

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 26, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 28 students of Grades 9 to 12 standing of the Beausejour High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kraynyk. This school is located in the constituency of Lac du Bonnet, the Minister of Agriculture.

We also have 45 students of Grade 11 standing of the Churchill High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Thorne and Mr. Sibeski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne.

And we have another 14 students of Grade 9 standing of the Birch River School. These students are under the direction of Mr. M. Boulger and Mrs. Whiteway. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

There are also guests in my gallery. There are 20 retired Canadian National supervisors making their annual pilgrimage to the shrine of government, so I'm informed.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and relates to the statement made today by the Manitoba Medical Association. I wonder if the Premier is in a position to indicate that the Provincial Government will be altering its course of doing things with the doctors in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Finance)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the question put by my honourable friend is perhaps too vague for me to respond to. On the other hand I can advise my honourable friend that a rather lengthy letter was sent to the Medical Association dispatched yesterday. I would assume that they will be in receipt of it, if they aren't already, sometime today. I think it's perhaps unfortunate that the press conference took place literally "hours" before the letter was received by them.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, by way of a point of order, the expression "doing things" was taken from the Manitoba Medical Association's statement and I refer to it because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, because I think - for the First Minister - the reference was made to the expression "doing things alone" that the Manitoba Medical Association has suggested. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate what representation they're making that the government is doing things alone on?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am now really subject to your advice as to whether I should respond or reply by way of speaking to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me indicate that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition didn't have a point of order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if I can put a question to the First Minister. Does he agree, or is it the government's position that they have been frank and honest in the negotiations with the doctors in Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, leaving aside perhaps the criticism or insult or whatever that is implicit in the question, I will simply reply to my honourable friend by indicating that one Mr. Kushner has been acting as the negotiator on behalf of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Mr. Kushner has been actively involved in this capacity for a period of some time now. We have had a meeting with the Medical Association and with Mr. Kushner. I have no reason to believe that there is other than worthwhile exchange of views taking place.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of privilege. The First Minister made reference to the insult of the question - of the statement made in framing the question. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am using the language of the Manitoba Medical Association and not my own when the question

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . was put.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, PLEASE! Let me indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that one of our rules of debate is that one should use his own language in debates, and that includes questioning too. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The matter relates to the incident that took place on Tuesday evening here where the Member for Flin Flon made some unparliamentary remarks, and subsequent to that, yesterday and last night to be exact, the member went publicly on the airways and repeated substantially the same remarks that he repeated in this House. And further to that, if that is not enough to cast reflection on all members of this House, the Minister of Agriculture at a public meeting made the charge -- and I have to refer to a note -- and he's referring to the election. He said that this campaign will be one of the dirtiest we have ever seen, and I continue the quote: "The Opposition Parties don't attack our policy decisions as much as they attack personalities."

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. JOHNSTON: Now, Mr. Speaker in the 10 or 11 years that I've been in this House - and really I did not want to speak today, I'd hoped the incident of two nights ago was closed but apparently it isn't, I think that the editorials and the statements that people are making outside of this House about all members of the House - they're not singling out certain ones, but there have been some pretty grim remarks made across this province and indeed across Canada about the conduct of the members of this Legislature; and, Mr. Speaker, I may be called a hypocrite because I know I'm pretty rough in debate, but I hope I don't attack a personality, and I hope I don't attack beliefs that I believe are strongly held. I think sincerely that, although there's some smirks on the other side, that I speak for more than myself in this House, and I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that you will if necessary call a special meeting of Party Leaders or whatever action you think necessary, but for God's sake, let's stop this.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me first of all indicate that I have allowed a lot of latitude. I think I have explained once or twice what a matter of privilege is, and I do believe members can raise points of order; but unfortunately most members indulge in explanations and in indicating their particular opinions under the pretence that it's a matter of privilege. The matter that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie raised, although it may be of great concern for him and probably is to almost every member of this House, was not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister on the question of the MMA position vis-a-vis negotiations with the government at the present time. Can the First Minister confirm or would the First Minister comment on the assertion by the Manitoba Medical Association reported in a local newspaper today that the government has steadfastly refused to bargain on higher pay. Would the First Minister comment on that claim for the benefit and enlightenment of members of the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, I do believe our rules in respect to verifying statements in the press should be enforced. If we are going to conduct ourselves according to the procedures, let us all try to adhere to the rules. The Honourable Member for Fort Gary wish to rephrase his question?

MR. SHERMAN: Well yes, Sir, I was going to raise a point of order, but I'll rephrase the question. Can the Honourable the First Minister advise members whether the government has steadfastly refused to bargain on higher pay as claimed by the Manitoba Medical Association?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it can be said that there has been either a refusal or for that matter a steadfast refusal. The facts as I understand them, Mr. Speaker, are that the Manitoba Health Services Commission and their chief negotiator, Mr. Kushner, have had quite a number of meetings with representatives of the Medical Association; that much time was spent with respect to what is known as the manual of fees, and once that exercise is completed that they were to sit down to discuss matters pertaining to fee for service and matters relating to utilization rates, etc.

There is I think some confusion on the part of at least some representatives of the Medical Association who have interpreted the statement made by all Ministers of Health in Canada that there would be no increase in fees. But, Mr. Speaker, since that time there has

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . been some adjustment in fees announced in the Province of British Columbia; I believe there are certain negotiations still under way in Alberta and there are negotiations under way in Manitoba. It is a matter which as I outlined in my letter to them, which they, I believe, will be now in receipt of, that negotiations hopefully will continue in the course of the next few months and that before the end of this calendar year no doubt there will be some adjustments agreed to; and all of this related to the composite index of medical fees across Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry have a supplementary?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister. Has the Honourable the First Minister met personally himself with representatives and spokesmen for the MMA?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, such a meeting did take place, I think approximately three weeks ago. Now if my honourable friend - perhaps I misunderstood his question - if he meant alone, the answer is no, persons from the Health Services Commission and the negotiator Mr. Kushner, and the Minister of Health and Social Development were present.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would it be the Honourable the First Minister's opinion that communications on this subject are still wide open or that the action taken by the MMA today really represents a breakdown in communications?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it's in order to give my opinion in response to a question asking for an opinion, but assuming it is, I would simply say that it is my opinion that the press conference statement really was made without knowledge that the letter of reply had been dispatched, and I would be more interested to hear their response subsequent to perusal of the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I.H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to the seizure by the government of British Columbia of the 3,700 dozen Manitoba produced eggs. Does the Minister, or has the Minister made a formal protest to the NDP government in British Columbia over this seizure of Manitoba products?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the question was answered quite properly yesterday. It is not yet determined today whether or not there was anything illegal about this seizure and whether in fact the shipper of eggs from Manitoba to British Columbia was in contravention of provincial or national law. When that is determined, Mr. Speaker, we will take whatever action is necessary.

MR. ASPER: Is the Minister of Agriculture to be taken as saying there are circumstances under which Manitoba produced eggs cannot be sold in British Columbia?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is asking for a legal opinion and expressing an opinion of his own. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines)(Inkster): On the point of order. The honourable member started his remarks by saying, "is the Minister of Agriculture to be taken as saying." Now the Minister of Agriculture gave an answer to the previous question which the honourable member can take as he likes, but he is not to pursue a question as to whether the Minister of Agriculture is to be taken as saying something.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party may rephrase his question.

MR. ASPER: On the point of order that you have ruled. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. ASPER: . . . Mr. Speaker, you have made the comment that this is asking for a legal opinion. Now, Sir -- that's what Mr. Speaker said. Sir, this legal opinion was granted by the Supreme Court at the instance of the Government of Manitoba. My question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I am not in the habit of debating. There was a further point of order raised by the House Leader, I said that point was well taken. I give the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party an opportunity to rephrase his question.

MR. ASPER: Has the Minister of Agriculture consulted with the corresponding officials in government in British Columbia relative to this seizure of Manitoba eggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, some few days ago where there was such an occurrence, I believe there's been another one since; with respect to the first occurrence as I understand it, there was a violation of provincial regulation, and if that is the case then of course there's no possibility that a complaint can be launched unless that regulation is in conflict with the Canadian constitution.

MR. ASPER: Does the Minister of Agriculture accept the fact, or accept as a rule, that the sale of Manitoba production eggs can be restricted in British Columbia or any other province of this country?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I would state categorically that wherein there is a violation of the Canadian constitution that I do not accept that as a rule; and wherein there is a violation of a national agreement under Bill C176, I don't accept that as the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I should like to direct a question on the same subject to the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSON: I'd like to direct a subject to the Attorney-General and ask him if he is taking steps to insure that the seizure in British Columbia is not in violation of a Supreme Court ruling that was made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order has been raised. Would the honourable member state his point of order?

MR. ASPER: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I was entitled to two supplementary questions. I didn't ask either of them. I was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, a supplementary question. Can he instruct this House under what basis or give us his advice as to what basis could constitutionally justify the seizure of these eggs in British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't have to justify anything, but I think all honourable members would know -- would know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: . . . that the Canadian constitution is quite clear on matters of inter-provincial trade and therefore if there's a violation the matter will be taken in hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Has Manitoba entered into any agreement with anyone which precludes the sale under any circumstances of production of this province in British Columbia?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I shall place my question again to the Attorney-General and ask him if he is taking steps to insure that the seizure of Manitoba eggs in British Columbia are not in violation of a Supreme Court ruling that was made a couple of years ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture through his department is in communication with the industry affected, and as and when that department calls upon our department for inquiring investigation it will be immediately pursued. I assume that the industry is in close communication with the Department of Agriculture on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): I have a question for the Premier and Minister of Finance. Will the Minister of Finance direct the Superintendent of Insurance to investigate the increase in fire insurance premiums in Winnipeg by board companies by some 30 percent; and direct also in that investigation to determine if there is a connection between the closure of Winnipeg fire hall and the increase in fire insurance premiums, and particularly the closure of the fire hall at Morley and Arnold?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a question somewhat similar in nature had been asked earlier and I did proceed to have the matter checked out. I regret that I do not have the information available at this point but I will endeavour to get it as quickly as possible. The

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . second part of the question as to whether or not there is a causal connection between the closing of certain fire halls and increases in fire insurance premiums in the neighborhood is something which I believe we also have under some analysis, but we do not have complete policy discretion there obviously. It's a matter of policy determined by the City to a certain extent. In any case, I will try and get a comprehensive reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate to the House how many officials have quit the Manitoba Statistics Bureau since its inception in November 1972?

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

HON. LEONARD EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I can't tell him I can take the matter as notice, or perhaps as for an Order for Return, but I will take it as notice and look into it.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question asked by the Honourable Member from Rhineland the other day about the availability of government assistance for airstrip development in southern Manitoba and I note that the newspaper, the Free Press of yesterday refers to this, and lest there be any misunderstanding, I would like to remind the member that we announced a year ago that there was an airport assistance program available in southern Manitoba including grants up to \$ 3,500 for the cost of construction and improvement of airports, loans for \$20,000 to the same airports and an annual operating grant of \$ 500.00.

I am also pleased to inform him that six airports in southern Manitoba have taken advantage of this program, including the Town of Morden which I believe is near the member's constituency, I am also pleased to note that the national Aviation Magazines have referred to this Southern Manitoba Assistance Program for airports as one of the most progressive and generous in Canada. And in case the honourable member didn't get a copy when I filed one last time, I shall take this opportunity to send him a copy of the handbook, and indeed I'll make copies available to anyone else who would like to receive one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the Statistics Bureau published a recent report which was circulated only to the government?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there is no - it would depend on what you define as "report"- there is no publication or report as such. There has been various tabulations made of Statistics Canada data which is already available to the public, to members of the House in official Statistics Canada publications. There has been some work I believe by the bureau in summerizing this as a convenience for certain government researchers, but none of the data is of such a nature that it is not already available to the honourable member, for instance, by going across the hall to the Provincial Library.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On whose instructions did Planning and Priorities intervene in the operations of the Statistics Branch of the Manitoba Statistics Department?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the honourable member is talking about. If I did, the question is out of order anyway.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has Planning and Priorities intervened in the operations of the Statistics Branch and Bureau?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there was any instruction relative to what my honourable friend is inquiring about such instruction would have been issued over my authority. I can recall no such instruction but I will check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker. Is it true there's a large ore body been found in the Flin Flon area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope it's true but I don't know.

MR. BARROW: Well are you aware that there has been one found, and that this

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BARROW cont'd). . . . information is being released from Toronto tomorrow ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake .

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I directed this question to the First Minister yesterday and I wonder if he could give me a definite answer today. Has he received a brief from the people of Cypress River pertaining to the veterinary services clinic there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will try to have the answer to that in about ten minutes, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has there been any communication to the Minister from Washington or from Ottawa indicating that new bilateral air agreements will open up a Winnipeg-Chicago run to a Canadian carrier by 1974 ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated to members of the House on several times past, that we have had communications, not always written, with the Federal authorities in Ottawa. We have not communicated with Washington, but the information I was given verbally a couple of months ago is now being confirmed by press reports that a Chicago-Winnipeg air connection seems a virtual reality. It will still be a matter of months I presume before there is a determination on which Canadian carrier would be involved and so forth. However, I am very pleased with the reports that I've received and the information I have is that this will be a reality in the not too distant future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is he listening? In view of changing benefits in various social service benefits or sectors, will the government, or the Minister indicate whether retired civil servants who have selected one particular, a different particular pension option when retired, will they be able to change these options after they have been retired for, say a year or so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe so. I believe that there were certain options available to civil servants while they were actually in the employ of the government and it was their choice to elect as to whether or not they would have joint survivor benefits or otherwise. I might say, I don't know whether this - I'm reading the mind of my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia - that in certain cases the pension benefits ended with the demise of the civil servant who was entitled to a benefit. There is no retroactivity insofar as the option is concerned.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. In view of the legislation that will be introduced that the Minister indicated the other day, would he consider that as the conditions change, that these civil servants or former employees would have these options?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it would be practical or I do not think that it's applicable to any pension scheme that is in force either in Canada or anywhere else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Can he tell the House who will suffer the loss occasioned in the seizure of the eggs in B.C.? Will that loss be suffered by the farmers or by the Government of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would have his facts sorted out he would know that the transaction was between a wholesaler or distributor and some buyer in British Columbia, therefore there would be no loss as far as the farmers are concerned.

On the other hand, if it's a violation pursuant to the constitution or pursuant to the National Marketing Act, then of course, the person who violated such legislation would have to suffer the loss.

MR. ASPER: Does the Minister anticipate or does he have any indication that further seizures may be made in the near future?

MR. USKIW: I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that where laws are violated and where people are caught violating laws that losses will occur to those people. If in this instance

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . there is no violation I would expect some restitution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister. Has the First Minister contacted the NDP leader of British Columbia and discussed this issue; and if not, will he raise it at the next Western Premiers' Conference?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter is one which would be dealt with on the basis of the constitutional law of our country. The Honourable Member for Morris has asked the question in a way that is easily understood and he has been given a reply by the Attorney-General. That is the way in which we will proceed.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister. If the government of British Columbia -- (Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: Does the Government of Manitoba have any plan of retaliatory action to discourage the Government of British Columbia - for prohibiting the sale of Manitoba production in British Columbia?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, retaliation is the last resort I should think in almost any circumstance. There can be no justification for even contemplating retaliation until all constitutional legal procedures have been exhausted. And certainly those avenues are open to us and we intend to proceed in that manner at the earliest opportune and appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West. Order, please. Although the honourable member doesn't indicate they're supplementaries, if they're on the same subject, they are. And the honourable member has had three questions or more on the egg problem. The Honourable Member from Brandon West.

A MEMBER: And laid an egg.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister responsible for transportation in Manitoba. With reference to the public hearing being held by the Air Transport licensing authority in Brandon on Tuesday, May 1st, to deal with the application of our regional carrier Transair Midwest to abandon the Winnipeg-Brandon air service, is it the intention of the province to be represented and present a brief at that hearing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Province of Manitoba to submit a brief, and I will be submitting it personally.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House whether in general terms he will support or oppose the application of Transair Midwest to abandon the service?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government of Manitoba is that we should do everything in our power to ensure that the citizens of Manitoba get good quality air service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could explain to the housewives of Manitoba the reasons for the dramatic increase in the price of seeds from McKenzie Seeds Company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know, I'm not familiar with the exact price increases or if there are such, but if there are such I'm sure they're in keeping with the general trend in the rising cost of living.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): My question is to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister could clarify the position of the government relative to the election of the mayor, there seems to be some doubt in some people's minds just what that policy was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it has been stated, I don't recall if it was stated in this House, but I can certainly indicate now in the most formal of manner, that there is just no doubt, Sir, but that the policy of the government will be to legislate in that respect at the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . appropriate time, which would be at the next session of the Legislature.

Now then, Sir, the democratic process will have something to say about that and in the event that others are given the responsibility for the affairs of government of this province, that will be a decision open to them and I hope that they will make the right decision. If we are returned with the confidence of the people, there is just no question, Sir, but that we will legislate in accordance with the way in which I outlined last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the stated positions of the three major parties in this House is to allow the mayor to be elected, may I ask why the government has to wait till the next session to see to it that the mayor will be elected and to legislate accordingly?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because the government determines the timetable of its own legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance and ask him, with the significant reductions in the fund for war and post war measures, how the Province of Manitoba can expect to mount a very sized scale of egg war against the Province of B.C.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Riel made reference I believe to the War and Post War Emergency Fund. And I would say, Sir, that I admit, Sir, we would be in a poor position to retaliate or withstand any defensive action of the barricades if we had to depend on that fund, Sir, because the Tories managed to deplete it of almost all of its resources. But Sir, but Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . Sir, we have managed through sound fiscal management to replenish it back to where it was in the first place. (Hear, Hear)

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is there enough in it now to purchase 400,000 eggs?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, 14,000 eggs --(Interjections)-- 400,000 eggs, we have replenished the Post War Emergency Fund to \$14 million, so I think there's enough there to buy quite a few eggs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. Could he indicate when the Public Utilities Committee might be reconvened?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe at the meeting today it was left between the Chair and the Government. I assure him that it will be in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake was asking as to whether a brief and covering letter had been received from the Cypress Veterinary Services District Provisional Board. The answer is yes, it was received and referred to the Minister of Agriculture. Really, Sir, the whole point of the matter is that there is a Manitoba Veterinary Services Commission. They have taken the decision unanimously, for stated reasons, to decline the request for a veterinary services building at Cypress River for reasons of the service being available in other surrounding communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister then. Is he indicating to me that he is not going to take any further action in regard to this matter?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Veterinary Services Commission has made a unanimous recommendation here, and I think that my honourable friend will agree that the Veterinary Services Commission is quite representative of those who are interested in veterinary services. In fact it includes a person on there who is providing a very good public service, who I understand was a previous candidate of my honourable friend's party, so it cannot be said that there is some partisan consideration here.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture on the same subject. I realize it's a question that should have been given notice and I wonder if he would take it as notice now. My question is, could he advise me as to the reasons why the Veterinary Services Commission reversed a decision made earlier to give a cash assistance program to the St. Claude area under the Veterinary Services Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about two different things. They have their reasons for making their decisions and I will take that as notice and inform my honourable friend as to why. In this particular situation however it is a matter of location. The commission has taken an unanimous position; I have consulted with them on that position. They do not wish to change that position so the matter should rest at that point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier regarding his trip to Thompson over the weekend. In view of his favorable comments on a day care centre there, I wonder if he is prepared to give further financial assistance to that day care centre that he toured while in Thompson?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for Thompson can well appreciate that occasionally at least from time to time there are worthwhile things worth doing which are not particularly easy to finance or to assist under existing government programs. There will have to be some accommodation made, hopefully it can be done. It is not clear to me at the moment just how this might be done but we are on record as favoring the establishment and continuation of as many day care centres for working mothers as possible and we are still in the process of evolving policy. I hope that I can be more positive or more specific at some future date.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the First Minister in charge of Manitoba Hydro and relates to the inability this morning of Mr. Bateman to provide the Utilities Committee with the breakdown of the \$13 million of cost associated with the Churchill River diversion --the \$13 million of resource damage that Hydro has estimated. The question is: Will he undertake to see that the members of the committee, or members of the House as the case may be, are furnished with that information in advance of the next Public Utilities hearing on the Hydro issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss as to how to reply to that question because, Sir, I will not reply to a question that has an assumption with which I must take great umbrage at. I was at that same committee meeting, Sir, and I do not recall that Mr. Bateman indicated an inability to provide information thus far. The information with respect to resource losses has been detailed to some extent in the Task Force Report and in other documents. My honourable friend has had ample opportunity to pursue that and will in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The First Minister has stated something that is not what I said nor is it correct. What he has said is that Mr. Bateman did not have an inability. Now the fact is that Mr. Bateman said he did not have the information and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let me indicate that I was allowing a little extra latitude because I couldn't comprehend the question the way it was being phrased. But let me also indicate that Beauchesne Citation 171 (hh)says: "A question oral or written must not seek information about proceedings in a committee which has not yet made its report to the House." So therefore I now find the question out of order. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister responsible for Hydro. Will he undertake to provide the Members of the committee considering the Hydro Report and Churchill River diversion with the breakdown of how the \$13 million cost estimate for resource loss was arrived at, and which is not given in any other report?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, now that my honourable friend is not-suggesting any inability on someone's part I will undertake to see if there is any information that can be made available that has not already been made available in the Task Force Report and related

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . documents. I will undertake to see if there's additional information and if there is we'll forward it to my honourable friend.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will he also give the same undertaking vis-a-vis the mineral resource studies that were referred to in committee and indicate the cost . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I must caution the honourable member that proceedings before a committee are not proper as questions before the House until the committee has reported. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Could he provide information of mill rates for the various school divisions outside of Greater Winnipeg the same as are published in today's press on those divisions contained in Greater Winnipeg area?

MR. SPEAKER: I do believe that question would be more properly as an Order for Return. Oral questions. Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

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

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris Killarney.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal grievance. The grievance is that I am a citizen of the Province of Manitoba and I am being denied freedom of choice of where I purchase my automobile insurance. This in my opinion as a member of this Legislative Assembly is important to me and to the constituents which I represent. I did not arrive at this conclusion today but have always had the conviction that we should be left with that privilege of making the decision of what we might think is best for ourselves in the interests of all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, during the debates that have taken place in this Chamber I along with other members of our party have always stated that we are not against governments going into business as long as they are in competition with private industry, that private industry is not regulated out of business but is allowed to compete freely. In fact I would say this is what the citizens of Manitoba are asking for is the right to make their own decisions.

Mr. Speaker, under the list of reports required by legislation, the Act states that the annual report of the Manitoba Public Automobile Insurance Corporation must be tabled in the Legislature not later than 15 days after the commencement of the opening of the session. Mr. Speaker, the annual report was tabled on Monday, April 23rd, more than two months after the opening of the session. If this corporation had been operating under the Insurance Act of Canada, they would have had to have it filed within 60 days after the year-end. Mr. Speaker, this report was tabled six months after the year-end.

Regarding the annual report, much mention was made of the saving to the citizens of Manitoba of 15 percent. Mr. Speaker, this is misleading as it is like comparing apples and oranges. The agents of the Province of Manitoba were getting 7, 10 percent commission in 1972 from the Manitoba Public Automobile Insurance Corporation compared with 12.5 percent paid by the private insurance companies in 1971. In fact many of the agents I am told have never received their full commissions for February 1972. The agents of the province who were to cash in on transitional assistance got very little for their capital assets and many of them had to sell the remainder of their business because they did not have enough to live on. In my own case, I received for my 23 years as an insurance agent \$419 for my automobile business. This works out to less than \$20 a year for my capital assets.

Mr. Speaker, the organizational expenses of the corporation mentioned, there were \$3,480,000 spent on organization. No mention was made of the \$2,539,000 mentioned by the auditors that was owing to the Motor Vehicle Branch in 1972. This comes to over \$6 million, Mr. Speaker. Was this an interest free loan by the government or is this a new method of bookkeeping that will be used by the corporation whenever they use current moneys in departmental estimates to subsidize the financing of Manitoba Public Automobile Insurance Corporation?

GRIEVANCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Mr. G.C. Trites, the President of the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company in his press release yesterday made mention of the fact also, where no part of the \$6 million was charged as an expense in this year's operation. He also mentioned about another part of the auditor's statement where an error could not be corrected for administrative reasons, which would if corrected have decreased the surplus by \$300,000.00. Can all these mistakes in accounting be charged to computer malfunction? I don't think so, as I think it is the duty and the responsibility of the corporation to avoid this type of mistake and the public will not accept this in the future.

Mr. Speaker, under the Insurance Act of Canada the corporation would have shown an underwriting loss of \$855,000, as this is based on premium income less expense. I would like to know what method the corporation is following as I know they do not have to report to the Superintendent of Insurance for Manitoba. Mention was made in the annual report "citizens have better coverage". I would like to inform the members of this House that Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company in the Province of Manitoba, the head office of Wawanesa, sold \$25 all perils and accident benefits were provided in all policies previous to the Autopac coming into force. This is a better coverage than Autopac provide at the present time. All coverages were available and each person decided on the company and the coverage of his choice.

Another matter I would like to discuss is the cost of drivers' licenses. When we were responsible for the operation of government previous to 1969, the cost of an annual drivers license was \$2.50. What is it today? Six dollars for women over 25 years of age; \$10 for women under 25 years of age; \$10 for men over 25 years of age; and \$25 for men under 25 years of age. On top of that, if a person has six demerit points or more he can be surcharged from \$50 to \$300, and this has to be considered as an insurance premium.

Mr. Speaker, another statement mentions the Head Office is in Brandon and executive offices in Winnipeg. I would like to know how many of the corporation officers work in Brandon as I doubt if any member resides there or works there on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that in my opinion, and the opinion of the Conservative caucus, we believe that in the best interests of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba that the people be given the freedom of choice to make their own decisions and that the three based Manitoba companies - Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company, Portage Mutual Insurance Company and the Canadian Indemnity Insurance Company be given the right to compete with the Manitoba Automobile Insurance Corporation on a fair and equitable basis. This is my request and I think it is a fair and just one.

The Conservative Government under Duff Roblin instituted crop insurance in the Province of Manitoba in 1959 but no farmer has been told they had to buy it or else. This decision was left to the farmers for themselves to decide. The right of freedom of choice, Mr. Speaker, is important to the constituents which I represent and I hope members on all sides of the House appreciate and respect this right that we have had for many years and now find it has been taken away from us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make a few remarks in respect to the comments made by the honourable member. The honourable member's first request is that insurance be returned to the competitive area. I cannot help but think of Wednesday morning when I was leaving Ottawa and from an appearance the evening before on television dealing with automobile insurance. In speaking to the cab driver he wanted to know as much as he could about public automobile insurance in Manitoba. He related to me that his premium in Ottawa was \$160 for third party liability alone. That seems to be the price of the competition that the honourable member referred to.

I would like to be very specific here, too, and say this to honourable members across the way. That I wish to challenge them as to what their exact position is going to be on public automobile insurance, if by some ill fortune they should form the government of the Province of Manitoba next election. --(Interjection)-- And I'm glad to hear, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear -- if I could just make myself heard above the Leader of the Opposition -- I'm glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition state clearly from his seat that he would return it to competition. This is what that would mean, Mr. Speaker, let me be as clear as possible,

GRIEVANCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . . clear as possible to the honourable members so that all in Manitoba will know what that will mean by way of costs. First, first it will mean that every individual who is 25 years of age and over, 25 years of age and more will pay 30 to 40 percent more in their insurance rates in 1974 than in 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. May I ask the Honourable Member from River Heights to contain himself. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: That is No. 1 undisputed fact and at an appropriate opportunity I feel I can prove that conclusively. No. 2. For those that are 25 and under, who may for a moment think that is a good idea, let me point out that it will mean an increase in their rates from 500 to 600 percent in 1974 over 1973. They will return to the good old days of Conservative Government when they paid from \$500 to \$600 to \$400 on their premiums. That is what it means in dollars and cents to the people of Manitoba. Let that be clear, let there be no mistake.

Secondly, secondly --(Interjections) - Mr. Speaker, I hope I get . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the opportunity to carry on with my remarks. I'm having some difficulty making myself heard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I appeal to all the honourable members to wait until their turn arrives. They will all have an opportunity to say their piece. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: The second point, Mr. Speaker, is that in reference to the Member for Killarney's statement that Mr. Trites had suggested that the report did not show a 15 percent saving, let me again repeat what I said in an interview last night. That the report if anything was overly conservative and cautious insofar as the savings of the people of Manitoba are concerned, and I pointed out in this way: In 1970 there is no question whatsoever by every analyst and every underwriter that the public corporation has at its availability, that the public of the Province of Manitoba would have paid \$45 million, at least, for the same coverage -- (Interjections)-- for the same coverage from private enterprise, from private corporations.

No. 2. The Canadian Insurance Underwriter this last month, Page 14, pointed out the fact that the volume of insurance written last year premiumwise in total increased 11.3 percent - 11.3 percent. The last statement that we have for sales by private insurance companies in Manitoba is 1970. Add 1971 and 1972, add 1971 and 1972, Mr. Speaker, and we have increases in premium volume in excess of 22 percent -- 22 percent. The Honourable Member for Killarney chooses to ignore that fact. And that is represented by premium increases and increases in the number of vehicles; vehicles increasing at the rate of 3 to 5 percent each year plus premium increases. In 1971, for which we do not have records for the private insurance companies in the Province of Manitoba, rates increased in excess of 10 percent alone plus the increase in the number of vehicles.

Thirdly, the honourable member makes reference to agents. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the records at the Public Insurance Corporation insofar as the earnings of agents are concerned, and let me assure the honourable member that the majority of agents last year made sums greater - the majority, not all - the majority made sums greater than that which they had prior to the inception of Autopac and let there be no . . . And let me also say to the honourable members that I have had the opportunity to speak to many agents, especially in the Autopac Agents' Association which represents Autopac agents and they will acknowledge the fact that their earnings are favorable compared to that prior to the inception of Autopac.

Thirdly, the honourable member makes some vague reference to an underwriting loss of 800,000 and he said that we're not using the rules of the insurance industry in setting up our statements. Of course we're not, because a public insurance corporation adds into the accident fund the interest from their investments. There's no such thing as underwriting losses; only per se the interest from investments are added into the accident fund and that is the advantage of a public insurance corporation over that of a private insurance corporation operating . . . (Applause)

The honourable member makes reference to the fact that organizational expenses should have been included in this year's financial statement. The honourable member would like to encumber the motorists of this year with the organizational costs of setting up the Crown corporation which will benefit motorists for the next 15 to 20 years. That's what the

GRIEVANCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . honourable member would like to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: Any accounting person would explain that this is not the usual case, that the organizational expenses are spread over the period of benefit of any corporation, not landed in the one period in question.

The honourable member makes reference to the fact that we're not able to buy 25-dollar deductibles from the corporation and good old Wawanesa offers 25-dollar deductibles. Let me tell you what that means, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what that means? Do you know what that means? It means that for \$25.00 of advantage to reduce a deductible from \$50.00 down to \$25.00 it costs the average Manitoban \$10.00 to \$12.00 -- \$10.00 to 12.00 to insure \$25.00 worth of goods? What a rake-off! What a poor investment. And the honourable member cries tears that we don't offer that type of service. Of course we don't, and let me tell you this. I have had Manitobans -- I have had Manitobans . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. PAWLEY: I have had many Manitobans express regret that this service is not offered, but once that cost is pointed out then they can see very clearly that they've been wasting money over the years in the purchase of 25-dollar deductible insurance which they only collect, which they can only collect, Mr. Speaker, if in fact they were at fault in the accident, they don't even collect it if they're not at fault under 25-dollar deductible collision coverage.

The honourable member makes reference to drivers' licenses, how the increase of drivers' licenses has increased, and I thought every member of this Legislature knew that the additional cost in drivers' permits did not relate to the cost of the drivers' license but was an additional charge insofar as payment of the Autopac insurance premium is concerned, with no relationship to the driver's permit whatsoever.

The honourable member complains about the fact that 50 to 300 dollars can be charged on a driver's permit for demerit points. Let me tell him that Mr. Atkinson, John Atkinson who is a member of the Board of Directors of the Insurance Bureau of Canada, acknowledged on a program only Tuesday night on which I was present with him, that our system of rating was one of the best in Canada because we were able to relate conditions to the driver's permit, (Applause) rather than relate additional cost to accidents, whether or not there was in fact a charge or a conviction ever levied against that motorist. Much fairer, much more reasonable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let there therefore be no mistake whatsoever insofar as the public of the Province of Manitoba are concerned; if they wish that their rates be increased, 30 to 40 percent for those 25 and over, 500 percent and more for those 25 and under, all they have to do is to follow the advice of the Conservative Party Opposition in this Legislature. Let there be no mistake whatsoever on that point, none whatsoever, I'm prepared to debate that question anywhere in the Province of Manitoba.

And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, just to show how dinosauric, how right-wing the Official Opposition is, let's look at the good people in the State of Louisiana.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: Yesterday morning, I received a newspaper clipping from the State of Louisiana; the Commissioner of Insurance who we introduced in this House has returned to the State of Louisiana. No flaming radical revolutionary. In fact he confessed to me he voted for Nixon because he felt that McGovern was by far too radical -- by far too radical in his estimation. He announced in the State of Louisiana upon his return that he had seen a plan which he was convinced was the automobile insurance plan of the future; and furthermore indicated that it was his desire to prepare and introduce a bill to the State of Louisiana implementing a plan similar to that which is in existence in the Province of Manitoba. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: Is the motion to go into Supply agreed to? So ordered. The Honourable Member for Logan.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17 (a) -- the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon, I made some comments in connection with the department in regard to labour and especially farm labour, farm help.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . Later on the Member for Osborne spoke and inferred that what I wanted was cheap labour and the implication was there that the people that grow sugar beets in this province, or onions or special crops of that kind that need hand labour, that these were more or less slave drivers and that they were poorly paid --(Interjection)-- the Member for Osborne. And I certainly would like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture afterward whether he's speaking on behalf of the government or whether this is government policy; because certainly if that is the case I would like to hear from him.

We have a minimum wage here in Manitoba; surely these people are paying that and more. Then, too, many of these growers contract this type of labour with the people concerned for a given amount for so many acres and depending on how fast a worker works or how much he can get done in a day, so that depends on his hourly rate. And in many cases some of these people make very good money indeed, and it is far from what the Member for Osborne indicated that here these people were slave drivers and that they were trying to get cheap labour from other areas. I think that is shameful, that is very absurd to imply this to our people in rural Manitoba who presently, especially this year could really run into serious trouble as far as getting experienced help on the farm. I'm sure some of the members on this side of the House who are farming have trouble getting experienced hired help as it is, so that we can have a serious problem, and to have this inference made I think is in very poor taste coming from the Member for Osborne, and I certainly speak out on behalf of those people that need help of this kind that should be made available and that they should not be smeared in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments on the Estimates of the Minister of Labour. I do want to respond just briefly to the Member for Rhineland, and in part it's a question to the Minister of Labour when he chooses to participate again in the debate.

I, as a matter of fact had some experience working in some of the fields in California as a student there, and where Mexican labour was used, was brought in at the time. I was paid on a per piece basis, and I know that according to American law the farm labour was not included under minimum wage, and certainly the wages paid under those conditions were absolutely shocking, and in fact they couldn't make any money out of me, the farm growers couldn't, and I couldn't make any money out of it either. That was the case for most white workers, given the wages that were provided, none of them could do well. The only ones who they could make money out of were the Mexican labour because they would work far harder for the wages that were provided than any Americans would. I don't believe that the minimum wage laws do apply to farm labour in Manitoba, and therefore if immigrants were coming into Canada for this purpose, applying for work in areas where there may be some opportunities and these opportunities were not being taken up by Canadian labour because of the wage conditions and the working conditions, I believe that unless the minimum wages were applied to this area of economy, that in fact there's no indication at all that they wouldn't have exactly the same effect that the Member for Osborne noted yesterday, which I believe to be correct. I think the Member for Rhineland knows this, and therefore the effect of his suggestion, and I think he realizes this himself, would have a detrimental effect on the level of wages in the Province of Manitoba and in Canada as a whole.

I think that the suggestion is a rather good one that farm labour do come under the minimum wage regulations in the Province of Manitoba and I hope that the Minister of Labour would comment on that possibility.

I do want to ask the Minister of Labour a few questions about how his new Labour Act is working out. He did have occasion to answer some questions that came from across the floor, and one question I have is that based on the desire on the part of the government to make it possible to have a greater degree of unionization, an easier certification of unions in the Province of Manitoba, which of course to my mind is extremely desirable, and I'd like to know however limited the Act has been in terms of time, it's just come into effect in fact, but what has been the effect of the Act in terms of certification compared to say a previous period of a similar time span. Has in fact the Act worked in the way we hoped it would, and that is to increase the numbers of certifications among working people in the province?

Mr. Chairman, after the bill had come through the House and the Committee and was

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. GONICK cont'd) amended I had occasion to ask a friend of mine who is a well known labour expert across the country, Mr. Ed Finn, who's the research director of the CBRT if he would go through the Manitoba Act as amended and give some comments about it from his point of view, and there are just a few criticisms he had of the Act, mostly his review was very glowing as I expected it would be, but he had a few reservations about some clauses and I wanted to make it available to the House and in particular to the Minister of Labour to see what comment he would have about them. Not because I expect that the Act would be amended at such a short time after it was changed last year, but for future reference.

One of his criticisms is the effect of equal treatment principle to unions and employers, and this is what he says about this aspect of the Act. And I'm quoting from the article. "The Act makes unions liable for damage suits for the actions of individual members. It imposes identical penalties, fines and/or jail terms on corporations and unions regardless of relative ability to pay. Individual workers as well as union leaders will incur \$500 fines and/or imprisonment for two months for participating in, or condoning wildcat strikes. These are much harsher penalties than those provided in the new Federal Labour Code and in most other provincial jurisdictions." And he goes on to say something which I think everyone on this side would agree, and that is that only if the balance of power between unions and employers were equal, would legislation based on the principle of equality be justified. He says that in his view this particular clause in the Act is a backward step because even the most responsible union cannot control the conduct of every member, and if the unions were charged with the acts of individuals and individuals also charged that this would be an unfair treatment. So I'd like the Minister if he would to comment on that in terms of his own view.

Another point that Ed Finn raises in this article I asked him to do, is with regard the definition of strikes, something I didn't realize myself at the time the legislation was being put through the House last year. He says that under the new code any activity that is designed to restrict or limit output including slowdowns and working to rule will be regarded as a strike, and this kind of a broadened definition really drastically reduces the options available to unions in their dealing with the employer. Because very often under pressure rather than engaging in a strike off the bat unions will use other pressure, such as work to rule, such as slowdown, and if however this is to be defined as a strike and is therefore not available to them as a legitimate tactic, which has been used for years and years by the union movement, then this might cause them to have to declare a strike under conditions where they would have preferred to use less potent or direct weapons in the collective bargaining relationship.

Finally, another point which I think was raised at the time and I'd like to know how this has worked out in practice because there were reservations at the time raised. And that is giving the individual employee the right to apply for union decertification, which of course opens the door to company stooges to harass unions through various legal and technical procedures, because if an employee, a single employee could get the support of 35 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit, which of course is much less than half, the Labour Relations Board would conduct a vote. I'd like to know if this has been done, if this has worked out in this way, if there's been any attempt to misuse the Act by company stooges or others who may be convinced, persuaded by employers to try through this means to decertify the union local.

There is another small point which he raised, and again I think it was noted in this case by myself at the time of the debate. It has to do with the technology clause in the new Act. The Manitoba Labour Act has some similarity with the new Federal Code with respect to the requirement that employers if they intend to introduce technological change have to give 90 days notice, and if the Labour Board finds that in fact this is a change of substance in the plant, then that matter can be opened up for negotiation before the actual contract is due to be re-negotiated. But the Act does not compel an employer who flouts the technological change procedure to reinstate and compensate dislocated employees, which I think is part of the Federal Labour Code and I wonder if - first of all, if this clause is being used at all, I'd be curious about that; and secondly, if it has been used, if there has been any attempt on the part of the employers not to reinstate and compensate dislocated employees even after they've been found guilty of flouting the law, and in any case, if the Minister can believe that this might be an area for possible alteration some time in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few other comments more general about the labour conditions

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. GONICK cont'd) in the Province of Manitoba and they relate to some of the findings in Guidelines, the first volume, dealing with the economic overview. I found some statistics there which I found shocking regarding to the degree of inequality of income which prevails in the Province of Manitoba even more shocking than what I had figured out on the back of an envelope, of statistics which were somewhat less sophisticated than the ones that are made available through Guidelines.

The statistics show a growing degree of inequality in the Province of Manitoba. In 1963, for example, the bottom 25 percent of all tax filers got 6.8 percent of all the earnings; 1970, the bottom 25 percent got 4.7 percent of all their earnings which is a deterioration of their conditions. I certainly do not blame the Minister of Labour for this, I only mention this because we are dealing with labour working conditions in the Province of Manitoba which at least is partially under his jurisdiction.

The Guidelines has a number of other shocking statistics which I think we have to talk about, when we deliberate about such things as minimum wage, conditions of work in the Province of Manitoba, full employment, unemployment and the like. Said that by 1970 the top five percent of the tax filers got as much income as the bottom 50 percent; a statistic which is shocking and of course it describes the shocking situation in this province. That group of 21,400 earners who received over \$12,000 in 1970, received as much income as the 214,000 persons who earned less than \$4,000 a year; another shocking statistic which we have to face up to in this province regarding our legislation and our programmatic effort with regard to improving the quality of life in this province. The top one percent of tax filers, only 4,300 individuals whose average income exceeded \$40,000 a year, received as much income as the bottom 32 percent. The top one percent receiving the same amount of income as the bottom 32 percent, who are 137,000 people. Four thousand people receiving the same income in total as 137,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, these are, I suggest, horrendous statistics describing a story which is the story of the way our economic system works and which the Government of Manitoba must look at seriously, as Guidelines does, brings into the open, makes it available to us, suggests we have to deal with it and has some ideas. Of course these statistics seriously underestimate the degree of inequality, underestimate it, because there are many people who earn so little income that they do not file tax returns at all. In fact 15 to 20 percent of individuals in Manitoba earn such low incomes that they file no tax return and this obviously will underestimate the degree of income and equality. Whereas at the upper end, at least in 1970, which is the last year for which we have statistics, many sources of income such as capital gain were not counted as income for tax purposes, so again we get an underestimate of the degree of inequality. And it could be argued that if we took family income rather than individual income, the degree of inequality would be less. However, still taking family incomes into account because there would be two or even three people earning an income in the family, thus boosting family income, still 30 percent, over 30 percent of Manitoba families earn less than \$4,000 a year. I have a reason to offer, and it's a reason I'm going to return to in a moment, is the kind of employment opportunities which are not available in the Province of Manitoba, at least not in 1970. So we will get to that in a moment.

But Mr. Chairman, another kind of statistical information presented in Guidelines, which is interesting here, is the average weekly earnings in Manitoba in 1971 came to \$123.00 plus change, which looks to be substantially greater than it was in 1960 where it was \$71.00 and change. This looks to be a major substantial advance over this 11-year period on a weekly basis. But Mr. Chairman, if you take into account the higher prices, higher taxes, higher deductions of one kind or another, the amount of money left in the person's pocket after this is taken into account in terms of real purchasing power, which is the only thing that's important to that person, the increase is much much less than it appears to be. In fact, I suggest that there probably isn't any increase at all in 11 years.

For example, I did a bit of back-of-the-envelope calculation and I find that in 1971 it would take roughly \$112.00 to purchase the same goods that one would purchase in 1960 for \$72.00. So most of the increase between \$71.00 and \$123.00 is taken up by price increase so in terms of real purchasing power there's no advance at all. When one takes into account increased taxes, increased deductions in pensions, increased deductions in unemployment insurance, I suggest that the entire increase is probably wiped out on the average -- on the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . average -- for your average wage-earner in the Province of Manitoba. And there hasn't been any real gain in purchasing power between 1960 and 1971 and that of course has to be the main priority of the government is to improve the real standard of living of the population. And I simply suggest that in terms of wage earnings, if you take into account the money increases, the price increases, the tax increases and deductions for various things, that what is left in the person's pocket is no more in 1971, it might even be less than it was in 1960.

Now we have other programs certainly to raise living standards. We have what I talked about earlier, the Public Housing Program. The Minister of Municipal Affairs talked about our Public Automobile Insurance Program, all of which I think does something to raise living standards. But if we just take a look at the take-home pay, take into account price increases, I don't think that the working person in Manitoba has advanced his position in the last 11 years. In fact that person may even be worse off.

Another statistic which the Guidelines offers which I think we should look at for a moment, is how Manitoba relates to Canada in terms of weekly wages earned. The gap in fact, as the Guidelines points out, actually increases through the 1960s. In other words, the excess, the extent to which the weekly earnings in Canada were greater than the weekly earnings of Manitoba grows over the 1960s. In 1960 the gap was a little less than \$4.00 a week. In 1971 the gap grew to about \$14.00 a week, which means that the Manitoba worker compared to the Canadian worker on the average is getting into an increasingly worse situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, these are things that I pointed out in Guidelines, I think very important, very important statistics which the Minister and the government must take into account when they're discussing programs in the field of labour, programs regarding our minimum wage and other areas.

Well if we turn to a different chapter in Guidelines, we find some other useful information for our consideration regarding job opportunities in the Province of Manitoba. If members are interested in this particular reference, they'll find it in a chapter called the Dual Labour Market which I think is very interesting. It says that, it suggests that you can divide the labour market in Manitoba into two components. The primary labour market is the jobs in secondary manufacturing industries, jobs in mining, jobs in essentially high paying industries which offer fairly steady employment at good wages, reasonable working conditions.

Then there's a secondary labour market. A secondary labour market is in the service industries, in some of the manufacturing areas like the clothing industry, in the people working in restaurants, in many of our department stores and so forth. They call this a secondary labour market because wages are very low, because the wages there, the wage limit is defined at \$2.00 an hour. In areas of the Province of Manitoba where the wages average \$2.00 an hour or less, they define that as a secondary labour market. This is industries where, because of layoffs, because of company failures, because of poor working conditions, there's a great turnover of labour employment. Where the people employed are often marginal to the labour force they turn from their job to Unemployment Insurance to training programs, back to their job somewhere in the secondary labour market, to welfare, back to jobs and so forth. It's a kind of vicious circle where they're stuck in a secondary labour market where they never will earn a decent wage and in fact, earning the wages that they earn, working a full year 50 weeks a year, earning the kind of wages that are offered in that sector, they would find themselves defined as among the poor -- that is below the poverty line -- in this country and in this province even though they are working full-time at this work.

Now 44 percent of Manitoba's labour force now is to be found in this so-called secondary labour market. This is the so-called sweat labour that the Member for Osborne referred to the other day where it is in fact difficult, somewhat difficult to find labour because the conditions are so poor and because the wages offered are so poor. Why should a person want to spend the rest of his life living under those conditions, working under those conditions and being so poorly paid. And very often, the member said, some member opposite said he would, but I don't think any member in this Chamber can be found in this particular industry.

There was a study done which would -- some people would say, well, these people happen to be people of lower skills, poor education, and that's the best work that they can do. In some cases this may be correct, but another study which is cited in this chapter did an examination

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. GONICK cont'd) of 10,000 workers of equal skills, in fact equal unskills because none of them were skilled, and they looked at the workers of this calibre in various industries, some of which happened to be in the secondary labour force, labour market, some of them which happened to be in the primary labour market. In other words, they had the same skills, the same education or the same lack of education, they were capable of the same productivity, but some of them happened to be lucky to get themselves in a job in the so-called primary labour sector which had good unionization, strong unions. They were working for large companies producing a product which had a large and growing market, where the other individuals, same education, same skills, found themselves in industries -- in the restaurant industry as dish-washers, as waitresses; in department stores; in the various service industries; and the wage differential for people with the same ability was startling. Because, in the secondary labour market, in the sweatshop labour they were earning \$1.79 an hour on the average, in the primary sector, the same kinds of people, exactly the same background, were earning \$2.82 an hour -- a substantial gap and only because there are limited numbers of jobs in the primary labour market in this province and only the lucky ones presumably are able to find their way into these jobs. In fact, what is very distressing, and the Minister of Labour and I think the Minister of Industry and Commerce and others that are responsible for economic health of the province would have to be concerned about this, because in fact the growth of jobs in the Province of Manitoba is far greater in the sweatshop industries than it is in the highly paid areas of the province. Between 1961 and 1970 the growth in the jobs in the high wage sector comprised only 31 percent of the new jobs whereas about 70 percent of the new jobs in this decade were to be found in this sweatshop industries of the province. In other words, the job opportunities are developing much faster in the low wage under \$2.00-an-hour sector and there's a far slower growth in the high wage, high productivity industries in the province. And that has to be a concern of the province of the government of Manitoba, with its intent of improving living conditions in the province.

Another point which is related is that if you look at the wages growth in the two areas, the wages are growing much faster in the high wage areas than they are in the low wage areas so the gap is growing there as well. So, Mr. Chairman, what we find and we certainly hear about it all the time, this so-called deterioration in the work ethic, but I suggest to you that one of the primary reasons for the so-called deterioration in the work ethic -- people don't want to work the way they did before -- is that the most job opportunities in the province happen to exist in the least desirable kinds of industries where the working conditions are miserable and where the rewards are miserable. So if they can get out of doing this kind of work, why shouldn't they? I spoke of the many who would argue that if they're going to work, give their labour, give of their labour, give of their energy, they want to be at least decently paid and the fact of the matter is that in this province, and in the rest of the country as well, the growth of jobs does not happen to occur primarily in the areas where they could earn a decent wage, and therefore they tend to look at other opportunities, other options that they might have. Of course one of the options is getting into a training program because if they get into a training program they get retrained, they're paid a salary which is in excess of what they would have gotten had they been working . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has three minutes.

MR. GONICK: Thank you. But they find that the training programs are just a kind of holding operation because most people who get at these retraining programs only find that they can find another job somewhere in the secondary labour market.

Now another point that is raised in the Barber Report is that if you take the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba, a person works 50 weeks a year, 40 hours a week, he's earning \$3,500, and with a family with three or more children they could get far more on social allowance in the province, so why should a person do its family out of a better income by working when they can get more on social allowance? In fact that is the case for a fairly large portion of our labour force who only work because they have the work ethic because they'd be better off on welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I just have one other comment to make, I'm sorry I don't have more time to develop this but perhaps on another occasion. That is, I think that our minimum wage legislation leaves a lot to be desired. In my view the \$1.75 an hour is not sufficient, I would

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. GONICK cont'd) say that \$2.00 is not sufficient. I would suggest under existing situation with the cost of living being what it is and growing as fast as it is, that a minimum level of income -- and by the way it's barely, it would be barely in excess of social allowance if we provided this -- would be \$100.00 a week guaranteed weekly income for our labour force based on a salary basis rather than an hourly basis. Anybody getting a salary as a minimum of \$100.00 a week, which I suggest to you still, on a yearly basis, would barely be over what a family of four or five, with four or five children, would get on social allowance. I would like to see our labour legislation move away from a dollar basis which is a niggardly basis, I believe it to be, based on a salary basis like many other individuals earn -- a salary rather than an hourly wage -- I think that should be applied across the board. I think it's reasonable that people would earn a minimum \$100.00 a week, and I think that should be something that the Government of Manitoba would consider, if not now, certainly in the near future.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I spoke on the estimates of the Minister; I was of course interrupted. I just have about five minutes -- (Interjection) -- interrupted. I'm trying to be nice today. I'd just like to make a few brief comments, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend again the Honourable Minister, who I'm very proud to be called my colleague, on some of the legislation that he's passed. I've waited 40 years for it, he's waited much longer.

I think the most important thing is union security, the right to organize, which means a great deal to me with legislation passed that no miner should work in an unsafe working place. This happened quite frequently in my career. If you're a strong, strong union representative and causing a little bit of trouble here and there, it was a common practice they'd put you in a working place that wasn't fit to work in. I'm not saying that all staff people were this type. We have many shift bosses that wouldn't send you in a place that he wouldn't work in himself. But on the other hand, we had different types who had no regard for a man working in dangerous places, and they took advantage of the younger miner, of course. People come off the farm they're used to working hard, they don't know their rights and they were sent in these places and quite often injured, sometimes killed.

It's pretty hard to explain a dangerous place to people who've never worked in mines, but if you have a raise and it's hung up forty feet and you have to get it down, this muck is loose, it could come down at any minute or could stay there for days, you don't know this. But the process you do, Mr. Chairman, you put up three ladders and you pray as you go up and you place the shot where you think it will be the most good, and hopefully you'll bring it down. If you're lucky you get away with it. I got away with it many times and I think the Member from Thompson — he's not in the House — would bear me out. This no longer exists, Mr. Chairman. No man has to work in a place that he considers unsafe, and I think this is the most progressive piece of legislation that I've ever seen passed in this House.

I want to commend my honourable colleague for his help, his assistance in curing air pollution in the Flin Flon area in conjunction with the Minister of Mines. They said it couldn't be done and we did it. We're now going after water pollution control and I hope, and I'll call on both of them to assist me in curing this problem that's existed in Flin Flon unnecessarily for 30 years.

Another piece of legislation, and no one's mentioned it and I'm very very happy it was passed, is compensation cases and they get paid for suffering from neurosis. I didn't know what the word meant but explained by, I think Mr. Stevens, it does happen. It happens in mines quite often, frequently. A man is crushed badly; he falls down a raise of some 50, 60 feet and he's hurt badly, but eventually physically he's well, but mentally he's not ready to go back to work, and we will pay him compensation until he gets back his emotional or mental quality, stability, to go back to work — another piece of legislation that I'm very proud of.

We've come a long way, Mr. Speaker, from the work gang that I worked with in Seven Islands. I worked with a bunch of Italian boys who couldn't speak English — very very poorly — and we were working for 90 cents a day, and we formed a group or committee — I was on it — for \$1.00 — a dollar a day was what we wanted. And we bargained for three days. We never got it so we cut a tenth off our shovels. We've come a long way since those days.

One thing I'm going to ask and implore my colleague to look into is the stop watch system used in our plants in Flin Flon. Here's what takes place, Mr. Chairman. They have experts — highly paid experts — to cut down the working force. And what they're doing, they're going through the plants — the smelter, the zinc plant — and they're holding stop watches. If two men are doing a job they'll time them and they will discuss and decide, if we build a ramp we get rid of one man. And what happens? They get rid of the man but they don't build the ramp, and I think we should look into this type of labour relationship.

I'm going to ask my Minister to introduce a housing scheme, a housing scheme where the HB M & S will lend people money at 4 percent. If this sounds fantastic to you -- (Interjection) -- Would you repeat that, my honourable friend?

A MEMBER: I was laughing at you; there's nothing else to do.

MR. BARROW: Look in the mirror some time, my honourable friend. This may sound -- (Interjection) -- This may sound fantastic to my honourable friend from Rupertsland. I could slam him but I won't.

A MEMBER: Don't say what you think, it may be unparliamentary.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would try at this point to indicate where the provocations start from which leads to the kind of problems that we had the other evening -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Legislative Assembly to now continue its debate in such a way that the provocations would not occur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer the honourable members to our House rules. When an honourable member is on his feet making a speech in this House, he's not to be interrupted by other members. I think it's a courtesy -- (Interjection) -- Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it applies to everybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with my honourable friend and I think when a man speaks he should be heard and if he's not interested he can always leave the House.

A housing program where the company would be forced — or maybe not forced; maybe if you just introduced it to them — a loan at 4 percent, and I said it might sound fantastic to you, but Mr. McKenzie who's second in command from the top, and Mr. Warwick who is third or vice versa, have both got loans of \$40,000 for houses, \$60,000 — I don't know which is which — at 4 percent from the corporations, and if they can use their employees in this fashion why not make it standard? They did it in Snow Lake, Mr. Chairman. They built houses there in 1959 — a three bedroom house at \$13,200 with a tenth down at no interest, 15 years to pay, which was a commendable effort on their part. And I commend them for it but it's a two-prong thing. To have a Task Force in a remote area you have to make it attractive for the people or they have three crews — one coming, one going, and one staying — but once they get hooked into a house of course they have roots, they have a nice place to live, and are more inclined to stay. I'll commend the HB M & S for their efforts towards the curling rink, their skating clubs, but again, this makes people stay and in the end it's much much cheaper than having three working forces such as they had in Thompson a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask the Minister to take a good long look at a dual license system for taxicab drivers and truck drivers. I have no desire or no wish to protect alcoholics or lusers, but I do think that the man who occasionally falls off, loses his license to drive his car, should also lose his driver's license as his way of living. I would hope you take a good long look at this.

I want to commend him, Mr. Speaker, on a smaller item. On compensation cases people have been sent down from the north with an appointment to be seen by a compensation doctor suffering, say, from silicosis. Three days later they're still there suffering from malnutrition waiting to see that same doctor, and this has been changed, Mr. Chairman. Appointments are made and they're made on time. Also he's made available to any man to appear before an appeal board if he thinks he's been unjustly dealt with. This also is run on schedule. And finally, if they aren't satisfied, within eight to ten days I can arrange or they can arrange or the doctor can arrange to have a final board, and that man can take anyone and four times they've asked me to appear with them, people who speak very poor English or not able to express themselves, and they have at least received answers — maybe not always the answer they wanted but they had results.

And last but not least, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just mention my friend's negative and purely untrue statement that you can't get a job if you're 40 years old. Anyone that wants to work in the north 40 years old — we have people up there working in the school 68 years old. If a miner wants to work and doesn't want to choose his job, the 40-year old age does not deter him. I'm 56 years old and I can get a job tomorrow, and I see no reason for the attack on . . . for the 40-year old age. I thank you gentlemen for your kind attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't intending to speak. I think the Member for Morris said it very well for all of us when he suggested that the Minister was being snippy and guilty of suffocating arrogance in his answers. However, there's been — (Interjection) -- Well it's . . . difficult to be nice; he is a very nice person but he is guilty of being a little arrogant once in a while. But because of some of the things said by other members besides the Minister, I feel that I should get up and take some time of the House and deal with some of the points raised.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

I think the Minister is — as I indicated last summer when we dealt with labour legislation, Bill 81, I believe — I think he hypnotized himself into a kind of drug-like condition where he feels that he can do no wrong and that he is the great labour Messiah that Manitoba has been waiting for, and all the stuff he brings into this House is good and everybody should get up and applaud because he said so. Well, I want him to know that there are quite a few union people — and I think he knows some of them — that disagree with him. As a matter of fact, two years ago I think that they petitioned, or perhaps petitioned isn't the right word, they met with the Premier and suggested that there may be more qualified people to fill that post. I hope that the Minister does listen once in a while. Members on this side know something about labour problems. We may not be Ministers and we may not have the years of experience of dealing with labour problems like the Minister, but we know something about the problems and I would suggest very seriously to the Minister that he listen to some of our complaints.

I think he indicated in his remarks that the sun has finally risen for the working people in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think for many people it certainly has risen. He has brought in legislation that I think that we have dreamed about, many of us have dreamed about, good legislation, but it's ironical that while having brought in this progressive legislation we have an unprecedented situation where a group of people, and I don't know how large they are, whether there's 50,000 or 100,000 of them, are completely disenfranchised economically in our society because of their age. We know that the majority of the companies in Manitoba will not hire people who are 40 years old — and I'm not going to name them because the Minister already knows them and it's not fair to name one company — 40 years or over they will not hire him. If you start working at 39, of course, they will allow you to work until you're 65, but if you apply for a job and you're 40 years old they will not hire you.

And we had a revelation in this Assembly by the Minister of Health and the First Minister, and I believe by the Attorney-General, where they are going to use the full force of the government and the law to make sure that criminals, or ex-criminals, pardon me, people who have served time, will get special consideration in being hired. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons we're having that problem is because they're using The Human Rights Act to force employers to hire these people. That same government and that same Human Rights legislation does not help the people who have never committed a crime in our society. Now that seems pretty incredible for a Minister who likes to give the impression that he is one of the greatest that ever sat in this House, to sit back and do absolutely nothing for honest people who have never raised their voice or their hand in anger against society, are treated worse than garbage while guys who have been in jail, some of them have made it a career almost of being in and out of jail, who are given preferential treatment, and we have one example at Headingley — there are other examples — who are given preferential treatment in our society while the other ones — and again I say I don't know what number there is but I know there are many people over 40, men and women — who simply cannot get a job in this province and the Minister has not lifted a finger to assist them.

Mr. Chairman, the member for -- oh yes, I want to deal with the -- before I get into the remarks made by the Member for Flin Flon. The Minister brought into the House unemployment figures, low unemployment figures, and I think at that time he indicated that he was proud, and I'm sure that the government is proud of having the lowest, one of the lowest or perhaps the lowest unemployment figures, unemployment force in Canada, and I think if it was not artificial I think that it would be a great deal for us all to cheer here. The Premier in response to a question, I think admitted that a couple of the projects that he was aware of created 30,000 man months, I believe was the figure he used. And of course there are many other projects. I'm not a mathematician, Mr. Chairman, but I've had people with a little more education than I have who did some rapid figuring and on the basis of their estimates if the jobs, these make-work, short-term, no-future jobs, were not created by artificial stimuli of millions of dollars of expenditure of public funds, we would have one of the second highest unemployment rates in Canada.

Now it's fine if you have an emergency, if you're in a pinch and something happens, perhaps the actions of the American Government when they brought in the DISC Program, or there was some surcharge against Canadian goods which affected this country and the government has to react quickly overnight and spend public funds in order to protect the industry and

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) protect the jobs in Manitoba. But, Mr. Chairman, this has been going on, I believe, now for about three years. I understand that the government has got a semi-permanent plan of continuing these programs, which I suggest again are of questionable value and have absolutely no future for that individual. And I think that it's an abandoning of their principles and policies on which they were elected to use that type of almost a cynical approach to solve a very serious problem. And, using that technique, Mr. Chairman, any government in this country can turn around by the simple expedient of going to the market and borrowing 10, 15, 20 million dollars, create all kinds of work and then say, "Look what terrific guys we are. You know, there's no unemployment in this province." Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask you and I ask the Member for Crescentwood, who is a pretty sharp cookie and knows the business of economics, how long can you continue that situation? It's artificially created prosperity or high employment. I would ask the Member for Crescentwood to tell the House -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Well, Mr. Chairman, just briefly in answer to that. As long as these people are producing something of value, some product, some service, they are creating the revenue or a large part of it which will ultimately pay for their wages. So the government can do this indefinitely as long as they are creating something of economic value.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that's what's happening, if that's what's happening, of course, I don't think anybody would disagree. But I know along Highway 6 leading to Thompson, not last winter, the winter before that, they gave money to a bunch of men, I think 12 men, to go around and pick papers along the ditch. I mentioned to the government, "You know," I said, "the ditches are full of snow and I don't know how they're going to pick papers unless they dig tunnels under that snow," and the government agreed at that time that this was one of those bad deals that they got sucked into. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Crescentwood would not approve of the kind of projects where guys will go around and pick papers or some other junk along the highway in the wintertime when we know, first of all, it's not there because the snow has got it covered. I'm sure he would not approve of that type of project, and I know, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to catalogue them because it would take me a couple of days and, you know, we have more important things to do than to catalogue the failures of the Minister of Labour, but there is a tremendous waste of money and economic activities that we have in this province, Mr. Chairman, I suggest are artificial, they're short term and they're meaningless and unproductive, and unless the Minister comes up with something better, then he should stop wasting public funds in order that he can get up in this House and say to all concerned, you know, "What a great guy I am. Look, we have the lowest unemployment figure in Canada." That's a sham and it's not becoming of the Minister because he is not that type of a show person. You know, he doesn't indulge normally in that type of thing.

The Member for Flin Flon was talking about housing, that they're going to somehow coerce Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to build four percent housing. Well, Mr. Chairman, the government has been in office four years and they have had every opportunity to get into housing, and they've done, I must say, in that area they've done a pretty darn good job, certainly better than previous governments, but I say again, Mr. Chairman, it's of little consolation to the 40,000 people or 43,000 people who are still living in dog kennels for them to be told, "But look, the other 7,000 have new houses." (I believe they've built over 7,000 units which is a very impressive figure.) It's of little consolation to those people who are living in these dog kennels to throw these figures in their face that someone else is living in a good house, and if the government stops worrying about the people who are living in \$40,000 homes, as the Member for Flin Flon mentioned, if they spent at least as much time worrying about those that are living in dog kennels as those that are living in \$40,000 homes, they may . . . something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Point of order has been raised. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to people living in \$40,000 homes. I merely said if they can borrow money at four percent to live in these \$40,000 homes, why can't working people borrow the same -- at the same rate of interest?

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. That's not a point of order, that's a difference of opinion. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, I just simply want to tell the government and the Member for Flin Flon that they can live in a \$100,000 home and they can go to Florida twice a week, it's none of his business and none of the Minister's business. If a man makes a success, whether as a politician or as a businessman, it is really none of your business and none of my business provided he achieved it honestly. And the Member for Flin Flon and the Minister of Labour and myself are living better probably than 90 percent of Canadians, and if he is going to use that type of argument then perhaps we should lower our standards of living so the poor wouldn't feel so bad about it. I am suggesting to the government that they spend more time trying to solve the problems of the poor instead of making remarks, snide remarks about the rich. The rich we can't do anything about, there's not very many of them. Let us look after the affairs of the poor and look after their problems, whether it's the minimum wage, better housing and discrimination against them, and the rich will always be rich and they'll always have their fun and they'll always be able to afford all the things that they've done before, and as far as I'm concerned I don't believe that I'm entitled to live in the same kind of house as James Richardson and I don't think that you are, and I don't think it's our business in what type of house they live. We were elected here to bring up the standard of living and improve the lot of the poor, and, Mr. -- (Interjection) -- No, he probably inherited it, and if you want to bring some equality in, then perhaps we should raise the income tax for them. But let's not turn around and say that a successful person has no right to live in a \$40,000 house because maybe some of the Ministers will have to move out of their mansions.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Crescentwood was talking about the minimum wage and I agree with him. Minimum wages must go up. The inflation, the galloping inflation is eating up any increases they have received. I would venture to say that the niggardly increase that the Minister of Labour granted after great pressure from the back bench and from the labour union has probably been all eaten up by inflation, runaway inflation, and they're worse off today than they were 12 months ago, and I suggest to the Minister that he have a very serious look at it because if he doesn't, with the welfare programs the way they are being managed today, that you will find out a lot of these guys are going to get tired of waiting for the reformed Minister to change things and they're going to go on welfare because it certainly pays. He knows, Mr. Chairman, that today's poor are tomorrow's welfare recipients.

Now we have a choice in our society. We either make it possible for the poor to live, and working for a living, because if we don't they will go on welfare. That means we will have to pay the whole shot. And that's really a very simple decision to be made. I know it's going to cost the Provincial Government money. I think when I was in Cabinet we discussed the cost of that increase, I believe the first one was 15 cents, and the minute you put that up, of course, the lowest civil servant would have to get an increase and the cost to the Provincial Government - which means the taxpayers of Manitoba - was pretty substantial. But it's something that the government has to face up to. You can't keep saying, keep decrying the fact that we have all this poverty and the poor people, on the other hand, refuse to use the one weapon, the one mechanism with which you can turn around and elevate the economic standards of perhaps 30,000 people in Manitoba just like that, by signing a paper and say we will raise the wages. The Minister has that power and I suggest that he use it, that he not sit around waiting for pressure from this side or from the Chamber of Commerce or from the labour organizations or from someone else, that he has that responsibility and he should use it, and if he doesn't use it I say what I said yesterday, that somebody's going to tell him, "Move over, Alphonse, so I can do it."

Mr. Chairman, may I simply close by the remark that the Member for Flin Flon made congratulating the Minister where he said he did a terrific job, he cleaned up all the pollution in Flin Flon - I don't know what he did but apparently he did something to clean up the pollution. I suggest there is a further problem that was not there in 1969 and I think if they want to clean the pollution up in Flin Flon they should kick out the foulmouthed MLA that is causing pollution in here and in his own town, which I suggest is an insult to the miners who sent him here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the Honourable the Member for Rhineland has left because he indicated to me **that** he had a very important engagement, and

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) would have to leave somewhere around 4:30, because I would have liked to have touched for a moment or two on his proposition dealing with immigration and the supplying of workers for the agricultural industry. But possibly my honourable friend from Rhineland, who is a most reasonable individual, and I say this not trying to compare others in this House, but he is a reasonable individual and he did raise one or two very important points, and I suppose that it could be agreed that one of the more important factors that we're confronted with in Manitoba is that the farm labour situation is not as good as we would like to have it and that there is at the present time a difficulty being faced insofar as the provision for farm labour in the province. I may dispute with him, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not the solution may be in importing or having people immigrate into our country in order to provide for the services, and it might be that the point raised by the Honourable Member for Osborne and I believe to some degree by the Member for Crescentwood is valid, in that historically it has been assumed that we use the people who immigrate to our country as providers of low-cost labour at minimal rates. But as I said, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Rhineland has left. There is an inclination, as I understand it, from public announcements that other members of the committee are not interested in the Department of Labour and are anxious to get on, so I will choose some other time to talk to my honourable friend from Rhineland and expand with him some of the difficulties that are being experienced insofar as farm labour is concerned.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood did make some suggestions as to the possibility of farm labour in Manitoba coming at least under the provisions of the Minimum Wage Act. This is a matter that has been given some consideration, Mr. Chairman, and there are some jurisdictions in the Dominion of Canada that do apply the minimum wage provisions to farm labour. Not too long ago, we did meet with representatives of the farm labour organizations and this point was raised, and we can pursue this in the future. But I do want to assure my colleague from Crescentwood and also my colleague from Flin Flon that I will come back to the points that they raised in their contribution, and I think their contribution was most valid and constructive insofar as the estimates of the Department of Labour happens to be concerned, and I trust that time will permit me to come back to their contributions, which in my opinion were very very valid.

But I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I can allow at this particular time, to go unanswered some of the points raised by the Member for Thompson. One of his major criticisms, as I listened to him, was that the programs that the Government of Manitoba have are stop-gap programs, and that I was able, that I was able a week or so ago to announce to the House that Manitoba had the lowest unemployment rate of any province in the Dominion of Canada. Now this might aggravate my honourable friend from Thompson. It certainly aggravated the Leader of the Official Opposition, it aggravated the Leader of the Liberal Party because, and I don't know where they are this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and I hope I'm not faulted because I observed that just after the question period each of those honourable gentlemen seems to have a habit of running out of the Assembly and not taking part in any further debate. My leader is represented by me, at the present time the Deputy Premier, and I don't think I can say the same for either of the two other political parties that are represented here. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, forgive me; forgive me. I do now note that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside has got up from the back of his Chair. -- (Interjection) -- No these aren't nasty remarks, my dear colleague, they're facts. However, this seems to me to be a process in this House.

But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the criticism that was directed to me on my announcement of having the lowest unemployment rate in the Dominion of Canada, was greeted with jeers and criticisms by both the Liberals and the Conservatives in this House. They attempted, they attempted at that particular time, as indeed this afternoon the Honourable Member for Thompson has attempted to say, that these were only stop-gap propositions and really are not fulfilling any useful purpose. And my honourable friend from Thompson has just said, "Hear, hear." A question was asked of me as to the reduction in actual percentages of unemployment in Manitoba as the result of the input of this government in providing work. At that particular time I didn't have the precise percentage figure before me, but Mr. Chairman, I suggest, or I inform my honourable friends and in particular the Honourable Member for Thompson, that I now have that figure and that if it was not for the input of this government

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) and its programs, the unemployment figure in Manitoba would have been about one percent higher than that that I had the honour to announce the other day, which still would have placed us in about the second or third position in the whole of the Dominion of Canada. I think this is very significant, Mr. Chairman, and whether or not the Honourable Member for Thompson is prepared to accept it, I leave it to his judgment. I almost said good judgment, but I leave it to his judgment to assess. He doesn't accept. Of course he doesn't accept, Mr. Chairman, because this is the type of attitude and action taken these days by the Honourable Member for Thompson. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Sour grapes.

MR. PAULLEY: I think maybe the Honourable Member for Radisson described it and I don't think he was unparliamentary in his description that it's sour grapes, because the Honourable Member for Thompson now, because of his idiosyncracisms, has changed from what he used to be. I don't know really -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and you've lost your mentality. But Mr. Chairman, there has been a change in the psychology of my honourable friend and anyone who in this House tells me that government should not attempt in times of need to supply work for the unemployed, I think has lost his cool and lost any intellectual approach to the facts of life. I realize, Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am one of the oldest members chronologically in this House, yes and I act like it and I only act like it, Mr. Chairman, may I say to my honourable friend, because I have gone through a number of years in which this nation, this province, and indeed all of the nations of the universe went through periods of depression, the lack of employment and the like. I recall quite vividly, Mr. Chairman, that during the '30s I was one of Bennett's employees, that in order to provide what was considered at that particular time useful agricultural employment for five bucks a month, the farmer was awarded that amount of money, I was awarded that amount of money too for over three years in order to get me off of the so-called unemployment rolls. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, at that time five bucks a month under the Conservative regime of Bennett, five bucks a month to the employee, five bucks a month to the employer in order to put on a semblance of a reduction or the creation of employment in the Dominion at the time when we had a 10 percent average . . .

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: When I'm finished. A 10 percent average unemployment in the whole of the Dominion of Canada. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- you don't even know what you're talking about. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada were crying for adequate facilities insofar as hospitals are concerned. No one really had any worthwhile hospital facilities in the years that I'm speaking of. No one. Many people, many of the children of Canada and including Manitoba were going to little one-room shacks called schools because -- (Interjection) -- because . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside -- I will read him Rule 42 of our House Rules for his edification. "When a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him except to raise a point of order or a matter of privilege." I don't think the Honourable Member for Lakeside has either at the present time. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: At that particular time, Mr. Chairman, kids were dragging themselves to schools at the time there was a requirement for them. At that particular time there was a requirement for decent roads and they were not being provided for. There was no useful provisions or provision for useful social development in Canada but only a desire of the day to take guys off of relief rolls in order to make it appear as though they were performing some useful purpose. And in those days a Grassmere ditch was built to the northern part of the City of Winnipeg by hand labour in order to use the unemployed on projects such as that when at the same time machinery was idle. And yet my honourable friend today from Thompson and the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party condemn this government because we have an input in the socially worthwhile projects in order to aid the unemployment situation in Manitoba -- at decent wages. No more relief projects where, in order to get a chit for a loaf of bread somebody had to go down to the Tecumseh yard of the City of Winnipeg and take an axe to a log of wood. No one had to come here in the City of Winnipeg and by hand dig a tunnel in order to provide for the construction of the sewer plant in the City of Winnipeg. Which was done.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

Does my honourable friend the Member for Thompson or the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Liberal Party suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should revert back to those days? We're not doing it, we're doing it at decent wages and we're doing it for socially worthwhile constructive projects. Our PEP program to provide for employment, -- (Interjection) -- That's right, that's right, and I wouldn't be a darn bit surprised if on the farm of the Member for Lakeside that he wasn't able to utilize the application of labour for some worthwhile project under the proposals of the Department of Agriculture in order to create barns. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether he's been able to do it or not, but this is what we are doing at the present time.

MR. ENNS: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . privilege has been raised.

MR. ENNS: Well, the honourable member who is the dean of the House, knows full well that any member of the Legislature can avail himself to any of the programs provided for by the government, for direct payment.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. That's right, Mr. Chairman, and I agree with my honourable friend and I'm glad that he agrees with me, because we are providing programs for worthwhile projects and we're being criticized because we are doing it. Because in doing it surely it's a cost of the taxpayer as a whole. We are alleviating some of the problems of the persons who could not have these projects achieved and at the same time we are reducing the incidence of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. And I say, Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Labour, I make no apologies at all for the programs of this government to do two things at the same time: Reduce the incidence of unemployment and at the same time do something constructively worthwhile, and for that the Member for Thompson this afternoon is condemning us as indeed the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Leader of the Liberal Party have done likewise. Oh, Mr. Chairman, what strange bedfellows a few months bring about. What a change, what a change that has taken place since the time that I went up to Thompson and spoke at the nominating convention for the Honourable Member for Thompson and tried to induce the people of Thompson . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Reluctantly.

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't do it reluctantly, I did it because I thought it was a good thing at that time. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, whether I would do it today, but I did it then, but oh, as I say, Mr. Chairman, what a strange change has taken place. My honourable friend the Member for Thompson, in his remarks a moment ago, said that these people that we are providing jobs for today, there is no future; there is no continuity of employment; and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned and I think that I can speak for this government, that while the conditions continue to prevail across Canada with widespread unemployment, that this Government of Manitoba will accept its responsibilities and endeavour to provide for jobs at reasonable rates for those who happen to be unemployed. That is our promise.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back in the history of Canada over the last 50 years we find we were burning wheat in Manitoba and Canada because we couldn't afford to purchase coffee that they were producing in Brazil and they were burning coffee there because they had an overabundance. I say, Mr. Chairman, it's about time, it's about time that not only we in Manitoba realize our obligations to our fellow man, not only here in Manitoba but elsewhere as well, -- (Interjection) -- Sure. My honourable friend there just a moment or two ago was talking of put pressures for increasing minimum wages. Of course we've had pressures for increasing minimum wages and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I hope in a day or two to be able to give to this Assembly a report from the Minimum Wage Board, which I have not received, but I'll bet, Mr. Chairman, a dollar to a doughnut that members of the Conservative Party particularly will cry as they have done with every one of the four increases in the minimum wages that this government has announced, they will cry because it is going to affect industry or the likes of that. Well I don't give a continental whether they cry or not, and I wonder whether the Honourable Member for Thompson will join with them in the tears that come from their eyes.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, what a difference a few months makes, or a few years. From condemnation because we weren't doing anything to provide for useful work for the citizens of Manitoba, now condemnation. I don't know what my honourable friend is yapping about, I can't

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) hear him. But I do say this, Mr. Chairman, there has been a change in the approach of my honourable friends and this government, without equivocation, has announced its desire to carry through useful programs of construction, useful programs such as our PEP program to provide for the old age pensioner that he can improve his home better than he ever had before under any of these other sojourns - but we're condemned for it now because these aren't so-called permanent jobs.

But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Labour, that the number of permanent jobs in Manitoba have increased significantly in the last four years, and yes the Civil Service as well, because Mr. Chairman, in the Civil Service we have provided for Autopac at lesser rates than anybody ever had to pay for in the Province of Manitoba before, and of course this requires an input of people. We have provided for expansions in programs and the employees concerned are members of the Civil Service, but even so we have provided even the next process, Mr. Chairman: Basic work conditions far better than most industries in the Province of Manitoba provide. I had the honour the other day, Mr. Chairman, to announce in this House that the provisions for pensions for the Civil Service will be among the best in the whole Dominion of Canada. I doubt very much whether in the automobile insurance industry the employees in that industry would be able to take advantage of the provisions of the new regulations, which will be enacted, providing I have some support from the other side of the House and I hope my friend from Thompson will support us in this advanced proposition of retirement at 60 voluntarily without penalty. I doubt very much whether those civil servants in Autopac will condemn us for it. I doubt very much whether even in quiet reflection the Member for Thompson will condemn us, but he's so wont these days, Mr. Chairman, because of his movement across a blue carpeted corridor, to condemn this government. I fault my honourable friend for condemning us for doing the things that at one time he advocated. I question my honourable friend for condemning us for doing the things that he at that particular time advocated and those things that he was elected to do . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and now he's across the corridor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's a certain amount of leeway permitted for all when they speak, but to make the kind of a statement that the Minister just made, that I at one time advocated certain programs that I condemn today is untrue, — the Minister knows that it's untrue, and I don't know why he wants to make that kind of a statement. I wish he would reconsider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to the Member for Thompson, that I have made any statement at all that is unfair to my honourable friend based on the evidence of his contributions in this House and in particular to the contributions that he made just a few moments ago. I say, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend, we had a program when we became elected in 1969 to do certain things — we're carrying that through. We have in the conduct of the affairs of the Province of Manitoba attempted to bring about, and we have achieved it, not to our satisfaction entirely, the lowest unemployment rate that we have in the Dominion of Canada, and as Minister of Labour I am glad to have had part in that contribution. I make no apologies at all, Mr. Chairman, because in trying to provide work for Manitobans we may not have supplied or provided for so-called permanent jobs. But I do want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that I am sure the people of Manitoba, the employees of Manitoba, who are working in those jobs, are damned thankful that they don't have to go on to the relief rolls as they did in the years of the Conservative administration, during the Depression and afterwards as well. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know differently. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside says to me I know differently. That is so true, that is so true that I do know differently, because I was one of those that got five bucks a day for going out into the fields of the farm and stooking -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I earned it, I earned it, Mr. Chairman. I can answer my honourable friend from Thompson that I earned it by being up in the morning around about 5 o'clock milking a herd of cows and out on the fields around about 9 o'clock in the morning driving a team of horses or a tandem of four, harrowing and discing on the farm, and let no one ever -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Oh, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend from Lakeside is so correct. It took Manitoba a heck of a long time to

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) recover from the effects of misdirection of the Conservative Party either in the Thirties or the Sixties, and this government is doing it today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution Nos. 73 to 81 were read and passed.) That completes the Estimates for the Department of Labour.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I had intended, although I didn't specifically state it and if there's any problems we won't do it, the Minister of Labour is also responsible for the Civil Service Commission and I intended to go ahead with that.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer the honourable members to Page 10. Resolution 25(a) -- The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I think that it would be only appropriate for me, as we deal with the Estimates of the Civil Service, to express my appreciation for the co-operation that I have received from the Civil Service Commission in all of our endeavours, and also on behalf of the people of Manitoba to express to the Civil Service personnel of our province my appreciation for the co-operation that we have received, and I recognize that there are times when there may be some differences of opinion between the public and the civil servants, but I feel, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba is well served by the employees of the Government of Manitoba whether they be individual members within the so-called Inner Civil Service or the Crown corporations and other units within the Civil Service.

So on behalf of myself as the Minister responsible to this Assembly, I want to say thank you for a job well done. At the present time, at the present time, as I am sure members of the Assembly will be well aware, we're into negotiations for a new agreement to cover the next couple of years and I am hopeful that we will be able to come to a successful agreement to the mutual satisfaction of all.

I was greatly pleased the other day to be able to announce, as I've indicated even this afternoon, to announce a new deal for the Civil Service of Manitoba in respect of pension provisions. As you know, Mr. Chairman, one of the provisions is voluntary retirement at age 60. I've already had a considerable number of employees come to see me and express their appreciation for this provision because it will be a new venture, in general, in Manitoba. I realize, Mr. Chairman, in rising as we enter into the appropriations for the Civil Service, that there are a number of areas yet that we have to take under consideration. I realize that particularly in the Civil Service group life insurance there are some apprehensions as to differences in coverage under the present contract between single and married and females and males. These problems are being considered at the present time.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that in the appropriation for the Civil Service there is a provision in the estimates under Item No. 29 for some \$450,000 for the payment of Manitoba Health Services Insurance Plan premiums. I'm sure honourable members of the Assembly are now well aware, as the result of the progressive provisions of this particular government, this is no longer a requirement because of the abolition of the requirement of the payment of hospitalization and Medicare premiums, which of course — and I think I can say and indicate — is a result of the progressive thrust of this government in the field of human endeavour.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat and reiterate how appreciative I am as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, and under The Civil Service Act, the Chairman of the Joint Council which can be considered as tantamount to a labour-management relations committee, I appreciate the co-operation and in saying that, Mr. Chairman, I also appreciate that from time to time I am the recipient of a few barbs even from those that I work with in the Civil Service Commission. Manitoba Government Employees Association by legislation is the bargaining organization for the civil servants, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you as a long-time union member can appreciate sometimes the position that I find myself in as the representative of management. But I do say that while we do have from time to time differences, they are differences that do not reflect in personalities and criticism on a personal nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add a word or two on this particular resolution as a follow-up to the Minister, and say that we would like to identify ourselves with the remarks that he made of a laudatory nature, and a justifiably laudatory nature, with respect

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) to the Civil Service and its loyalties and its energies and its commitment to the people of the Province of Manitoba. I think that for our parts in the Conservative benches we can take some considerable pride and satisfaction in the Civil Service that serves the province and the people of Manitoba, because it was during a lengthy and successful series of Conservative administrations that much of that service was built, Sir, and I know that the Minister of Labour will not mind my making reference to that fact. The people of this province through administrations of differing hues have been well served by their Civil Service and continue to be so, and we would like to identify ourselves with the Minister's remarks in that respect.

At the same time I would just add one word of caution where the earlier retirement age is concerned, and say that I would hope the Minister is approaching this question with the conscience and the objectivity that I know that he attempts to bring to the administration of all his departmental affairs. The earlier retirement age is attractive in many ways for many persons. It's also unattractive in some respects for some people of certain temperaments and certain ambitions. A voluntary early retirement age is certainly desirable where people, men and women, where men and women who are serving the public and exposed to the rigours of that service over a lengthy period of time are concerned, if the people themselves desire that kind of a retirement. But the House Leader has pointed out that a voluntary retirement is not desirable in all cases. Certainly in the case of many of us in this Chamber we probably would not welcome, would not welcome any other kind of retirement than voluntary, but there are many, there will be many people in the Civil Service who will have different opinions as to what kind of strictures they would like to see in existence where their retirement is concerned.

There will be many people who will want to continue working on. I know that there's nothing contemplated at the present time that would prevent them from doing this, but I just want to raise that one suggestion and leave it with the Minister for his consideration. He's the type of person who, like Tennyson's brook, probably hopes to go on and on forever, not necessarily in the same manner as Tennyson's brook although on many evenings, on many evenings he does carry on precisely and literally in that style. He should therefore keep in mind the fact that many public servants of the Province of Manitoba like him, no doubt will want to continue putting their energies to good use for as long as their health will permit. And provided he approaches the proposition from that point of view and that this is not the forerunner of some kind of compulsory retirement that takes people out of the mainstream of productive contribution and work at what is for many people the height of their powers and the height of their experience, then we support and endorse the moves that he's making in that direction. So I leave that thought with him and ask him to leave retirement in the 60s at the voluntary level it now occupies, and leave civil servants with the freedom of choice to make that decision for themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Go ahead, Don, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I want to . . .

MR. GREEN: I would just ask the honourable member whether he is going to be short. If not we could call it 5:30. He's only got three minutes.

MR. CRAIK: I'll be very short, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to say that in general, the Civil Service of Manitoba is held in very high regard and always has been held in very high regard. I want to say that also, on the other side of the coin, that in calling a spade a spade I don't think there's ever been a time when I've heard so much complaint come from so many civil servants about the practice of this government to recognize political service of people joining the Civil Service. Mr. Speaker, it's perfectly in order for the government to ask to name the people and so on, and in so doing of course you can start a holocaust that is unending in this House. What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is that very frankly in my opinion the impression generally in the Civil Service, particularly those who have been in the Civil Service for some time, is that political interest is entering as a qualification in people's success in the Civil Service to an extent that never occurred before. I say this because people who have attempted to make a career out of the Civil Service are concerned that their personal qualifications -- now whether it may be from the point of view of the training and background that

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) they've brought to their jobs and what they thought was their objectivity that they brought to their jobs, is in fact in danger of being put in a position that is not a priority position as to whether or not they succeed in their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, a large amount of this has occurred because of the very numerous people that the government has hired in at the Executive Assistant level, and in some cases have gone on into the Civil Service, people who have in fact run even as candidates for the government out of a Civil Service position and came back in at a Deputy Minister level, which is acknowledged as not a Civil Service appointment but is in fact an appointment of the Cabinet and not of the Civil Service, but all of this has led to a rank awareness, a rank awareness of the general rank and file Civil Service that politics is an important part of success in this government's, in this party's administration of the Manitoba Government. So I'm saying it, Mr. Chairman, as an impression that I believe to be true because it has been uttered by so many people who I have never known to have any political affiliation or interest that work in the Civil Service, who very deeply feel that their progress in their career is endangered by the fact that they are going to be bypassed by those who have joined the government more recently under this administration, who are going to bypass them because of their rank in politics.

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but make this the major point in dealing with the Minister's Estimates at this time, because it's, whether we like it or not, it is a fact of life, it's a matter of deep concern to the several thousand people who have put in many years of dedication to the Provincial Government, and whether or not they're right, whether or not they're correct in their assumption, they feel threatened in their job because of the importance that they feel of political interest now in the Civil Service, and this is not the way that the Civil Service should operate and it is not the way in the long term that citizens of Manitoba, not the way they want to see the government run as well, where political affiliation any way plays a part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 5:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p. m. this evening.