible, to try and establish, in fact, that every job was an additional one. That's spelled out pretty clear in their review, the same as I outlined our review last night, that it is — I don't suppose anything is impossible, but terribly difficult to establish that. It was reviewed in the program in '77, it was reviewed in the program in '78, the only thing I can say to you Mr. Chairman, and the House, and to the general public is that we're endeavouring to tighten up on it and to assure ourselves that in fact, to the best of our ability, it is additional jobs.

MR. EVANS: Just very briefly, well, I'm glad to hear the Minister say that, because I think we agree that when you're dealing with this kind of a program, the very nature of it, I believe, makes

it a difficult type of program to implement. I'd simply like to recommend to him that he consider, because he is responsible for the employment office, or the job office, I guess it's called, that — or whatever the term is now — that there are other ways of creating jobs, direct job creation, involving other elements of our society. They are more costly than this, and I suggest, for example special employment programs through the municipalities where the municipalities administer certain programs and hire numbers of people to do specific things that can be approved, likewise with school boards, school divisions, likewise with hospital boards, and so on.

In other words, going back to some of the programs we had a few years ago, I'm suggesting there are other kinds of jobs that are available in the public sector. We're talking about the private sector here; I say that there are jobs available, also, worthwhile jobs in the public sector that could be created. But I don't really expect much to be forthcoming in view of the fact that the government is taking a fairly tight-fisted approach generally in its budgeting.

But I have been one who has, for many years, advocated special efforts by government to create jobs when unemployment tends to be higher than we would like to see it, particularly for particular groups of people or in special areas of the province, such as in northern Manitoba where we have undue high levels of unemployment. So I simply, without really saying anything more, recommend to the Minister that he and his staff look at other areas where worthwhile jobs can be created for young people and others, and where you may not have the same kind of headaches that you have in administering this kind of program that involves the private sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; 1.—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I thought you'd recognized some other member. I wanted to ask the Minister of Labour about his policy position regarding the rights of employees of government who are not protected under the agreement with the Manitoba Government Employees Association. I have spoken in the last number of months, described as ruthless, and callous, and heartless, the manner in which people have been discharged by this government, and I'm not going to repeat those comments at this stage because I want to talk about the policy of government in relation to termination employment. I, frankly, had been under the impression that only a Deputy Minister could have his position terminated by Order-in-Council, or by the Premier, the First Minister. But I always had the impression that all other civil servants, from Assistant Deputy Minister down, had rights for grievance, and had protection under the Civil Service Act to go to the Civil Service Commission. And it's only when these termination of employments took place that I came to the conclusion that, and it's only an opinion I've formed, that the Act seems to say that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can terminate employment period. And I'm wondering what is the policy of this minister, as Minister of Labour and I suppose, Minister for the Civil Service, in regard to the rights of civil servants who are not protected by the MGEA. Do they have any rights? Does the government recognize any rights? Does the minister think that they ought to have rights, and is he contemplating any changes to give them rights that they don't have now? And, of course, all this is premised on the question as to whether I'm correct in my impression, recently acquired impression, that they don't have any rights.

MR. MacMASTER: Civil servants in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, who are not covered by the MGEA agreement, have the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, then the minister seems to be correcting my impression and he says that they do have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission. May I ask him what has been the experience? How many appeals have there been launched? Well, let me reverse that question. I seem to recall seeing the report of the Civil Service Commission that would indicate very, very few appeals have been made. If there is an appeal, and if there have been any appeals to any extent since the last report of the Commission, what authority, what rights does the Civil Service Commission have in regard to that, after hearing the appeal? Can the Civil Service Commission reinstate them? Can the Civil Service Commission order that their employment shall be continued?

MR. MacMASTER: It depends on the set of circumstances, Mr. Chairman. I'd have to know what specifically the member is talking about, but the non-covered employees, the excluded employees certainly have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister has repeated what he said the last time. I was asking, what authority does the Civil Service Commission have to deal with the appeal? Can they order a minister to continue to employ a person whom he has discharged, or whom the

has discharged? Can they order that he shall be kept at the same salary but in a different department? I'm not clear on that. My impression was that they couldn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just remind the honourable members that we are on the Department of Labour and Manpower. The Department of Civil Service has been discussed and passed and we are now on the Department of Labour and Manpower. The Honourable Member for St. Johns. exactly what you've said, but, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing firstly, not with the Civil Service Commission but with the Minister of Labour and his salary. And the Minister of Labour is the minister that I've been given to understand is the responsible minister dealing with the employment of people who work for the Government Services. I'm talking about the minister and about his policy, and through him that of the government in relation to termination of employment. And I think that's a perfectly legitimate question to ask this minister, because policy is that policy which is determined by the government and carried out through the minister, whose salary we are now discussing.

MR CHAIRMAN: I would agree with the honourable member, except . that the Department of Civil Service has already been passed. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the Department of the Civil Service. I don't believe there is a Department of the Civil Service. I think that there is a Civil Service Commission, for which there are Estimates, which we have dealt with. But we have not dealt with this Minister's Salary, and I'm talking about the Minister of Labour. Mr. Chairman, I'm talking about the Minister of Labour, whose salary we are now dealing with, and who is the Labour Minister for this government, and therefore would have a concern for employment of people employed by the Crown, right in the Province of Manitoba. And he has been answering and I assume he's not refusing to respond to his policy, and I'm just attempting to determine his policy in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm at a loss, I've made a ruling. I understand that we are on this department, and if the honourable members don't care, go ahead. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, you said, go ahead, so I will go ahead and I won't debate it further. Mr. Chairman, so I'm asking the minister whether the rights of these persons, the only right he has described is that they have a right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission. My request is, that he inform us what the Civil Service Commission can do or has done in regard to appeals that may have been brought as a result of termination of employment?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know if they've heard an appeal on termination of employment, Mr. Chairman, so I can't tell you what their decision was.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did ask the minister what rights do they have? Now, he said that doesn't know what happened because he's not aware of any appeals, but I'm asking him, what rights do they have to enforce any decision, or any opinion they arrive at, in regard to such an appeal?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's just about an impossible question to answer because I don't know the circumstances under which the minister is referring. I don't know what particular appeals have been before the Civil Service Commission. I would say that if somebody had been appointed by Order-in-Council that they should be removed the same way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister has expressed an opinion. He says, if a person has been appointed by Order-in-Council his term should be terminated the same way. Does that then mean that they don't have any rights if the Order-in-Council discharges them? Is that what he is saying?

MR. MacMASTER: I already answered that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, from his seat, the minister has said, "I answered that", and frankly I don't think he's answered that. He expressed an opinion that if a person has been appointed by Order-in-Council he should be discharged by Order-in-Council. But I was asking what rights does he have, and he did not answer that. Earlier he said they have a right to appeal, but he said he doesn't know any specifics. I'll take an example — the Minister of Education discharged an Assistant

Deputy Minister, I think. He discharged him, and told him to get out. I think he gave him notice within the same day, I don't think he gave him notice beyond that, and I'm told he didn't give any reason for the discharge. And I'm told that it was later confirmed by Order-in-Council. So I ask the honourable minister, under those circumstances, does that person have any rights, and what is the nature of those rights?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that that particular situation was dealt with quite thoroughly between the person and the department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not really making an appeal on behalf of any person. I am trying to determine this government's policy, and this minister's policy, in relation to that kind of a situation. And he asked for a specific and I gave him a specific example, and now he says that it was dealt with between the person and the department. I'm not concerned to deal with that person and that department, but the minister asked for an example so I gave him an example. Now, how do you deal with a situation like that? Does that kind of a person have rights in the opinion of this minister? Does the minister, as Minister of Labour, concern himself with that kind of a problem?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that the Civil Service played a role in the resolve of that particular situation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we're batting a ball back and forth here, and the minister is as adroit as I suppose I'm trying to be. I'm trying to get an answer and he's not giving one. He says he understands the situation was handled. Well, that's fine. Now, using that as an example, how was it handled? So that in the future, when something like that happens, I will, for one, have an understanding of how these things resolve themselves.

And let me remind the Minister that there was an occasion not long ago when I asked specifics, I asked whether there was a settlement arrived at as between the Deputy Minister of Education who was fired, the Deputy Minister of Labour who was fired, the Deputy Minister of, I think, Agriculture, who was fired, and we got a report and I think it was from this Minister, who said that the matter has been settled.

Now, since there have been settlements, in this particular case that I did refer to as an example he said it was disposed of, can he now inform us what is government policy in relation to the right of government to discharge a person without cause, what rights does that person have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, it's the member's assumption that it was without cause, Mr. Chairman, and I have said that the Civil Service played a role in resolving the situation, as they do in most cases.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that it's an assumption on my part that it was without cause. Let me tell the Minister that I am informed that no cause was given, which is much worse, I think than no cause at all. But a refusal to give a cause, to my way of thinking, is one of the poorest ways in which an employer should deal with an employee. And the Minister of Labour has more experience, probably, than I have in being an employee and should have better ideas as to how management ought to deal.

But when I said, without cause, I really meant, without cause being given. So my assumption in that respect is not incorrect, now that I've clarified it. Without cause being given or shown, a person is discharged, what is the position of the Minister of Labour and the government as to how he's to be dealt with. Now, the Minister said he understands it was dealt with with the Civil Service Commission. Well, in what respect? How do people in the future, being faced with this situation, expect this government and this Minister to assist them, or to inform them as to their rights?

MR. MacMASTER: I answered that particular question too, Mr. Chairman. They have the right to appeal and carry on discussions with the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission will help them resolve the particular situation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I've listened carefully to what the Minister said from 10:00 o'clock on. Mr. Chairman, he says that they have the right to go to the Civil Service Commission which helps them to resolve the situation. What rights does the Civil Service Commission have to impose its opinion? Does he say the Civil Service Commission is an arbitrator? Or a conciliator? Or does

it have rights to say to a Minister, you did wrong, you should correct it in a certain way.

Can't the Minister be forthright and tell us? Can he not take an example and tell us that that's what happened, or is he actually hiding behind this vague description because he doesn't want to, and if he doesn't want to, I wish he's say so. I for one wouldn't have much more point in trying to get the Minister to tell us something if he doesn't want to tell it to us. There's no way, Mr. Chairman, that I can force him to do it. I might be able to try and prolong this evening, but there's no sense to that, I have no desire to do that. I'd like the Minister to answer the question. Either that he refuses to answer it, or in a forthright way, say what can be done or what has been done without a vague reference to, the matter has been resolved.

Now can't the Minister be more frank with us and state what can be done, what has been done, or that he refuses to tell us?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't think it can be answered any more specifically. I said that the Civil Service played their role in those particular settlements, they worked with the people involved in reaching what ended up being a satisfactory settlement, and that's really all I can say about it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that in my opinion, for what I've learned, what I've tried to learn, there was no satisfactory settlement at all. There was an imposed settlement and I think my original statement was correct, that when the Order-in-Council is passed by Cabinet there is no right given to any person; that the appeal which the Minister referred to, I don't know what rights the Civil Service Commission has, he has not indicated that it has any rights, and unless the Minister is prepared to tell us that I have to assume that maybe they acted as conciliators — and as he well knows, conciliators cannot impose an opinion. All they can do is to negotiate as between two parties, the way President Carter did in international affairs in recent months.

Now, is the Minister prepared to tell us whether they have a right to impose an opinion, or whether all they do is negotiate, talk, in an effort to conciliate? He hasn't answered that. He may say he answered it, but I don't know to this moment whether he suggests that the Civil Service Commission can impose its opinion, or whether all it can do is conciliate. Could he answer that part at least?

Well, Mr. Chairman, we're just about through with this discussion because this Minister, I believe, has refused to respond to the questions I asked. I believe he knows the answer, I don't think he can hide behind any thought that he doesn't know the answer or is ignorant of the rights of the Civil Service Commission. But let me point out, Mr. Chairman, very very specifically that the Minister has not answered as to whether or not the Civil Service Commission has any powers to deal with the matter when there is a discharge by Order-in-Council. He has not answered that. If he thinks he answered it I want to tell him, he has not answered that, and the record will show that he has not answered a very very direct question.

He said a person, any person, has a right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission. I accept that. I asked him, what can the Civil Service Commission do? He said give me an example. I gave him an example, he then said, but they settled that. An example, he said they settled that. That doesn't really deal with the answer to my question which was not related to the example. The example was only descriptive of what could be the problem.

So since, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has refused to answer, and he has refused, the last two times he just sat in his chair and responded in a vague way from his chair and not for the record, that either he doesn't know the answer, which I don't believe, or he doesn't want to give the answer, which I do believe, but I have to tell him that he has not given an answer or made an effort to give an answer. And I say that very specifically because I don't want to leave this Chamber with the Minister believing that somehow or other I have misinterpreted what he has said. He has not answered as to the rights of the Civil Service Commission in dealing with an Order-in-Council and I am disturbed that the Minister doesn't have the guts to get up and make a statement and say, that's what happened.

He hasn't got the guts to stand up and stand up and say they have no rights; we did the legal thing — which I believe they did, incidentally — and we stand by what we did. Mr. Chairman, he has not said, he has not had the courtesy to state for the public consumption how this government deals with discharged employees. All he said is they settled it, they negotiated. Well, I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I spoke, just recently, to one of the persons who said that it was settled to his complete dissatisfaction, but after consultation with his lawyer, who was told, you haven't got any rights so you better settle. If the Minister thinks that that is satisfactory on both sides he's badly mistaken.

It might be all very well for me to sign saying, yes, that's the law so I have to comply with it. But I asked the Minister for his policy, for government policy, I didn't get it. The Minister of Education seems to be listening to what I am saying. I wonder if he has any opinion as to whether

the government has a policy which it's prepared to enunciate on it's two hind legs, stand up and say, this is our policy. Because he leaves me with the statement that the policy of this government is as it appeared to be when Sterling Lyon, and he was then Sterling Lyon and nothing more, he was First Minister elect, summoned three people into the office he didn't even have a right to occupy, on a Saturday afternoon, two days before he was sworn in and ordered them to get out and be out by the time he was sworn in.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard one Minister say, that's right, that's government policy, nor have I heard one Minister say, that's not government policy, this is government policy. And therefore, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has not responded openly, forthrightly, at all to the questions I asked, which means — and Mr. Chairman, I draw to your attention that I cleared a number of weeks ago the fact that these cases that I have mentioned are not sub judice in any way, they are apparently all settled, they are disposed of. And in spite of the fact that they're disposed of and therefore can be discussed, no one in government, and I blame this Minister most of all because I think it's his responsibility, has had the — well, I used the term guts — I'd have to use the term, has not been forthright, enough to say, this is the way it was settled, we did it according to law, we did it according to advice given to us, the following is the manner in which it was dealt with and justified, and if he didn't justify it, then I would have said to him, well what are you going to do to change the law to make it more reasonable, that a person who may have worked for government for a number of years — is fired out of hand without any rights, and is that what this Minister of Labour approves of. Is that the kind of policy, the labour policy of this government?

Because I say what I said when I started this period of questioning, that my impression was when we were in government that you could not discharge a person with rank below Deputy Minister without that person having grievance rights, and tenure rights, and rights to be heard on cause, just cause or not. I thought that and that I believe was the position of the former government. I don't think we discharged anybody. I really don't, maybe that was our mistake. I don't think we discharged anybody below the rank of Deputy Minister unless we could show cause, but now I find that that's not necessary, and this government apparently has done it and hasn't even got the courage to stand up and say that's true, and we did what we had a right to do and what we wanted to do. I'm not talking about Deputy Ministers because I never did believe that they were entitled to protection but below that rank I haven't seen any statement by any Minister and I raise it with this Minister because it is his responsibility and unless he responds now, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I'm really very disappointed that he has not had the courtesy to make this statement.

And I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that when I started, I said I have made attacks on the government for the way it has dealt with human beings, but I wasn't going to do that this evening when I started the questioning because I wanted to talk about policy and the future, and I've ended up because of this Minister's reluctance to respond by doing exactly what I didn't want to do and that is talk about the way this government has callously and ruthlessly dealt with human beings in a way that is disgraceful to my way of thinking. And had I thought that, or been told that they had any rights that were protected that would be different, but now I'm under the impression that the impression I had the day Sterling Lyon called in those people, as to the callousness of the Conservatives, is only confirmed by the failure of this Minister to give a forthright response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass. 1.—pass. Resolution No. 77 — pass. That completes the Department of Labour and Manpower. Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported that the Committee has adopted certain resolutions to Mr. Speaker and asked me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Tuesday, May 29, 1979

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).