



FOURTH SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Peter Fox
Speaker



VOL. XXIV No.69B FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1977 2:30 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Friday, May 27, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 32 students Grade 5 standing of the Forest Park School under the direction of Mrs. Melnick. This school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Finance.

We also have 48 students Grade 5 and 6 standing of the Harrow School from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Minister of Education.

On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, approximately a week ago, the Member for Morris read into the record a letter that he had received from a constituent in Gladstone, that is a constituent of the Member for Gladstone, with respect to a statement allegedly made by one of our staff members with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I have here five copies of an affidavit signed by our staff member denying such a statement. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Directors has not yet recommended on whether legal action is going to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: I wonder, was the Minister rising on a question of privilege or on what pretext did he rise to make that statement?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I assume that under Ministerial Statements that that would be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Well, I would like to reply to the Ministerial Statement of the Minister to the extent that if he would care to see another copy where two people were involved and they are both willing to go to court, so we're all ready, any time you are.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Order please. Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. I would like to ask the First Minister if he would investigate apparent discrepancies that exist from a story that appears in the Free Press of today with the announcements of the Attorney-General on previous occasions in the House that Dr. Kasser is going to be tried in the courts in Austria. I wonder if the First Minister would investigate the relative accuracy of the statements of the Attorney-General in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it is well known that both the Province of Manitoba and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission is attempting to get prosecution with respect to that individual, but insofar as checking the accuracy of a Free Press story, if I were to start doing that, I would have time to do nothing else.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was not asking the First Minister to check the accuracy of the Free Press story. I was asking him to check the accuracy of the statements of the Attorney-General and in that respect, Sir, I would ask the First Minister if he considers the legal advice given to the Attorney-General by a well known lawyer in Manitoba as being of sufficient quality and sufficient accuracy as to ensure that there is no possibility of conflict of interest.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should think that the solicitor being referred to is one that has a good reputation as a lawyer and there is no reason to believe that he is unable to see a conflict of interest when it appears.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary. Would the First Minister be willing to submit that problem or that position to the Law Society of Manitoba for their investigation?

MR. SCHREYER: If my honourable friend wants to take that course of action, I would suggest that he feel free to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct the question to the Honourable the First Minister whom we have known has been in the north recently and we welcome him back. Perchance, did he have an occasion to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . visit the construction site — Mr. Speaker, I am trying to ask the question. Perchance, did he have an opportunity during his sojourn in the north to visit the construction site at the north end of Lake Winnipeg, the Jenpeg construction site, in lieu of some of the recent controversy about that construction site? Has he anything to report?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to answer that question in two parts. The first is that I have been in telephone communication with the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and with the Soviet Embassy and I am advised that all of the steps that need to be taken in order to bring the two principals together have been taken. There has been some difficulty in getting visa clearance but that has been done now with the co-operation of the Department of External Affairs and the discussions will continue with additional persons being present in the course of the next very few days. In the meantime, there is no work stoppage whatsoever and I am expressing an intuitive opinion that this will be resolved early next week. In the meantime, there is no work stoppage.

I might add further that I am advised this morning that unit No. 1 at that construction site, that is at Jenpeg, has been put through its initial water tests and has been, I am advised by the senior engineer, performing better than the rated capacity expectations. So that's good news. So that's the good news to set alongside the fact, which I acknowledge, that there has been extreme slowness but the first unit apparently will perform very well.

The final point just to clarify any confusion for my honourable friend, the north that I was visiting was, in fact, the Artic North and not the mid-north.

MR. ENNS: One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister. To use his own words describing slowness, I think one of the problems that erupted in this story was the slowness of payment by the Government of the USSR in this respect. Is the First Minister satisfied that the discussions involving the — I don't particularly wish to repeat the numbers whether it's \$2 million or whatever it is — that that area of difficulty is being satisfactorily negotiated during these talks and that, in fact, there will not be a reduction of the work force or any further slow down in the construction site?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is closely correct. I believe that the amount at issue is in the order of \$2 million and, indeed, the point of the disagreement has to do with late payment but, at the same time, I must say to my honourable friend that there has been no previous complaint of late payment so that this is the first of its kind. The slowness that I was referring to was the slowness of the actual installation of the mechanical works but then I also say that the first units commissioning runs thus far are proving out indeed better, according to the senior engineer, than the anticipation according to rated capacity.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, without testing your indulgence one final supplementary question. The Minister again referred to slowness and I would ask the First Minister to indicate to us, in terms of the original project of Jenpeg power coming on stream, where do we stand right now? What delays has there been to date in terms of bringing Jenpeg on stream.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never hidden the fact that in our opinion, the installation of the first two units is behind schedule. As to just how many months, I cannot give precision to at the moment . . .

A MEMBER: A year and a half?

MR. SCHREYER: Oh no, nothing of that kind, Mr. Speaker. That, too, has to be compared with the fact that it is not uncommon for the installation of major components in a major engineering project, there are sometimes, delays. As a case in point, there is right now, volunteering the information, there is a delay of some few months with respect to the supply by General Electric of generating equipment at Long Spruce. So that too happens to be the fact of the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. Would the Minister advise the House if he has checked with Mr. Suss regarding my questions that I raised earlier in the day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HONOURABLE J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, my answer to the member's question is contemptuous silence, but I will give this information to the House. Approximately one month ago, it was drawn to my attention that an incident had occurred in the Youth Centre, and the staff was carrying out an internal investigation. As you can well appreciate, youngsters are somewhat intimidated by each other, and it was somewhat difficult to get some information. Subsequent, in about a week's period of time, one of the counsellors was successful in getting some of the information from one of the people who was involved in this particular incident, and made notes.

The cottages at the Youth Centre — and you have all been invited to go and look at how these places are located, including the Press. The notes were left on a desk in one of the cottages at the Youth Centre. The notes disappeared from the desk, and subsequent to that I was advised that a copy of these notes had been forwarded to the Winnipeg Tribune and the Winnipeg Police. Subsequent to

this time, which would be in this month's period in the time frame, I will have a full report in chronological order, but I don't think that this matter can be allowed to sit over the week-end.

The subsequent course of events is that a police investigation has been going on, and will continue to go on, and as it is with all police investigations, if charges are to be laid, they will follow the usual course and go to the Attorney-General's Department and charges will be laid.

Other investigations which are going on are: How this document disappeared from the Youth Centre; another investigation which is going on is whether criminal charges should be laid against people who are contributing to the dissemination of information relative to juveniles which is protected by statute.

As I said when I started this, Mr. Speaker, what we are involved in, in this particular question, is more important than Bud Boyce, is more important than the New Democratic Party, we're talking about justice and the respect for law. All across this country, politics has not entered the juvenile system, and I have been asked questions by members opposite, and I have tried to respond to each one of them, but when it comes to juveniles, until there is a change in the Act, that the names, addresses, and the rest of this information is protected by statute, I have to uphold the law, and I expect that by all members of this Legislature.

MR. WILSON: By those remarks, can I suggest that even though after . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WILSON: By those remarks, would it be possible for the Minister to indicate whether there will now be a proper airing and inquiry of the problems that I brought up this morning, and why did the Tribune and the Police and his department sit on it for thirty days?

MR. BOYCE: One of the other possibilities, Mr. Speaker, is that a member of this House will be called before the Privileges and Elections Committee of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I was asked to take as notice the number of complaints in the Department of Consumer Affairs in regard to smoke and heat detectors. I would like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that we have twelve companies registered. Eight complaints were registered with the Department of Consumer Protection. Complaints were not in regard to the standards of the equipment, but in regard to sales and in regard to some misinterpretation pertaining to employment of staff, but not in regard to the quality of the units themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information. Can you tell us what has been the result of those complaints, whether they have been investigated, and if corrective actions have been taken to deal with these practices?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, all eight complaints have been investigated, and as reported to me I feel satisfied that they have been looked into to the satisfaction of both parties. If the honourable member wants details, I could supply the same to him.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether the practice as undertaken by these companies in terms of — if it was a matter of certain sales practices that were deceptive or not fully representative of the products, or of high-pressure tactics — and if there were, as I understand it, certain practices related to the employment of people, whether it is high turnovers, and certain agreements were being solicited from salesmen, etc. Have those actions now been corrected and changed so that they no longer take place?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. I would like to cite one example, possibly to clarify it. In regard to employment itself, which was one of the eight complaints, the person felt that he was going to be doing demonstration only, but it was again strictly a sales job. So the individual felt grieved and launched a complaint with the Department of Consumer Protection. And it goes on in regard to the other complaints, but not based on units sold.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask, on the same line, whether the Minister of Labour has anything to report from the meetings that were to be held yesterday concerning the whole question of standards for these fire safety equipment features?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my honourable friend will take the answer to the question that he poses on a sort of an interim basis. I report we met yesterday for a considerable period of time, my Deputy Minister, the Director of the Mechanical and Engineering section of the Department of Labour, along with the Fire Commissioner. We considered the problems that have developed, particularly in the last wee while, and just before I came into the House, I received a report which I haven't had time to thoroughly consider as yet as a result of our deliberations.

One of the areas covered we hope to overcome is one, I believe, that I indicated to the House the other day, a misunderstanding of what is meant by the Department of Labour sticker on these devices. It is intended, Mr. Speaker, only to indicate that the electrical apparatus is safe for use, but

not an indication that the smoke detector or heat detector is approved.

We have under consideration attempts to insist that any of the units that are for sale will have to have the approval of the Underwriters' Laboratory on the unit up for sale. In addition to that, we are considering the possibility of having spot checks undertaken of the equipment that is being sold in stores to ascertain as to the efficiency of the unit. And further than that, we considered whether or not it may be a possibility, and I think that it is a possibility, and in conjunction with Autopac, who allow a fifteen percent deduction in the premiums because of a fire detector being in a home, that in co-operation with Autopac the Department of Labour will produce an informational brochure available to the public, not only indicating the general concept of the fire-smoke detectors, but its makeup, and also to indicate possible locations for the installation that would be most effective in the household. And also with the co-operation of the Department of National Defence, who have a fire-testing unit or area at Fort Osborne barracks, that we would from time to time utilize those facilities, Mr. Speaker, to further allow us to continue on a test basis the efficiency of the units.

So all I really can say to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, is that the meeting was held. This is a tentative report. I have asked the department — or I suppose I should say I have ordered the department — to document for me a precise pamphlet, and we intend to expedite the production of the same as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Honourable Member for Lakeside had asked a question asking that I ascertain whether it was correct. It was suggested that perhaps one of the units in connection with the Jenpeg construction was flawed and required it being sent back for complete remachining in the Soviet Union. The answer is that in fact there has been no unit that has had to be sent back. There was one unit that had a metallurgical flaw but this was corrected by means of a process on-site by a metallurgical specialist group in Canada which the suppliers paid for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wanted just to pursue one further question with the Minister of Labour and say by the way that I welcome his statement. I think certainly the steps he has taken will be a major change and improvement. I was just wondering if he might provide some indication as to the timing as a result of that meeting, if he could indicate when these different changes and improvements in this fire safety equipment measures and standards might take place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't give a precise date. My instructions to the department were to go forward with all haste in order that we may overcome the possible fleecing, in some respects, in the sale of smoke and heat detectors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him, in lieu of his statement this afternoon, is he planning court action against my constituent, Mr. Gerald Ore?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, had the member been listening he would know that I had indicated the board had not yet recommended on that course of action.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would like to make two changes of the Law Amendments Committee. The Minister of Consumer Affairs will replace the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Member for St. Johns will replace the Member for Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would make a change on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. I would like the name of Mr. Blake to replace that of Mr. Banman on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for St. Johns is going to be on the Committee, I wonder if he could inform us what name he would like to go under. I have different names that he seems to go under. Mr. CHEIACK, Mr. CHE Well IACK, CHE help, IACK, CHE it clarified. Thank you. IACK, CHE. I'm IACK and CHE Yes, IACK. I wonder if we could have his preference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

A MEMBER: A rose by any other name.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to change one further name on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. Change the name of Mr. Steen for that of Mr. Henderson on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Friday, May 27, 1977

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

CAPITAL SUPPLY

THE SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM, 1977

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): Order please. When the House rose at noon, we were on Resolution Schedule A, Special Employment Program \$16,500.00. The Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. :

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I do wish to make a couple of remarks under this item under the Schedule of Special Employment Program. I know when the program was introduced into the House, we welcomed it and thought at last the government was coming through with something worthwhile and specific and something had to be done. Now we've had an opportunity to assess what has been done and what has been happening for the last month and Mr. Chairman, I am concerned. I don't believe that —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. If honourable members want to have caucus meetings, I suggest you go somewhere else to hold them, not in the Chamber. It is not fair to the honourable member that's speaking. He can't hear himself. I can't hear what he is saying. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I do wish to make a few remarks under this item. I believe we have had now an opportunity for at least a month to assess how effective the program is and may be and can be, and perhaps the government, the Minister of Finance, and particularly the Minister of Industry and Commerce, may —(Interjection)— the Special Employment Program, the \$33 million program. Well, the applications have been now out —(Interjection)— I can appreciate that very much, and I know somebody said that we have had 200 and some applications, I believe, under the small business job creating programs. But the approximately 200 applications in the first place is very, very small. If we only have 200 applications I would say that's a disaster. And secondly from information that I am getting, the 200 applications doesn't mean 200 job creations or placements. It may mean a couple of dozen. If that is the end result I think we should be all concerned and perhaps there should be some changes made. Maybe there should be a different course of action taken because it is a very serious situation at the present time, and if it is not creating the job opportunities that it should be, perhaps there could be some amendment. It doesn't mean that I am critical of the government for trying to do something. I think we welcome the money that was spent, in fact we said maybe there should have been more money set aside.

We were critical of the temporary job opportunities, we said they should perhaps be of a more permanent nature, but I believe that even as the applications are coming in, we don't need any kind of army of workers. As the applications are coming in the secretary could assess how many are coming in and how many are really factual requesting placements. So just by a phone call to the office wherever the applications are coming in, I think the Minister can assess in not a day's time, he can assess in a matter of five minutes just how successful the program is turning out to be, and if it is not successful at this stage then I say that maybe some changes should be made.

I am not critical of the government trying to do something. I say fine, we welcome the money coming in and I know the problem is not only in Manitoba; there are problems throughout the other provinces and nationally. But the point is we have to gear and use the kind of strategy that perhaps will make some sense and will create jobs. And if what has happened in the small business opportunities for small businessmen is not being very effective, then perhaps there should be some changes, and I think that this is something that we should do. I am concerned.

I am concerned on another point, Mr. Chairman. We have listened to many debates in this House and I know that many speakers have indicated that prior to elections there are many pegs go on the highway and flags and that there are some roads that are going to be constructed. Well, we have had some discussion in another area. The area that I would like to indicate to the Minister where, in my opinion, many jobs can be created, and we have debated it in this House, where the Minister quite proudly got up and said, "Look, we have 500 acres of land ready to come on-stream this summer." I have been driving down Inkster almost every week and I am waiting for some action, and I would like

Friday, May 27, 1977

to indicate to the Minister there is no action in the way of services going in, of the sewer system going in or water systems going in. In fact if I am not mistaken, it appears that the crop has been put in.

This really concerns me. Is the government making these announcements to say, "Well, this is election year and perhaps we are going to take some action and put 500 lots on stream in June or May." I think there should have been some action taken in that area. And if the Minister doesn't believe me, he can drive down Inkster and there is no action taking place. If there is no action in almost June then there will be little action by October because you don't install services in two or three weeks or even a month. So in my opinion I would say there will be no lots on stream in that area this year, and that is one of the most intensive, very labour-intensive programs that could be. If you can sell off 400 or 500 lots, and if these people can contract a lot of small builders for which it won't be in-shop, sort of fast, mass production construction, then I could see 3,000 or 4,000 people in that area, just in that wee little place on the jobs, on the construction. But driving down Inkster I see no action, none at all. In fact I believe the land is in crop unless it is grass and I am mistaken. But there is no action there. There are no services installed. We were told in this House four months ago that there will be 400 or 500 lots available to the people. Well, the equipment people aren't even there to start putting the services in, so if they are not in in June, there will be no lots available or on stream in October or November. So that does concern me.

What I am indicating to the House and to the Minister, there are areas that perhaps we could create jobs in which are very labour-intensive. I know that the unemployment figures are not very bright in the future for a lot of our young people. It is not too good at the present time, so I think the government has to address itself to it. I am saying that it is not difficult to monitor the kind of applications that are coming in — are there applications coming in? — and it should be watched and it doesn't take an army or a whole office staff. One secretary can assess how many applications come in a day and report to the Minister quite quickly with the information about the publicity that has been given out, and some of the advertising material that has been sent out to many small businesses. If there are no results, something else has to take place. The Minister has to do something else.

I have indicated one area where there could be job creation and I am disappointed. We were told four months ago we will have 400 or 500 lots on stream. The people will be able to purchase them at a very low price and make their own agreements with small builders and start building. Well, that is not happening in that particular location that we talked about as the first big development.

Perhaps there is another area where something should be done in the way of home repair and rehabilitation program. It is strange that the housing in this city and in Canada has a potential life expectancy of 50-60 years, and in Europe it appears to me that most homes have a life expectancy of 400 years. There must be something that we are not doing, and the big thing is repair, rehabilitation, and keeping the homes in good shape and in good repair, and some emphasis should be put in that area.

I asked the Minister a question the other day about insulation and I have a whole bunch of calls to the office and some letters that say, "Look," the people say to me, "We want to insulate our homes and I am on my holidays now and I want to start doing the job." "But," he says, "I phoned the Hydro, I phoned the Minister of Finance, I phoned the government department, and nobody knows anything about it, can't tell me." Now surely some people will be able to do it in September or October, but I think if there is an opportunity that the unemployment is on right now, and particularly with the large army of university students that are unemployed, there is an opportunity for them to get some jobs if we can get that program off the ground.

Again it was announced during the Budget, and the Budget has now been through —what?— a month or a month-and-a-half that has almost passed. One month. I know the Minister was able to produce the pamphlets in a matter of three or four days and get them to small business people, so somehow we should have got the mechanism and established how the system should be working. Again I say it is very important that we do something now, because in the fall most of the students will be going back to work, and there may have been an opportunity to create 300 or 400 or 500 jobs, maybe more, in that particular area. Again there seems to be nowhere where the people that want to use the program, avail themselves —(Interjection)— The First Minister says "Good grief" and I hope you will be able to explain it to the House so we can have some publicity because I think it is a good program. Maybe it will have to be expanded, but let's give the people the opportunity to use the program, and if it can create some employment, that's great. But right now it doesn't seem to be the case.

The other very labour-intensive area that the government can be looking it is the tourist industry. I know that the government at least on two occasions, maybe three occasions, have already announced a park, Nopiming Park, in eastern Manitoba. Well, again, I think it is a good area, I think it is a good program, but I think let's get some action, let's create some jobs in that area. If some services are required, if some roads are required, and if we can put 200 people to work in that area, say this summer, I think that will be a great objective. But I don't believe that's happening. I don't know if anybody's working on that park right now. I know that I have a news release from two years

Friday, May 27, 1977

ago, the services that we're going to put in, the washroom facilities, some other service facilities and so on, a road through the park, —(Interjection)— I know the Minister says the Estimates just passed it, well, that's fine, but the program I know has been announced on two other occasions, not this session, but a year ago. Last session, that same thing was announced, the establishment.

We need to create the job opportunities now for the people because there is very high unemployment. I think that's an area that we can probably put 200 people to work, youngsters in that area, so I am pointing out to the government that if the Special Employment Program that has been announced, a \$33 million program, is not working, is not effective, it has to be monitored closely, then maybe some changes in the kind of program that we set out has to be made.

I think it's the government's duty and responsibility to monitor. I know the Minister said, "Well, I don't know, we'd have to have a kind of army to monitor it and I don't know what's happening." Well, that's not true, because anybody can assess how many applications come in, it would take a secretary five minutes a day and report to the Minister. If you see, at least the small business program, if that's not working because they have to pay 50 percent for hiring an extra employee, maybe some of them are in the process of laying off some. I don't know. But there may be an opportunity to meet with some of the small business groups in the city and say, what is it that would create more jobs, in what way, and maybe some changes should be made.

I would admire if the government would take that action instead of being rigid in the position because these plans were made and we're sticking with them. If the plan is not working, then let's change our course. I believe it's the job opportunities in the small business where fifty percent of employees salaries paid by the special works program and employer has to pay half up to three employees. That's an area where I'm concerned because I don't think it's working. For some reason, the people are not availing themselves of that program. I think that should be checked into.

It's an area that I have to say to the government, I have to be concerned. Review it, not once a year, because four months from now it's going to be too late, or three months from now it's going to be too late. Even on the basis of us being critical we feel the government should be creating permanent jobs, not temporary, but even on a temporary basis, I don't know if the program is being very effective and successful. That's what I say to the Minister of Finance. You have to have a close watch on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the late Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent once said that the only difference between Liberals and New Democrats was that New Democrats were Liberals in a hurry. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia has succeeded, all on his own, in transposing that, because everything he's mentioned is exactly on the lines and along the direction in which we have already moved to develop policy and develop administrative capability and proceed, actually proceed with those programs.

My honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia, may have a point with respect to one of the several programs he mentioned, and I'll try and deal with it. There is a reason, in my opinion, why we couldn't have gone any faster than we have, and I'll come to that in a moment.

With respect then, sequentially, to each of the points he has raised, with respect to the private sector small business employment creation assistance, we are not pessimistic that the program will be picked up, taken advantage of by a significant number of small business operators in the province. To date, it may be true that there are only in the order of 200 applications, but I'm advised — the Minister of Industry who is more directly involved with that component of our overall job creation program can elaborate further — but my estimate is that by mid-June, which was the deadline, by the way for applications in the first place, that there will be in the order of 500.

Cabinet has authorized the extension of the deadline if necessary, to mid-July, and there may be some variations made in the program, but we do not want to depart from the essence of the framework of that program, because we believe it is significant assistance. If in the event we do reach 1,000 to 2,000 — the Honourable Member for Assiniboia may consider that insignificant, I don't — that means in the order of 1,000 to 2,000 jobs thus created in the private sector, and would have a provincial cost attached to it of \$1 million to \$2 million, which is not insignificant.

But one has to add that job creation of say, 1,000, — for the moment, let's use that figure — added to the other 5,000 approximately, indeed I would say 5,000 to 6,000, of jobs created relating principally to youth this summer. Now that is substantial by any standard or measure of definition — 5,000 to 6,000. I believe that through the summer temporary employment program for the youth, principally students, plus the additionality of the small business assistance program, plus some of the other additions, the Special Municipal Forgivable Loan Fund is another second round or second cycle in the order of \$10 million available there, and the municipal applications are coming in at a fairly good rate.

In addition to that, departments are being encouraged to maximize summer activity that would employ youth or students in the off-summer. When you add all that up, I am quite confident that the figure of 6,000 minimum — and again I say that has to be substantial by any standard of measure.

The honourable member mentions doing something, taking advantage of the present time to do

Friday, May 27, 1977

something with respect to the servicing of land, and the building of new housing on this land. That is being worked on, but my honourable friend surely acknowledges that the first step is the assembly of land. There are no excuses anymore, that's been done. But it took a while to do that. It also takes quite awhile — I don't think my honourable friend has any easy answers, and to be fair to him, he didn't suggest there were any easy answers — in terms of the time it takes to get the necessary plans of subdivision and zoning approvals. But I should tell him that in the Town of West Selkirk, in the northwestern part of Winnipeg, and in south St. Boniface, southeast St. Boniface, that there is action going forward now with respect to both the servicing of land, and lots are being sold in the Town of West Selkirk to smaller private builders, and hopefully this summer there will be construction activity.

He mentions more activity in the Parks Branch. Nopiming Provincial Park which was designated as a new provincial park a year ago, eighteen months ago, or thereabouts, in fact 75 to 150 cottage lots are being prepared there as a starter right now. —(Interjection)— Yes, and 75 to 150 campground parking for trailers and campers. 75 to 150 are being done right now, or if not already started certainly the necessary approval has been given by a Committee of Cabinet in recent weeks. So that 75 to 150 of camper places and there is a certain amount of work that has to be done to prepare that and 75 to 150 cottage lots. But that's only Nopiming Park. There is a great deal being done parallel to take advantage of existing Parks Branch personnel capacity plus additional hiring for the summer in each of the regions, Western, EastMan, Northern region, so that I would estimate in the order of 5 to 600 campgrounds and campground places. Lots development is continuing at Grindstone Point and that was doubled a year ago so that has to be done this year as well. All in all, I believe that the job creation activity program is unfolding well.

I would have to concede to my honourable friend that one would wish that both the servicing of land and the construction of new modest or medium priced housing on that land could have been a few months earlier. Well, having conceded that point, I don't think it is possible to concede that the small business program should be judged yet because the deadline is still two weeks away for the receipt of applications. That's one point. The first deadline. Second point, the Parks Branch, I think, has a full plate in terms of authorized summer work activity projects and I believe that they have additional proposals coming in within ten days.

Yes, Critical Home Repair, old home rehabilitation, that is a program which the Member for Assiniboia mentions with great positiveness and I thank him for but that was before the announcement of this job creation program. That was a program funded to about the \$4 to \$5 million level and that's the base. Over and above that, I believe that the Minister responsible for MHRC has authorization to come forward with an additional amount. The Member for Assiniboia should be aware — I think it is a positive development — that a committee of the City of Winnipeg Council I am not sure that the entire council has dealt with it yet but hoping that my remarks are not premature, it is my understanding that the City of Winnipeg is now thinking, or at least a significant number on council are thinking of taking the City into at least to a modest degree of critical home repair. The province is encouraging that in the sense that, for example, of the \$8 million of grants or forgivable loans that the City has as its allocation under the province-wide municipal forgivable loans program, the City say has in the order of \$7.5 to \$8 million. They can use any part of that towards the improvement and repair of any number of their 300 homes which I understand the City already owns, of old stock of housing. If they wish to spin that off to a not a developer but a private firm, non-profit, which I believe two or three such exist in the Inner City, that certainly would meet with provincial concurrence.

Interestingly and ironically, there is a provision under the National Housing Act which I am not complaining about for the moment but I think it is an unnecessary constraint — which makes it possible for CMHC to lend up to 100 percent of the funds required for the rehabilitation of older homes only if it is owned by a municipality, not if it is owned by the province. —(Interjection)— Well, purchase and rehabilitation. Yes, you are talking about the RRAP areas; well I am talking about availability outside of the RRAP areas. I say I am not complaining for the moment but I feel it is an unnecessary restriction. Be that as it may that's the fact of the matter, then naturally we want to encourage the municipality to . . . if they own a stock of old homes I repeat the City of Winnipeg does seem to own, they could at least move forward with rehabilitation and repair of those, not to mention the possibility of acquiring additional ones, fire-gutted or already health department condemned. It is frustrating. The Member for Assiniboia is right. It is frustrating to think that this could be done in a way that would do something both with respect to the supply of housing and, at the same time, create very directly productive and useful jobs. Well, that is starting to unfold the province has been into this already for some time, not under the provisions of the CMHA but with respect to a homeowner type of grant, for rehabilitation of old homes, privately owned, pensioner and income tested. There are organizations such as WHIP, AMISK, which are doing I believe at the rate of about 40 or 50 homes a year, both purchase and rehabilitation we are encouraging some incremental expansion of that. If the City were to join in with their existing stock of old homes, that would help make a more

Friday, May 27, 1977

meaningful impact. So, things are not only on the drawing board, they are actually into various stages of implementation. The greatest frustration of all is the time it takes to get the necessary approvals with respect to new subdivision land servicing and home construction and on insulation

So wherever there is loan involved as opposed to an outright grant, we do not feel it is prudent nor compatible with parliamentary procedures as we understand it to actually commence a repayable loan program before the formal stages of approval in parliament or the Legislature take place. On a grant program it's somewhat different. So that's one of the reasons, but frankly we did not realistically anticipate the insulation program getting operational or significantly operational until well into June, over the summer and in the fall certainly five months before winter. We hope to have it operational by then.

Here I have to say to the Member for Assiniboine, since he has good Liberal credential it is disappointing in the extreme that the Government of Canada is has not seen fit to follow up their good intentions as they print them in pamphlets and brochures about insulation, following it up with some meaningful program. Now I'm told that they feel if it's to mean anything program would probably be billion of capital implication for the Government of Canada. I have to admit that that's very substantial then they are doing that program in the Maritimes, not in all of the Maritimes, certainly in two of the provinces. I'm not sure, four or two but certainly not less than two and I have to ask, what is the basis for doing it province-wide in two provinces and not in the other eight So just capital cost implications cannot be the because if it cannot be tenable nation-wide then perhaps they shouldn't have started except on a pilot basis in one province or half a province, small province to do it in two provinces and leave the other eight out. It's the same thing with respect to the Beef Stabilization Program shouldn't complain too much because the Federal Government, after dithering for two years finally took a decision that they're going to get involved with the Cow-Calf Price Stabilization but then the hooker was that they would do it for all provinces except those that already had a program and there they would go 50 percent. Well that's ludicrous interpretation of programming that is consistent nation-wide. So, I think they're changing that now. should be changing their insulation program. — (Interjection —

Oh, I thought you were agreeing emphatically with what I was because it really is a peculiar interpretation of national responsibility, to start a program that applies in two provinces, not in the other eight, or that applies in five provinces, not the other five, such as the Cow-Calf Program. — (Interjection)— Well there is also the problem — and it is a real problem — whereby, for example, the price of oil is subsidized east of the Borden line — as it is called — and west of it it is not subsidized, and I don't know what the justification is for it, except to maintain, because it is imported. But, Mr. Chairman, oil was imported long before 1974. And, at that point in time, it was 87 cents a barrel less east of the Borden line and I'm not aware that there was one penny of subsidy west of the Borden line.

Now I think the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has finally got the essence of the matter. Indeed, perhaps there should have been a subsidy, but not the last 88 cents. Because that 88 cents was not taken cognizance of right through the 1960's, when the price of off-shore crude in Eastern Canada was less than the domestic price. Be that as it may.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, to get back to the main point of his concern of the insulation program — how quickly can it get started. I would say that it could get started even more quickly if the Government of Canada would simply undertake to cost-share. We don't expect more than 50 percent of the program. But we have not been able to get a definitive answer why they are prepared to go way beyond 50 percent on an insulation program retro-fitting in two provinces, and less than 50 — in fact zero percent — in the rest of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier has made some response to the remarks of my colleague on an issue that has been of some concern to this caucus for not just the last couple of months, but over the last two or three years. It's a question of creating jobs in the Province of Manitoba. It's only, I think, worth a historical footnote that up until the Budget, that the Honourable Minister of Finance presented, every resolution that we presented in the House concerning job creation measures was voted down by the government caucus, even though almost all those measures have now been incorporated as part of a special job employment program.

Now I say that that is perhaps worth a historical footnote. But I think it perhaps is just further support for the Premier's recognition of the fact that in this case the Liberals are more in a hurry than he was, when it came to the matter of creating proper job employment in the Province of Manitoba. It's only too bad that it took two years for them to catch up to what we recognized was a problem in 1974. I know that the Premier usually likes to exercise himself in late late night bed reading and I'd suggest he go back and look at some of those resolutions that were introduced in this House in the 1974, 1975 and 1976 sessions. That's not the point of my remark. I still think it does come down to the question that was not answered and that is still our basic complaint is that the creation of this special job employment program is going to have a very limited effect because of the choice of the four-month time cut-off that was established.

Friday, May 27, 1977

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Premier has certainly been in the intergovernmental game long enough to know that you should never try to predict what your counterparts may or may not be prepared to do. There may be all kinds of interesting things happen between now and the Fall in terms of what happens in Ottawa, that may ever preclude or add incentive for those kinds of factions. But the fact of the matter is that if we are going to spend this amount of money, which is a substantial expenditure of money from a provincial budget, then our concerns should be to get the best possible use out of that money.

I think that what the Premier and the members of the government will find is that because of setting this sort of four-month time frame around it, that the problem of implementation, of just simply getting the program geared up for action, as well as the reluctance on the part of the many community organizations and private business to simply hook in to a short-term program, will limit its effectiveness. The proposal for providing a certain premium to small business to hire workers, where parts of the salaries would be paid — which again is something we introduced in this House two years ago — I think only works if it is at least a year or more in duration. And to have that as a four-month operation, I think could only be reasonably expected to provide some support for students. It will not supply the kind of longer term job creation for the underskilled or those who have marginal employment opportunities, and are in and out of the job market, to get themselves into a more permanent job setting where they can begin to acquire skills, work habits, and a certain acceptance within that particular job setting, so that it may then lead into further employment opportunities.

I think that is one of the basic problems, Mr. Chairman, as I have talked to small businessmen since the program has been announced. They say that certainly they would be interested in being involved, because they recognize that because in the past, for reasons of the raising of the minimum wage, for example, and other cost reasons, they have cut out a lot of more marginal employment in their own operations. And that this kind of program could bring those kind of workers back in. I think that is particularly the group of people in the job market that this program is aimed at. But to simply do it for three or four months, they say by the time they gear up their program, get someone on site, do some initial training — whatever may be required, but get them into the job — then, you know, you've got two months. So that in a sense much of the effectiveness, from their point of view of getting some additional employees then, will be lost, because it just doesn't run long enough to make good effective use of it.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the things that the government should consider doing at this stage, is to indicate that in those programs where there has been beginnings of a successful implementation of this combined job-work training idea, that they would be prepared for extensions on it. I don't say that that would be universally so, but it would say that maybe the four months should be considered as a first phase, to determine that in some occupations — some job settings — it will work; others it won't. And in those where it does work, where the employee does begin to integrate and get fitted into the job site, that there would be that prospect of extension of it on the approval of both the government and the employer who has made application for it.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, very strongly, that if that particular indication was made, that you would find more effectiveness in the program; that it wouldn't be seen as a short-term program then, but would be seen as one that might have a full year's extension and therefore provide a greater degree of incentive for businessmen to join in on the program.

I would say that similarly the same kind of offer or option might be extended to some of the other institutions — the hospitals, the universities, the municipal agencies that are in the same program. Now I know that that opens up the budget extension a little bit. But I think in this case it is not one that the government necessarily has to commit itself to all these cases. Because the jobs will break down into short-term and longer term type activities. It would seem to me that a declaration of that kind — making that offer at least — would provide, I think, not only for a better use of the money that is now being expended, but also be much more beneficial from the point of view of actually incorporating a good job entry type activity, rather than simply having that kind of a quick cut-off.

You know, Mr. Chairman, we have learned I think — should have learned at least — of the particular problems associated with the short-term job creation. The Federal Government has been in this business now since 1970 I guess, with their LIP Programs, OFY Programs, and so on — summer-type programs. That is the experience that they have learned from it. They are going through a very difficult transition trying to move out of the short-term LIP and OFY Programs into the so-called "Canada Works" Programs. But they are doing so for a very specific reason. They saw that those kind of, you know, short stops really — First, they built up real expectations on the part of those that began working and all of a sudden, three or four months down the track, they say, "Sorry, it's all over." You begin to create a class of people who spend half their time, the last half of that short-term job activity, looking for the next grant. As a result, you know, that you weren't really getting the full benefit of the program. And so what they are trying to do, from the federal proportion under Canada Works, is to at least understand that it has to be not only longer in its term, but also if it is tied in with

the private employer as part of a training program, then that certainly is to my mind, from the evaluations and assessments I've seen, by far the most effective means of bringing underscale or unemployed young people into the job market and allowing them to stay there. The short-term work brings them in and then kicks them right out again. And it's only when you combine that kind of work-training program on a longer term that you don't see them at the Unemployment Insurance office again.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the major flaw in the present program, and I don't think it is a flaw that is difficult to overcome. I think that even at this stage to indicate that there would be provisions for extension of these would provide a much higher degree of effectiveness in the present construction of it.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the remarks made by the Premier concerning the programs related to employment, and the Budget related to housing, and insulation grants, and so on, there are still some major gaps in the programs. I think that the consequence of not really responding to those are really beginning to show up very glaringly right now. I don't know if the Premier has had an opportunity to look at the latest April statistics of Central Mortgage and Housing concerning house construction in Winnipeg and Manitoba. What is very obvious, Mr. Chairman, from these statistics is the private rental market in Winnipeg is dead. Virtually it has come to a standstill. We virtually don't build private apartments any more. The only apartments that are being built are those that are being built under the Federal ARP program which may come to a very short end. — (Interjection)— I agree, I'm not saying that Winnipeg is unusual in that respect although I would say this, more unusual in that we have had really since 1974 a net loss compared, if you look at demand of close to a thousand units per year. In other words we're under-building by a thousand units per year in the apartment market. You know, the choice I've heard expressed by various Ministers of Housing in your government is that the housing shortfall will be made up by public

Well, Mr. Chairman, the government's going to get itself into a very very heavy investment of Public Capital if it's going to try to make up year by year that shortfall through capital expenditure. I still think that there is major room for incentive programs to stimulate the building of private rental units. You know there's two problems of housing, one is supply and one affordability and I think that we have to have programs addressed to both those. In the supply area, Mr. Chairman, we don't have any incentive programs presently from the provincial side in the private market. We don't provide any incentive in the area of land and certainly not any incentive in the area of financing. So that in those two key areas there is no incentive at all. As a result the private rental market is not building apartments and as a consequence of that the vacancy rate in Winnipeg, as announced just two days ago has even gone down further. It's now 1.2 percent in the City of Winnipeg which means there is virtually no market in apartment units, no market at all really. If these statistics mean something it means that it will not change because they're not building them, simply not building them.

Now taking that supply side, I think that there again was room in the development of Capital Expenditures for loan assistance to that to provide for that kind of incentive to get the rental market back on stream to some extent.

Now on the affordability side there is also the need to take a very hard look at the question of housing allowances. That again is a major gap in the Housing Program in this province. Aside from some small 44(1)(b) Programs, which relate to non-profit housing, there isn't really much in the way of housing allowances. I can say that perhaps the most tragic victim of poor housing right now is the person who for most of life has been self-sufficient. It's that retired or semi-retired person who has a small income, who has never had any help from government and has never wanted any and finds out that even under rent control, even under the 8 percent and 7 percent, they can no longer afford to stay in their apartment. So their only out is public housing. You know, maybe \$150 to \$200 a month supplement.

What we really need is a Rent Supplement Program in this province, if you took the baseline of 25 percent of income or 30 percent should go to housing, and then make up the difference in between. First, allowing people to stay in their own apartment and not have to build public housing projects for them because you simply won't build enough, you simply won't keep up. That is one of the most really serious lacks in the housing market at the present time and it is growing more serious. If you look at the age cohorts in the City of Winnipeg, the people in that age bracket, in that income bracket, are increasing rapidly and there is simply no response.

A third point I would make, Mr. Chairman, comes back to the question of insulation. I would just like to ride a hobby-horse of mine, which I have been riding for a long time, with some limited success, but again I think that while the opportunity is here, it is worth repeating. That is that in the loan program that is being made available for insulation, I think that it should also be extended to allow loans for the introduction of fire safety equipment in apartment blocks. There is no such program available right now. That is the cause of much of the demolition, apartment close-downs, and deterioration that the Premier alluded to. That is one reason. — (Interjection)— And it is a job creation program, sure of course it is. — (Interjection)—

Friday, May 27, 1977

Well, if the Minister of Public Works would like me to explain the aspects, it is not too difficult. It takes men and equipment to put smoke detectors, to remodel doors, to change alignment — that costs money, it creates construction, people work on it, and the problem is that there is no private financing available. The banks, private financial companies will not lend in these areas. Therefore, in many cases there is simply no resources available at all. Never mind even talking about a premium interest rate, there is simply no money at all for that kind of program with the result that the only alternative now is if the city goes ahead, they will have to purchase those properties and bring up the standard.

But again if you want to try to retain some semblance of private activity in this field, then again you have got to provide some assistance, again as part of a job creation movement. Because the introduction of that equipment is the application of the fire by-laws in the city and they are now beginning to enforce the Act. It didn't make much sense for a long time because they never enforced it. Now they are beginning to enforce it and by their own lights and by some research that I have just concluded, we are talking about perhaps a close down of 700 or 800 units a year as a result of those by-laws, simply because there is really no ability to bring them up to standard and there is no capital resources available to help do that.

Now that means all of the public housing and more that you have built in the last year will simply be swallowed up, trying to make up for that lack. So there are some real holes in the housing program and again it is our great regret that in spending \$20 million or whatever it is on the job creation program — \$33 million, pardon me — that there wasn't far greater attention paid to the housing component of it, which I think would have had double value. Not only would it have created a lot of jobs, but it also would have created a very major social good in this community, where there are some serious problems right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to speak at length on matters that the Minister of Finance and the Minister responsible for Housing are well able to do, but there are a few interesting points that arise from my honourable friend's discourse.

I would begin by saying that no matter how he tries to slice it' he is advocating a greater degree of state intervention and greater activism in terms of public expenditures from the public purse than most of my colleagues, certainly more than I which I guess does put what I said at the beginning — the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent just transposes his statement very nicely.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge should know that it is possible sometimes in trying to fine tune an economy to overdo it. I tell you bluntly, Mr. Chairman, that in 1973 — my honourable friend has a short memory if he is implying that we are two or three years late with this program — because in fact in 1973 if we erred, it was by going a little too far with job stimulation. The manpower supply market in Manitoba was over-heated in 1973, and I make that as a flat blunt statement. In 1974, it is ludicrous to suggest that there was an unemployment problem in Manitoba. I don't care what the statisticians say. In 1973 and 1974, if anything, there was a shortage in relation to demand, a shortage of manpower supply. In 1975 it was perhaps almost optimally in balance; 1976 if there was a problem it was slight; it's only this year in the past three months that the unemployment levels have started to float high, much higher than we are willing to accept. But let's get at least the recent history straight, that in 1973 and 1974 to have added any more stimulus to job creation would have been absolutely counter-productive. Indeed, upon closer checking we found that we were running into competition problems with the pulp and paper at Abitibi Pulp and Paper, ManFor and others and the mining industry. So my honourable friend shouldn't think that it is always a case of having to stimulate the economy and the manpower demand situation. Now it has changed in the last three months and we are willing to admit that. We are not willing to accept the premise that this was the case in 1975 and most emphatically not in 1974 and 1973.

Having made that basic point I say to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that the suggestion that the summer period temporary employment creation approach in respect to young people, youth, and the private sector, and also departments of government — if he is suggesting that that's not good enough I tell him the other side of that coin is that it is precisely during the summer months that there is a peak of young persons' employment problems, and we regard this as being not only experimental, but in the nature of an apprenticeship. Not a formal apprenticeship, but an informal apprenticeship program in which young people can have occasion or opportunity to work with various types of small business owners and operators to just get a bit of learning curve experience with whatever the nature of the small business. We think that that should be helpful.

To suggest now that that should be put on a twelve month sustained basis I think ignores what we believe to be a fact, and that is that this is principally a summer-peaking problem. On top of that I am not so sure that the private sector should want to look to a permanent year-round system or basis for subsidization of what is hopefully a regular commercial operation.

But if my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, is anxious to see some of these seasonal short-term programs converted into more regular sustaining public subsidy of employment

Friday, May 27, 1977

program, I would tell him that the excellent place to start with that argument — there is room for that argument, it is not as broad as he thinks however — but where there is room and where I would urge him to make further representations is with respect again to at least two departments of the Federal Government.

I have to say that there is much that could be done. There is scope and opportunity to create more jobs that have at least three-quarters viability which is better than half viability or zero viability and that has to do with commercial fishing and has to do with forestry production. But the Federal Government while it has, as he rightly points out, been quite anxious, quite willing to engage in LIP, LEAP and other type of temporary programs, has been most emphatic in refusing to take under the umbrella of those programs or even under the Western Northlands DREE agreement, has refused to make any provision for even 50-50 cost sharing which we would be willing to contemplate with respect to the harvesting of resource — fish and timber — in the more chronic unemployment areas of the province which happen to largely coincide with the zone of commercial fishing and forestry production. And if there is to be an argument made for converting from seasonal short term to longer term, it is in these two fields, with respect to the harvesting of those two resources ; and we stand ready to participate to the extent of 50 percent of the take-up of that extra cost that is needed or that input that is needed over and above commercial revenues earned.

But you know the irony of it is that in our frustration and perhaps impatience, and maybe Louis St. Laurent was right after all, we are in a little more of a hurry than the Lib Liberals, we have not waited for confirmation of 50-50 cost sharing. Had we done so, we would be waiting yet. In the meantime we have gone ahead with financial input in two or three cases on a regular year-round basis with respect to two or three pulp and logging operations. They have not been commercially viable, but they have been in the order of two-thirds commercially viable which means that the subsidy is relatively shallow as opposed to a deep subsidy.

Now it's a rather ironic situation because now I will be accused of being very critical of the Federal Government and I have to say that in that respect I am. But on the other hand the Government of Canada, I think, has been quite generous with respect to not only the short term programs which my honourable friend complains about, with some justification, but they have been generous as well with putting in 50 percent, 60 percent, indeed 60 percent of the capital cost of infrastructure installation and . . .

A MEMBER: Jack Horner move over, here comes Ed.

MR. SCHREYER: My honourable friend shouldn't hold his breath. My honourable friend shouldn't hold his breath but that's an aside, Mr. Chairman.

I sometimes wonder if this is deliberate rational policy or if it is Machiavellian on the part of the federal people or whether they just haven't thought it through. If they have, they obviously are at a different conclusion than the Member for Fort Rouge who I know used to be regarded as a highly efficient executive assistant to the Honourable Paul Hellyer at one time and John Turner. So the fact that he is now at a completely different conclusion than some Federal Ministers I find somewhat amusing. But more important than amusing, I find it rather interesting as to why they are at different conclusions, because the Federal Government still persists in concentrating exclusively on short-term job creation some of which, although well-intended, is just nonsensical. And if you want examples, I will give you some.

In addition to that, and somewhat more justifiable, 60 percent or more of the capital cost of infrastructure installation in northlands communities — and that has a job spin-off effect, but that is only during the period of actual installation of the infrastructure. What I am suggesting is that in the domain of fish harvesting, commercial fishing in other words, and timber operations, in areas of proximity to chronic unemployment, they really should make a change in their policy so as to contribute at least 50 percent of the, let us hope, shallow subsidy that is needed on a continuing basis to provide livelihood earning opportunity for these people in these self-same communities. That is specifically what they refused to do. As soon as they note that you are talking about something more ongoing, they back away immediately. So my honourable friend had better do his persuasion in Ottawa and then come back and tell us that there is something tangible to talk about.

In the meantime we have, with respect to both fish and fur, at least gone some modest way towards regular, sustained employment creation by virtue of the 50 percent subsidy on commercial fish transportation. Now I am going to wait to hear my honourable friend say that we should be subsidizing at 100 percent. We have left the gap there for the federal entry, and by the way, commercial fishing, even inland, is a federal responsibility that was delegated to Manitoba in 1930 and now I think the Member for Lakeside would probably agree that they refuse to take it back. Something they have delegated, they don't want to take back and you just can't walk away, because that is to leave a certain number of people in a sort of no-man's land, which no government, in conscience, can do.

So there are reasons, you know, Mr. Chairman, to suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge that even if half of what he said is accepted as being correct, he leaves unanswered the whole question as to

why the senior level of government doesn't do at least some of what he is preaching.

My final point then, Mr. Chairman, is that with respect to his reference to fire safety, fire code standards, that sure, although it cannot be said to be the main reason, there is a job creation spin-off if there were to be the installation of upgraded fire safety standards and equipment in apartment blocks, but under the Rent Control Program, any improvements made of that nature are chargeable as a cost pass-through, so the landlord need not fear that he wouldn't be able to recover the costs of much needed fire safety improvements. That being the case, I am not sure that I understand what my honourable friend's point was.

You know there are people on the other side of that issue. There was an honourable member of this House back in 1966-67, thereabouts, who made a career of opposing any suggestion of the city or the province in those days of upgrading fire safety regulations and equipment and fire escapes and the like.

But let us say that we do agree with the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that there should be improvements made. Indeed we have passed, and it took effect a month ago, an upgraded fire safety set of regulations and building code — the City of Winnipeg has asked for a 60 day extension on that, and that has been granted, but the new code and regulations come into effect in the City of Winnipeg as well, before the end of June, I am quite sure, and I repeat the owner is entitled to pass the costs through, and the Rent Review mechanism allows that.

Now, if he is suggesting that we should be lending money on that, I don't know what the justification could be for that kind of approach. He says as well that a group of people that are finding it difficult to meet rents are those who have been, as he put it, self-sufficient up to now, people on retirement income. Well, I believe it is fair to say that if they have a problem being close to the line, that that problem is not aggravated over what it was a few years ago, even four years, three or four years ago, because the pensions — well, what pensions is he talking about? — Because the Old Age Security and the Annual Income Supplement, GIS and OAS, are both indexed and the index rate is at least as high as the allowable increase in the rent on apartments. The Canada Pension Plan is indexed, so unless he is referring to private pension plans, but for the most part I believe that while there has not been improvement in the face of inflation, I can't see to what extent there has been deterioration of the position of that particular group, given that the rent levels have been held to an indexed rate of increase in the past — what, two years? — that are not out of line, in fact they must be commensurate, probably a little lower than the rate of index on pensions themselves guaranteed, the GIS and the OAS and the Canada Pension Plan. So my honourable friend, I think, in response will want to reflect on those facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am prompted to add a few comments to the debate at this particular time, recognizing that my colleague from Fort Garry has possibly made some of the more major comments on the Job Creation Program for our side earlier on in the day.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that listening to my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, and the First Minister, listening to the representatives of the Liberal and the New Democratic Party debating this issue, it does sadden me that the debate is entirely taken up with what governments can do with respect to job creation. I have to concur with the one comment that the First Minister made, that one would not want to build long-term features into this kind of a program because that would not be doing the private sector any favour in the sense that to build a dependency of this nature onto a program like this doesn't encourage the kind of a healthy development, the kind of job that can stand competitive pressure in our market-oriented society. So to that extent I concur. But I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that we are on a treadmill, we are on a merry-go-round, and that as we pursue the policies that we are on now, we will be talking more and more about these kinds of subjects and these kinds of matters. We will be looking more and more to government as being the sole authority, the sole responsibility in terms of resolving short-term, chronic, or longer term unemployment problems.

Now of course those are precisely the issues, Mr. Chairman, that the First Minister and this government faces, and I don't wish to report to him as a teacher's pet might sometimes do when the Minister is absent, but I do this for other reasons, simply so that he doesn't accuse Opposition members for distortion and for wilful dissemination of untruths, but it happens to enter into this debate.

It was only yesterday in this very Chamber that members of his side suggested that we should nationalize International Nickel, Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting, Sherritt-Gordon, and every mining company in the Province of Manitoba. That was said most emphatically, Mr. Chairman, as the brownout we experienced in the flickering light, and it was said in fact, for dramatic effect, by candlelight or match light.

Now, Mr. First Minister, I am deadly serious about this. The Member for Flin Flon suggested that he would emphatically move and support and use his good influences in his caucus, in your caucus, to nationalize the mining industry. Now I am saying that we have just dealt with the Minister of Mines

Friday, May 27, 1977

and Natural Resources' Estimates, and I have just finished chastising the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources of Estimates that criticize him on ideological grounds. Nationalize him if you will, but show me where you are picking up the slack. Show me where you are picking up the slack in exploration dollars. Show me where you are creating the jobs. Don't have the Minister of Mines stand up and congratulate himself for bringing in a stand-pat Budget for bringing in a Budget that shows no increase. In the meantime you are scaring off the private developers. You can't have it both ways.

The Minister of Mines either comes in here with a considerably bumped-up Budget, you know into the \$50 million, \$80 million, \$100 millions of dollars, to take up that slack, or you don't allow or you squelch that kind of talk.

Now the other thing, even more serious, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in attempting to defend and fully explain your position of two-and-a-half times one on the income position, he took the better part of the afternoon to explain that I, having the capacity of managing 500 cattle should be happy to do that and my neighbour who has the capacity of managing 10 head of cattle and does that very well, that we should both be satisfied with similar returns. I think that's not stretching the point, I think that's displaying in a more graphic form the difference. If the Honourable Member for Gladstone has the capacity of farming 1,600 acres and farming them well, and if the honourable member whoever or somebody has the capacity for farming 140 acres well and they should be both be doing and contributing as best they both can, then both should be satisfied with the same return. That's what we spent, Mr. Minister, in your absence as you were touring the resources of the north, that's what we spent the afternoon on yesterday afternoon.

I just want to — and I'm very happy the Member for St. Johns is back in his seat — because I am sensitive to the charges that come from that side from time to time that we are deliberately distorting, that we are spreading the big lie, that we are not being truthful in the presentation of what we hear from honourable members opposite. I'm suggesting, and I'm using this occasion when we're talking about jobs, that if government caucus spokesmen talk about the nationalization of Inco, Hudson Bay, Sherritt-Gordon and every mining industry in this province, and you have not shown any willingness on the part of the public to pick up the slack, you have shown no willingness to extract those kind of tax dollars from the public to do that, then obviously jobs are going to go wanting. Jobs are going to go wanting. If you're going to suggest to the entrepreneurial community of Manitoba that we embrace as wholeheartedly as the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wanted us to embrace yesterday afternoon the concept that you, sir, first espoused in terms — I bet you were even generous about it when you were saying, 2 ½ times 1. Your colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, wasn't that generous. He took exception to the fact, why 2 ½ times 1? Why not 1 to 1? — (Interjection) — No, no but you said — (Interjection) — More equal, okay. You said, "more equal." But, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to rehash yesterday's debate. The point is we are talking about jobs. We're talking about jobs and we are working with our sister provinces in Canada in competition with the United States, with our trading partner. And by the way the Americans are resolving their economic problems far better than we are, far better than we are in terms of inflation, in terms of jobs and in terms of GNP.

Mr. Chairman, all I'm suggesting is that the people of Manitoba will welcome, we will welcome the make-work projects that this program envisages. And for every person that you employ we will be happy for it and we will welcome it. Every municipality that can take advantage of this program we will be happy for it. Every worthwhile thing that gets done will be an achievement and for that we are happy for, and we will support. But the very nature of the program, you know the parameters that the government, the First Minister puts on — we're talking of a four month program. Surely it doesn't give us any reason to be complacent about the future of permanent job creation in this province. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that this is a danger that we fall into, that we accept the medicine to effect a short term cure, but it happens to be a pretty addictive kind of medicine. We are not addressing ourselves and I haven't heard — we've had now an hour or an hour and a half debate, a discourse between the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the First Minister and I suspect we will hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce shortly, but nowhere in this whole question of job creation have we addressed ourselves even for ten minutes to the major supply of jobs, the private sector. — (Interjection) — Well, then we laugh. We laugh at the private sector, but my honourable friend from Churchill, the private sector still at least happens to employ most people in the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: How many people? How many people?

MR. ENNS: Most people in Manitoba. Now if you want to laugh at that sector, if you want to burden them with taxes, if you want to turf them out, if you want to make this a hostile climate for them to operate in, then make it that.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member would reply to a question. I wonder if the member was here between 12 and 12:30 before we broke for lunch.

MR. ENNS: No, as a matter of fact I was looking after my 240 head of cattle between 12 and 12:30 because there was still interest enough for me to do that because if I look after them, then possibly my return might be a little bigger than the fellow down the road who has 50 head of cattle. He could have

been here earlier and had we elected him into office he would have been here at 12:30 or between 12 and 12:30 — (Interjection) — Well, okay, I apologize. Mr. Chairman, I really didn't want to play the role of informing to the First Minister what happens when the cat's away, the mice will play, because that wouldn't be fair to the First Minister nor to the Minister of Mines nor to the Member from Flin Flon. Neither are mice and neither are cats, they are honourable members and honourable friends. But I want to again put it clearly on the record that your good friend and influential Member from Flin Flon representing a mining community emphatically suggested in this Chamber last night that the mining industry should be nationalized and he would work unceasingly toward that end. So when you hear that on the campaign trail, Mr. Minister, that's no distortion, that's no lie. That is a goal that a member of the New Democratic Party, a member of the caucus of the New Democratic Party is working to. And I assume is working ceaselessly to. — (Interjection) — Right, right. That's right, with the knowing support of the Minister of Mines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member, now he is distinguishing between what was said by the Member for Flin Flon and the big lie. He has shown the distinction.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I refuse that. I was goaded on. I was goaded on to say and suggest with the support of the Minister of Mines because the Minister of Mines' head was nodding, which unfortunately the people of Manitoba do not see, was nodding while I was making that statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I indicated my position in this House and not only in this House but throughout the province. I was nodding that that is what the Member for Flin Flon said and I respect that opinion. But to suggest that I am supporting that, the honourable member knows it is false and I therefore ask him to distinguish. The truth is that the Member for Flin Flon said it. The big lie is that I support it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, but surely, surely, just to get this little point straight. If I go home to my constituents and say, "A distinguished, well liked, influential member of the New Democratic Party caucus wants every mining company in this province nationalized," that would not be a lie. Right? Can we have that on the record?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or privilege or whatever. I said that. I believe in that. But the only support I got on this side of the House was from Cy Gonick. That's why he quit.

MR. ENNS: . . . accept the fact that he didn't withdraw the fact that he was a distinguished member, an important member and an influential member, representing a mining community and above all, my friend.

Mr. Chairman, in deference to the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry who want to contribute to the debate, I've made the small point that I wanted to make and that really was — (Interjection) — No, the point is this, that we are discussing job creation. We're discussing job creation and when Liberals and socialists talk about it, it doesn't involve the private sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's remarks are too philosophically interesting to allow to go unresponded. Sir, I apologize to my colleague, the Minister of Finance for prolonging discussions that are not directly germane to the immediate matter under discussion but I suppose in a broader sense it is all connected.

I have to say to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that of course if he wants to take advantage of an opportunity to work mischief then he can. But he already senses that his conscience is bothering him as to how much, if he were to blow out of proportion the comments of one honourable member of this caucus with respect to any one industry or another because does it surprise my honourable friend when I tell him that in fact, Sir Winston Churchill, a member of the Conservative Party or was it Liberal at the time, I've forgotten, he was responsible, practically to the opposition of every member of the Conservative Government of his day, to the nationalization of British Petroleum. But it was Sir Winston Churchill who insisted on it at the time when he was First Lord of the Admiralty. And there was bitter philosophic opposition because of that nationalization move. Then again, it was, I think by some ironic — it had to be irony and coincidence that his grandson, now a young member of Parliament was, if not the prime mover, was one of the prime movers of the nationalization of Rolls Royce and if there was ever an epitomizing example of private enterprise it was Rolls Royce for over a half century. Yet his grandson was responsible for the argumentation justifying its nationalization. Why do I mention that? Merely to point out that these kinds of considerations have to be looked at on the basis of a case study analysis and not I'm afraid on broad philosophic principles.

If my honourable friend is trying to suggest that we in this government have an attitude that if something moves that we should nationalize it, then I say to him on the other hand there are Conservatives who are responsible for the nationalization of some of the glory of private enterprise earlier this decade and six decades ago such as was the case of the very inception of British Petroleum. By the way, British Petroleum today is a corporate entity which the British Crown owns 62

percent dating back to 1911 and that 62 percent interest is worth literally billions of dollars not only because of its different holdings but because of North Sea and had they not had that then I suppose Texaco, Gulf or perhaps Aquatane would have owned it and that would be okay, except that most people don't know that Aquatane is owned by the French Republic as a state enterprise. So it goes.

I've just come back, Sir, from the Queen Elizabeth Islands in the high Arctic and I have to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, were it not for a consortium which is 45 percent Crown owned and the other 55 percent is quarter-owned by the Crown through another holding company so you add it together, it's 70 percent, were it not for that combination, then there would not be 800 men working at drilling rig activity in the Arctic. It's as simple as that. And yet, Sir, if I may digress for a moment I can think of few things more important to Canada's future wellbeing than the exploration and development activity going on in the Arctic and in the islands of Canadian sovereignty in the high Arctic. It's being done if not exclusively, very heavily, as a result of a combination of public owned activity.

That doesn't mean that mining companies must as a general rule be nationalized, except the Honourable Member for Lakeside should do the courtesy to the Member for Flin Flon to hear the reasons why he thinks it's a good idea, and that that's what debate is all about. For the moment my honourable friend has me rather confused as to whether he really believes that nationalization of the mining industry is a policy of this government because I can tell him quite plainly that it is not. But having said that I want to put the converse question to my honourable friend. Is he in a very Pavlovian way automatically opposed to any degree of public owned and public backed activity in mining exploration, because that is not an entirely different question, but it is a somewhat different question. And if my honourable friend is opposed to that, then I have to tell him that he is at least as extreme in his position as those who say that automatically, without case study analysis, there should be nationalization of the mining industry. That position is not less extreme and we do want to avoid extremes.

My honourable friend furthermore should not try to create the impression that there has been no significant rate of mining exploration and development. I think that one of the problems if there is one is that my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources is too modest because he could have reported to you that there has been significant, not only exploration activity but in the discovery earlier this year. So what does my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside want? He wants a bonanza to be struck every year? It doesn't work that way. I believe it's true to say that Manitoba has gone over the past five decades for years at a time without any significant strike in terms of mineral ore bodies and then there have been strikes and so indeed had there been in recent months, would it in any way change the reality? Maybe it would change the psychology if there were to be an announcement that in fact there has been significant discovery.

In the meantime we're talking about job creation and my honourable friend should be aware that the private sector in Manitoba is providing employment today for approximately in the order of 90 percent of the labour force. So he cannot make the argument that somehow we regard the private sector as unimportant. —(Interjection)— Well, indeed Mr. Chairman. But it is an axiom of government, Mr. Chairman, it's an axiom of government, that if something is not bust don't try to fix it. Now the private sector by virtue of the fact that it is functioning reasonably — (Interjection) — No, I think someone else did but I can't remember whom unfortunately that's the problem. But if the private sector is employing in a relatively steady and stable way, 90 percent of the total labour force what does my honourable friend suggest. What is he suggesting? That we should move in to fix something that is working reasonably well? So let it work, let it continue working. —(Interjection) — Help not compete. Well I thought competition. . . Impede or compete? —(Interjection)— Oh, I'm sorry because I was about to say that competition presumably is the hallmark of the system that my honourable friend wants to see protected in such purity that even the late Sir Winston Churchill would blush, because he was known on occasion to want to nationalize this or that. And I'm not so sure my honourable friend probably doesn't harbour a great resentment at this less than true Conservative, for those instances.

Be that as it may, we are what I believe to be in a temporary situation with respect to employment levels. You know, let honourable members cast their minds back six years. There was considerable pessimism in 1971 that the unemployment rates would hold up quite high and perhaps worsen, and in two years that dramatically changed. That is why I say quite unapologetically that we do not want this Job Creation Program to be regarded as some permanent feature, point one; and point two, we are not trying to exaggerate or over-emphasize the degree of slack or importance that it is supposed to fill, in meeting what we still believe to be a shorter term phenomenon.

Let honourable members look at the TED Report, just to get some historical perspective. The Manitoba economy, a combination of private and public sector, has succeeded in creating and sustaining more jobs than the TED Report even envisaged as a target. So that by 1973 our labour force, and total numbers employed in the labour force, was higher than the 1980 target. I believe that to be correct. If I'm not, I'm not out by more than one year. So what I'm saying in effect is, that with

Friday, May 27, 1977

respect to labour force plus total employment, Manitoba is running three years at least, and possibly four years, ahead of the TED Report.

So that one cannot therefore engage in all kinds of negative doom talk about our economy. Maybe it's being too candid — it is, in my opinion, one of the healthier economies in Canada. It is not as healthy or buoyant as Alberta; of course not. It is not quite as buoyant as Saskatchewan even, but it is more buoyant than any other province in terms of unemployment levels and in terms of relative improvement in disposable *per capita* income.

The disposable *per capita* income measurement is an important one and it shows that Manitoba has made relatively better progress in relation to the national average of disposable *per capita* income than certainly was the case in the early 70s, just so my honourable friend doesn't think I am being too partisan, and certainly all of the 60s. It was in 1975 and 1976 that disposable *per capita* income actually caught up to and exceeded the national average of disposable *per capita* income.

Now we may drop below again for a year or two, but I am hoping that it can then sustain at that trend line. So somebody will say, "Well, that's not good enough." Well, I suppose for the nay sayers it's not good enough. But in relation to the performance of the Manitoba economy through the late 50s, 60s, the first four years of the 70s, it is better — significantly better. And what am I using as a standard of measure to say "better". Well, the relationship between the Manitoba disposable *per capita* income for the past fifteen years in relation to the national average. The national average was always higher, except in the last two years.

Which brings me to the point, then, about this two-and-a-half to one business. I am in a way happy that one of my statements has given my honourable friends something to gnaw over just as though it were a very succulent bone to mull over or gnaw away it, and I don't mean that unkindly. In other words, it has preoccupied their attention. And well it should, because, Mr. Chairman, the question of relative incomes in any stable society is one that the public should never lose sight of.

I know full well that there will never be full accord and agreement as to what is the optimum, in terms of relative income. But I know this, that no stable democracy can ignore that question for very long because if it does, there is a great hazard of that democracy becoming unstable. Why? Well, because it is in the very nature of things. It is a feeling that beats in the human breast that dignity of the human personality has something to do with relationships between people; that the dignity of labour has something to do with the relationships between people, including the relationships of their material well being. I don't want that remark now to be misconstrued as saying that I am an economic materialist. Nevertheless, relationships of material well being cannot be ignored either. If it is, dignity of labour then becomes in danger as well. But for those who believe in the work ethic, therefore will believe in the dignity of labour, they cannot ignore the question of relationships between people, which has to take into account relationships and material well being.

I was not talking about someone on welfare. I was not talking about someone who was on the minimum wage. I was talking about the composite industrial wage level and the relationship between that and the highest paid echelons of any given entity. There is no magic to the figure two-and-a-half to one. Where that arises is that I was indicating that that happens to be a relationship already realized, or arrived at, in at least two western democracies. In at least two, and I suspect more, because it is in the context of take-home pay after taxes as between someone — some theoretical person — at the composite industrial wage level and the highest paid echelon of any corporate endeavour.

I believe that there are of course dramatic exceptions. But for that matter, we are not that far from that already in parts of Canada, practically all of Canada. But on the other hand, there are dramatic exceptions. The salary of some of the Presidents of some of the very major corporations, I have to admit is way beyond — way beyond that. But the pay levels between the most senior people in smaller-sized corporations, and the composite wage level today, and the after-tax position, is not very far from two-and-a-half to one; not very far. Who knows? Ten, twenty years from now there may be those who say that that isn't acceptable. In the meantime, it serves as a goal.

What did the late Franklin Roosevelt mean when he talked about the real test being whether or not we moved towards adding to the lives of those who have less? Well, he must have been talking about the quest for greater equality. Which is not to say therefore flat equality. Whoever takes that interpretation is again doing mischief and one can never be stopped from playing mischief.

But that is the context of that remark. Since my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, is preoccupied with it, I thought I should give the full background. Probably even in that context, he doesn't agree with it and I'm not suggesting that he should necessarily. But it's a far cry from suggesting that the wage relationship between the President of a company and someone who is just entering the labour force at the minimum wage, two-and-a-half to one; that was not the context at all.

Anyway, we wonder why the work ethic that is sometimes suggested is not quite as strong as it should be, could be, and some would say as it used to be. I wonder about the last point. But nevertheless, my point is that the work ethic is best served by dignity attaching to labour and that dignity best attaches to labour if there is less, rather than gross, disparity, as between those who are

in supervisory positions and those who are in productive positions in the labour force.

I see that in a very dramatic way when I visit a mine. I see it in a dramatic way when I visit a packing house. I saw it in a dramatic way yesterday at a oil drill site, where the responsibilities of the President of the company is one thing, and the kind of pace of work and action and activity on the drill site in Arctic weather conditions is such that there really is scant justification for that kind of ratio spread — if that.

I think it is the fountainhead of hypocrisy for there to have been such emphasis on the work ethic and the dignity of labour fifty years ago, when remuneration and material living conditions as between those working at the pithead, or those working on an assembly line, and those up in supervisory positions, material conditions and salary differentials of 10, 15, 20 to 1. And they expect dignity to attach to labour under those circumstances?

Now we all know that this and any other country can run into great difficulty, Mr. Chairman, because of unrestrained expectation which fuels the fires of inflation. And then they ask people to agree in the national interest to restrain themselves, or to accept restraint. And then we find those who are earning — whether it's earning or receiving — levels of remuneration that are 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 times as much as seasoned people in the work force at the composite industrial wage level; that one knows that that kind of state of affairs makes nonsense of any attempt to get any response to an appeal for restraint in the national interest. I mean, how can it be? If those who are at the composite industrial wage index level, which is in the order of \$11,000 today — so it's obvious we're not talking about the minimum wage for learners and apprentices — and for people to be at the composite industrial wage includes many who are older and seasoned — for them to be satisfied with \$11,000 and some arbitrary cut-off on increments, and to have somebody at \$60,000 or more incrementing not at \$1,500 or \$2,000 but at \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000 or \$10,000 or \$12,000 makes a mockery of the best of national efforts to get restraint in a time of urgent necessity.

So that is part of the context. There is no ultimate answer. Certainly there is no easy answer. Perhaps there is no ultimate answer, even a hard one. Because the matter is one of dynamics; it is not a static situation. My honourable friend at least should have some sympathy for the fact that no-one on this side is suggesting simple answers such as nationalizing this or that, or putting some flat scale of pay reward. But we are cautioning — indeed pleading, pleading just as much as cautioning and admonishing — that there has got to be some recognition taken about the opposite problem, and that is one of the growing and diverging disparity in income and material reward. Not that material reward is the whole part of life, but it is certainly part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Premier has just finished giving an interesting discourse of his own about how you go about achieving equality in society.

I find the remarks somewhat interesting, because in his earlier response he almost denied, in some ways, efforts to create greater equality in society; when he seemed to suggest that in the work force of Manitoba that there was not a substantial number of people who have been permanently unemployed for years by reason of lack of education, lack of income and lack of skills. And when he said that there has been no unemployment problem in Manitoba during the 1970s he, Mr. Chairman, is dead wrong. That when you look at statistics — and he may not want to look at statistics but those are a pretty fair indicator — that at a time when the unemployment rate in Manitoba was around five percent, which is considered to be a relatively stable position — between four and five percent — the rate of unemployment amongst young men and women living in the inner city of Winnipeg was around 15 percent. And it has been that way right through the 70s. The disparities between that group and segment of the population and those that he talked about — those with other advantages — has been a consistent factor of our social fabric. And to ignore that fact and to say it was not in existence and that therefore we don't need special work programs or training programs, to move them out of it I think is denying a basic fact of right now, you know, there are reasons for it.

There was a time in the society when it didn't take a lot of high school certificates, a university diploma or degree to get a job. But we are building a certificate society and there are large numbers of people — creepingly large numbers of people — who find themselves closed out of a lot of job options. And not simply because of their own lack of motivation and willingness. There are increasing numbers who simply find it unable to find a job based upon their present level of skills, or even their abilities, or even in some cases their own motivations.

The Premier has alluded in this House several times past with some pride to the WHIP Project. I don't know if he knows how it got started. It was started out mainly to take street kids, young men, primarily, who couldn't get jobs, and give them work experience — for the first time in their lives when they come to work every day and learn skills in a job. That wasn't accomplished in four months, Mr. Chairman. That has only been accomplished after two or three very hard painstaking years of work. Now I think the program is beginning to succeed; that the people who go through the program are beginning to acquire skills. But it is not a short-term three-month operation. It was something that started back in 1972 and 1973 and it is only now reaching its potential for enabling people to acquire

those skills.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of position that we are talking about. The First Minister suggested that in my remarks I was talking about a higher degree of state intervention, and so on. I wasn't necessarily saying that. I was saying that in many cases our approaches now are not working. We put vast amounts of money into the community colleges, and the Manpower programs, and yet the experience of the Manpower Department itself, the report by the Canadian Council and Social Development have all pointed out that they have far less utility and far more slack in their ability of transferring someone who is unemployed and unskilled into a job position than a work training program in combination with private business. And that was the kind of argument we were making. That we are putting an awful lot of money and getting little value for it in any of these other programs, that the emphasis should be there.

That's why the remarks by the Member for Lakeside are actually, you know, pretty irrelevant and shallow. Because when he is talking about he didn't hear us talking about using private enterprise, the fact is his ears were deadened by too much mooing and braying at noon hour. Because the fact of the matter is that is exactly what we are talking about. He is providing a means of co-operation between the private sector and the public sector. I think that has been lacking in this province. There hasn't been much co-operation.

I make no apology, Mr. Chairman. Our group believes very strongly in the social responsibility of business. We don't believe in a Darwinian, sort of Adam Smith, Calvin Coolidge theory that only the strongest survive. We believe that because the private sector, as well as other sectors, gets major benefits in the society, that they also have responsibilities. And one of their major responsibilities is to provide for employment opportunities and training opportunities for those who don't have them. But certain incentives are needed.

The problem is that we have too much polarization going on here. One group — and I've heard it many times on that side in the field of housing — is saying, "We don't trust the private sector in the housing field; we will do it ourselves." This side says, "We don't trust the public sector, we will leave it up to private enterprise." What we are saying is that in this very complicated world, there may be areas where a high degree of partnership and joint enterprise is needed, and that the particular skills and assets and resources can be utilized.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . the honourable member made, I did not refer to, and I would like to ask him accordingly this: When he made his suggestion rather casually about the possible program whereby the Crown would subsidize — presumably shallow subsidy — for those living in privately-owned apartment blocks, was he suggesting that this be done in conjunction then with some method of rent control, or was he suggesting that could be done without any necessity of rent control?

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, just to digress — if the Minister would know that I have been arguing in this House, again since 1974, for a program of rent restraint. I was probably the first one in this House to make that case because I felt that the beginning of 1973, when the apartment market began to drop off, that the rent increases at that time, in 1973-74, were 20 percent, and that was the problem that we talked about earlier, that retired woman who no longer can make it. It was when in 1973, 1974, 1975, when rents were going up in many cases 20 percent, that the base line simply moved up.

Now in direct answer to the question, I believe that what we really need — and I again have said it — as part of the rent control program, two other aspects that are desperately needed. One is the incentive for the increased supply of rental housing so that we can get our vacancy rate up around the five percent level, and thirdly is a rent allowance program in combination with it and I think the three go together. Each one separately doesn't work as well as the three working together, and that is exactly what we need at the present time. I think I have stated the that position. I think the Minister of Consumer Affairs would recognize that that is the statement we exchanged. He asked me in his Estimates' debate whether I would propose, that is what I proposed and I still think it is a good idea and I would still like to see it done.

But the fact is, I still think that what we are not recognizing in this whole job discussion, is that there is existing in the province a growing number of people, primarily young people, who simply can't get jobs through whatever stimulus the private sector gets through its own resources because they can't get that first entry. The short-term three or four month program that was announced will not be much of an incentive to bring them in.

I just went back over the resolution that we introduced in this last session. It was voted down by members opposite, and I would read it, that "Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of enacting legislation to provide jobs, employment and training of new skills for inner city residents by instituting tax incentives to private employers for the hiring and training of workers for the inner city, with particular emphasis on the unskilled young people."

Now, that sounds to me like we are using private business. I don't know what the Member for Lakeside is talking about, frankly. I think what he is trying to do is to make a debating case rather than

Friday, May 27, 1977

listening to what was really being said. Because if we do go back to the point that there has to be that degree of co-operation to make the program work, and Mr. Chairman, if that problem is not recognized, and if the Minister thinks that this is a short-term phenomenon, that if we get by until fall everything will go back to the way it was, that five percent level or four percent level, you still haven't solved the problem. You still haven't solved the problem, even if you get it back down to that level. You still haven't solved the problem that there is a growing number of young people in the age range of 18 to 24 or 28 who simply are not getting jobs.

The Minister of Finance was exactly right. That was a problem that was identified by the eight leaders at the Summit Conference. They said that is a major emphasis. Well, if it is being emphasized there, they recognize it there, other governments are beginning to recognize it, so we're simply saying we should be recognizing it here in the kind of job training programs that we are instituting. That is the point that we are trying to make, that that growing recognition that it is becoming one of the major economic problems of our time, one of which I don't see there are any villains.

I don't blame the New Democratic Party or government for creating the problem. I think the problem was created by a lot of servicemen who returned in 1945 to 1948 and decided it was the time to have a family, and that cohort of the post-war babies has been moving through our system like a flood tide. It hit the primary schools and the secondary schools and the universities and now they are in the job market and in the housing market, and so what we have to do is talk about natural human instincts to procreate, I guess, if you want to create a villain. But the fact is that there are increasingly large numbers of people in that situation and the kind of short-term thing we are talking about, the summertime programs, is really not an answer.

Mr. Chairman, I teach at a university. You know what often happens, there are many students who simply are kind of fighting to get back into graduate schools because they know they won't have jobs in the fall. They may catch on something this summer. In a sense we are almost creating a false educational market because it is warmer in there than it is outside and they know they are not going to get employment this fall. —(Interjection)— No, you know, Mr. Chairman, it was not true 20 years ago. I can indicate to the Minister that if looks again at the figures in terms of the changes, that 20 years ago three to four percent of the available people in that age range were going to university. It is now close to fifteen and twenty percent. —(Interjection)— Well, whatever the mix has got to be, in fact we have highly inflated expectations. We went through a period in the late sixties, where there was a lot of propaganda, both on the national level, and I even think the departments here were saying the best way to economic development was to get that university degree. We hypped up all kinds of people to go to universities, and universities were as much responsible. But we built up a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy, you know, that you have to kind of keep going in. I am in the business and I decry oftentimes what is going on. We went at a mad expansionary rate. We built very elaborate and luxurious facilities, and we enticed students to come in, basically on the promise that when you get out the golden egg is going to be under the rainbow. They are coming out right now, Mr. Chairman, and there is no golden egg there anymore. In fact they are coming back and saying, "Well, if I can't make it with my B.A., then I'll go back and get an M.A." And then two years later when they've got their M.A., they say there are no jobs available, so I better try and get a Ph.D.

Last year — I can give you an example, Mr. Chairman — it's not something that will bring great tears to the eyes of members opposite perhaps, but last year we created 35 Ph.D.s in physics and chemistry from the University of Manitoba. Not one had a job when they came out. Not one. Now, many of them left the province and slowly but surely they are beginning to find employment elsewhere, many of them in the United States. But 35 graduates and, Mr. Chairman, not one of them was able to find employment upon graduation.

Now, there are reasons for it: retrenchment in government — the Department of Mines and Resources were no longer hiring biologists to do environmental tests; oil companies were no longer hiring them to do it. So there was great retrenchment, but the fact is that they were coming through the system and they were coming out saying, "Heh, you know, I now spent 12 years getting an education. Where is that \$15,000 job?" It just wasn't there.

And that's why I think that the kind of sophistication we have to bring to these kind of employment training programs that we are talking about is really required at this point. That is my basic, underlying objection to this program. I don't think that it is targeted for the real sort of areas of unemployment slag that we have got presently and that we should be targeting much more carefully and much more finely tuned to those areas where we see that the problem of employment is going to be a continuing one — the unskilled native person in downtown Winnipeg; certainly the numbers of educated people who are coming out with degrees for which there is no longer employment; certain numbers of women in the work force; people who are in ages of 50 years old and are now finding that they are being pushed out for technological reasons.

I can give you another example in my own constituency, Mr. Chairman, in that when Eaton's Catalogue closed down, there were all kinds of women in the age range of 48 to 55, who were forced to leave on very very small pensions, who are now sort of sitting there, exactly the kind of problem I

described before, paying 50 percent of their income on rent because they can't get a job. At age 50 it is tough to get a job. And yet, you know, the whole pension system works against it. We have a pension system that really works against kind of continuous employment and while there may be many benefits to it, there is also a downside to it. That's one of the targets we should be aiming at.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have never said it and I know the Minister of Finance will agree with me — in his Budget I have never said that I was against the job-training program. I have said that I think that the kind of money that is being spent could be targeted much more effectively to aim in at a much closer examination of those real areas of serious concern in the employment area.

I think that the opportunity to work with private business in those areas is also very much open and that the work training scheme of even taking the people out of the community colleges where they are getting degrees that they can't use and putting them into more of a work experience, where it is combined schooling and work over a period of time, has a much higher rate of record of success than the kind of programs we're into now in terms of training.

I come back again to the Member from Lakeside who again was trying to suggest that we have no interest in private enterprise. He says, "Look to the United States." I ask him to look to the United States because the United States right now, the bastion of free enterprise in the free world, has far more extensive work-training programs providing for combined efforts between government and private business for the training of unskilled business than we have. That has been their major emphasis in the last few years. So when he says let's look to the United States — (Interjection) — Then you and I agree.

But you know something, Mr. Chairman' I was interested in the Premier's remarks and I went back and looked at some figures. It is not quite right to say that the Feds haven't been doing everything. In their budget last year, \$1.2 billion is going to job creation activity. Now proportionately, if you cut out — and I think it's fair to cut out of their budget foreign affairs and defence, which are two big items — if we just take a look at domestic expenditures. I think the \$1.2 billion would be on equal and perhaps greater proportion of the domestic Federal budget going into those activities than is our own provincial budget. Well, if we're talking \$33 million, plus I would add in the money that we spend on the Community College Program and so on, of which we get cost-sharing from the Federal Government in any event. If we added them up, I would say it would almost be — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, again I went back to these figures and I got the 1976-77 Job Programs and I see here Moose Lake Fishermen's Association, 22 jobs created, total grants \$26 million, 10 from the province and 16 from the Feds. They've got South Indian Lake Fishermen's Association, total grants 63, 12 from the province and 51 million from the Federal Government. Pardon me, \$51,000.00. You go through Traverse Bay Fishermen, 3.7, 5.8. So, Mr. Chairman, all these figures are there from last year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member aware that these figures he is reading off, I suppose the province could take as much sense of accomplishment as the Federal Government is because it is cost-shared. I did say that there were some things that were cost-shared but these are all, if he looks carefully, of an *ad hoc* nature and most of them small scale.

The major emphasis, which is involving many more people, had to do with those enterprises that have been started in areas of chronic unemployment such as Channel Area Loggers where we're not talking about ten and twenty and thirty thousand or whatever he is talking about there, but rather in the order of \$200,000, \$300,000, \$350,000 of subsidy that has to go in because the resource is there but it's a little on the thin side and quite frankly the labour force is going through a very definite learning curve. And there, there isn't a penny of Federal support. Moose Lake Loggers, Channel Area Loggers, Mystic Creek Loggers — there are three of them — and they are not Mickey Mouse. They are much larger in scope than all of these Canada Manpower shared things.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is right in that case although I can recall in the discussion of the Estimates of the Minister of Northern Affairs that we were talking about capital expenditures, I think in the order — and I'm just trying to recall — some \$20 million that was being signed in the new Northlands Agreement. Perhaps that is not enough but the fact is — and I agree that in some of these areas more should be done. — (Interjection) — Okay, but let me turn a question around on that to the First Minister, that if he agrees that in those areas of chronic unemployment, Cross Lake and Mystic Lake where you need a long working curve, why do we not apply the same argument and logic to what is going on five blocks away from this building. Exactly the same requirements are needed and yet the Minister has said that wasn't a problem. And I'm saying, I've got the figures here during the 1970s where it was twice the unemployment rates in those areas. — (Interjection) — Okay, I think, Mr. Chairman, that's something to work for, but that is the point. I think that in terms of creative job creation — I don't want to be redundant about it — that is the basic flaw in this program, in that we should have been using that capital to begin developing the kind of longer term job employment activities that would have addressed themselves to that problem, the problem of the 50-year old woman who is sort of laid off from Eaton's Catalogue, to certain of the people with university degrees who have certain training and can't get them and yet I think in some cases could be our most valuable resource — and working in these cases with private business.

Friday, May 27, 1977

The discussion I had just a while back, and I'll give you a good example, Mr. Chairman: A small manufacturer who works in the City of Winnipeg is trying to develop some new paint products and he wanted to hire a couple of chemists and so on to work on it. It took him two years — he was told by the Manitoba Research Council, "Don't even talk to us about. We can give you advice but we can't give you any money." He finally got some small grants from the National Research Council after a great deal of time and effort and finagling to sort of couch what is basically a development project under the term research, almost pure research. And NRC finally gave him, I think, \$20,000.00.

Now here was an opportunity to create a brand new paint product, hire some highly-skilled people coming out of universities and provide a general multiplying effect to the whole economy. And yet there was really as he visited from office to office and door to door, there was no place where he could get that assistance. Under this job creation program, that's the kind of thing I would have liked to have seen in it, so that that same manufacturer could have come to the Minister of Finance or the job employment office and said, "Lookit, I've got an opportunity not only to create some longer term jobs but to create a new product and to get some good economic activity going here. How about, through the Job Creation Program, helping me on it?" Well, he couldn't do it under this program, Mr. Chairman, that's the point. There is nothing in this program that would enable him to make that kind of commitment. It's not a three-month operation. He's talking of probably about a year, year-and-a-half, two years. And then when he gets the product going, it takes on and looks after itself and then he can pay those chemists or whatever it is on his own.

Those are the kinds of much more selective aspects to a job creation program that I think we should have seen. Maybe it takes more time to work out than they had, but that would make it into a good program and address itself to, I think, the real unemployment problem in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule A(1) \$16,500,000—pass; Schedule B, Capital - Special Employment Program \$17,000,000—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum of money not exceeding \$33,500,000 to the Special Employment Program 1977—pass.

That completes the business before the Committee. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. GREEN: . . . is the information this morning. It was 147 hours in the House, 80 hours in Committee, so I guess we've got about 150 hours total in the House and about 80 outside of the House, just for information's sake so you know how long we've spent on the Estimates. — (Interjection)— To each according to their needs. .

Seeing that we are finished with the Estimates, we have some financial bills and other bills and you know, the bills may be . . . I don't know how they are going to progress, but we will deal with bills tomorrow, the bills that are on the Order Paper. Some will be introduced at second reading and my intention is to go morning and afternoon. I am willing to listen to any other suggestions as to how we could proceed but that's my thinking is that we will go on the bills.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well' Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering, to the House Leader, depending on what happens at Law Amendments tonight can the number of representations, is it possible to have Law Amendments tomorrow afternoon or is there not enough notice time.

MR. GREEN: Yes, it is possible that we could deal with Law Amendments tomorrow afternoon for those bills for which all representations are heard. That means that some of the members could have the afternoon off because we could deal with Law Amendments on the other bills. We won't be dealing with Law Amendments on the City of Winnipeg bill in any event tomorrow afternoon even if we are finished with the representations. But if that is preferable, we could deal with bills in the morning and Law Amendments in the afternoon. But perhaps we could decide that at the end of the morning. I think some people would like that.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Ways and Means for raising of the Supply granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee prepared to proceed with the resolutions. First resolution, Special Employment Program, 1977. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for the Special Employment Program, 1977, that the sum of \$33,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Supplementary Supply. Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1978, the sum of \$12,906,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Capital Supply. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for capital purposes, a sum of \$522,162,400 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Main Supply, Committee of Ways and Means. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1978, the sum of \$1,102,951,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson that the Report of the Committee of Ways and Means be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask leave to introduce the bills dealing with the matters just approved in Committee.

MR. MILLER introduced **Bill (No. 74) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978 and to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same;**

And **Bill (No. 75) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978;**

And **Bill (No. 66) An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same;**

And **Bill (No. 40) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978.**

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Is that Bill 40, is that the one dealing with the Special Works Program?

MR. MILLER: The last one was the Main Estimates, Mr. Speaker, the Main Supply.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to proceed with second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to, as a matter of fact, I may indicate to the First Minister that we here at least are quite prepared to proceed with all stages of Bills 74, 75 and 66 if you wish to do that before 5:30. We would like to adjourn debate on Bill 40 at second reading if that's all right.

MR. MILLER: And 74?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes. 74, 75 and 66.

SECOND READINGS - BILLS NOS. 74, 75 AND 66

MR. MILLER: I thank the Member for Morris for his guidance.

MR. MILLER presented **Bill (No. 74) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978, and to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same for second reading.**

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I just want to make one caveat to that. Since we haven't had an opportunity to examine those bills, on the assurance of the Minister that these bills are in their standard form and do not contain anything that . . .

A MEMBER: I hope so, too.

MR. MILLER: To the best of my knowledge, there are no sleepers in it.

MR. MILLER presented **Bill (No. 75) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty the Certain Further Sums**

Friday, May 27, 1977

of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978;

And Bill (No. 66) An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same; all for second reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. MILLER presented Bill (No. 40) An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978 for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Report of the following bill for third reading: No. 74 — An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978 and to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for the Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): (Bills Nos. 74, 66 and 75 were read page by page and passed.) Bills be reported.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Vital, that the Report of the Committee of the Whole House be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to proceed with the Third Reading of the three bills just dealt with?

(Bills Nos. 74, 66 and 75 were each read a third time and passed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House desire to call it 5:30? The hour of adjournment having been agreed upon, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.