



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 11A

2:30 P.M. Thursday, March 1, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 1, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to draw the honourable members attention to the gallery, where we have five exchange students from Arlington, S.D., guests of the Glenboro School, under the direction of Mr. Garth McIntyre. This school is in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris Killarney, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

We also have 50 students of Grade Five Standing from Oakenwald School, under the direction of Mrs. Plenty. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Minister of Health and Community Services.

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

We also have 32 students from Daniel McIntyre Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Rose. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. We also welcome you here this afternoon.

Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I should like direct my remarks to the Honourable Member for Inkster. I have perused Hansard. I have found that the member's question that he asked the other day was not repetitive, and I apologize to the honourable member for my intrusion into his remarks at that time.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: I want to thank the Speaker and say that it takes a very big man, and sometimes I don't do it, but it takes a big man to apologize. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 51st Annual Report of the Chief Inspector under The Liquor Control Act for the year 1978.

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

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table four reports: The Annual Report of the Lands and Surveys, Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife sections of the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment, for the year ending March 31st, 1978; the Annual Report of Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited, for the year ending March 31st, 1978; the Annual Report of Moose Lake Loggers Limited, for the year ending March 31st, 1978; and the Annual Report of Channel Area Loggers Limited, for the year ending March 31st, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN. MacMASTER (Thompson): I beg leave to table the Civil Service Superannuation Fund Actuary Report, for the year ending December 1st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. MERCIER introduced Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Condominium Act, and Bill No. 14, An

Act to amend The Planning Act.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur) introduced Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, first I did have a matter of privilege of the House but I wish to await the presence of the Minister of Health and Social Development in order to raise my point of privilege.

In the meantime, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. During the past year, we have seen the departure from the Province of Manitoba of the Head Offices of, among others, Willson's Stationary, Roco, Salisbury House, Bata Shoes, Grey Goose Bus Lines, Transair, and no doubt many other companies. I would ask the Minister of Economic Development if he could advise the House whether a study is presently under way within his department in order to ascertain the amount of capital which has fled Manitoba during the past year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to take a look at it and try to accumulate some figures for the honourable member and, at the same time, I'll accumulate the figures for the past eight years too.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister indicating then that he is prepared to undertake a study as to the departure of capital from the Province of Manitoba during the past fiscal year, and is he also prepared to advise as to why that capital is departing Manitoba in larger sums than ever, despite the removal of all the so-called reasons that were advanced for departure of capital during the previous New Democratic Party years?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we are continually monitoring the situation the member speaks about. We'd be very glad to take a look at it and I would hope that we would be able to show the people that it's not all doom and gloom the way the honourable member would like it to be.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a privileges of the House, last Thursday, February 22nd, I asked the Minister of Health and Social Development certain questions in connection with specific comments made by cooks at the Selkirk Mental Hospital as to decrease in the levels of service provided by way of meals to the patients.

Yesterday, I also raised questions with the Minister of Health as to whether or not those same cooks had been interrogated by staff, management staff at the Selkirk Mental Hospital. Mr. Speaker, I regret to read in the Free Press of this morning, answers presented by the Minister of Health and Social Development to both the questions that I raised this past Thursday and also questions that I raised yesterday. The Minister of Health and Social Development indicated in the Winnipeg Free Press that he had in his possession menus which would disprove the charges and then went on to acknowledge that there had in fact been interrogation of the cooks at the Selkirk Mental Hospital. Mr. Speaker, I must reluctantly bring this to your attention. I feel this is a breach of the privileges of this House. There really is little point in asking questions of Ministers opposite if they are to leave this Chamber and respond to those questions in the corridor to members of the media prior to bringing the answers into this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I respect the principle that he espouses and I think we all espouse it in this House. I have tried to be very careful with respect to that kind of information. I responded to the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the questions he has asked me on this subject on

the basis of knowledge that I had up to that point in time in each case. Yesterday, after the sitting of the House got under way and the Question Period was concluded, I was supplied with a number of documents from officials of my department which outlined the situation with respect to the diet at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre, which speak to all the questions that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition raised, and which successfully eliminate the kinds of anxieties that he has raised. I haven't had a chance either to table that information or to deal with it privately with the Leader of the Opposition. I spoke generally about it; it had just come into my hands at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate your advice as to whether or not my point is well taken.

MR. SPEAKER: I have previously, on a very similar matter, made a request of members of the Treasury Bench in this respect and if the Honourable Minister of Health, in this particular case, having explained that this information came into his hands after the Question Period, I am asking the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he is willing to accept the explanation given by the Minister of Health.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to make a brief response to your comments. I do believe that that information should have been brought into the House and tabled in the House itself prior to its being disclosed to the media. This is the place; this is the Chamber in which that material should have been tabled. But I would like to then proceed with questions to the Minister of Health and Social Development.

First, is the Minister of Health and Social Development prepared to table the menus in question and would he advise the House as to the dates of the menus in question, the weeks which the menus in question, which he intends to table, cover?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure you, Sir, and all members of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, that what I said to the Free Press yesterday was general. This material contained specific detailed information, there was no detailed information given to the press other than my complete repudiation on the basis of documented evidence of the groundless anxieties out of which the Leader of Opposition has been trying to build an artificial case. I did not want to reduce the House or the situation in the House to the picayune level of some debates that were held on ill founded grievances raised by the Opposition in the health field last year. But I am prepared, I am certainly prepared —(Interjection)— This information, Mr. Speaker, goes into such details as the reasons for decisions on serving shrimp. Now if you want me to belabour and beleaguer the House and the time of the House with that kind of information, I will. All I said to the Free Press was that I had information which completely repudiates and refutes the Opposition Leader's charges. There are menus here, Sir, —(Interjections)— For the information of the Leader of the Opposition Sir, there are menus here for the week of January 29 through February 4, the week of February 5 through February 11, the week of February 12 through February 18, the week of February 19 through February 25, and I might say in case he is worried, they all apply to the year 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: What I would like the Honourable Minister to table are the menus during the periods which he referred to and I would like to ask the Minister if he would as well table the menus of the months of September and October, 1977 at the same time. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, I can't compel an answer from the Minister of Health and Social Development but I believe the Minister did wish to respond to my question as to whether he would be prepared to table the menus, of September and October, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I am fully prepared to table them or to read them into the record during the Estimates process. Let me read into the record, Sir, for one-half minute, one paragraph. This is from my Medical Director at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre. "A review of the menus on file does not reveal any occasion where hamburgers were served three days in a row nor even two days in a row. Attached please find three copies of our menu for the current four-week rotating schedule.

This menu was revised three months to include popular items. Purchasing of foodstuff is carried out by the Provincial Purchasing Bureau. There has been no reduction in the quality of foodpurchased."

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Is the Minister now tabling that? Will one of the pages please pick it up?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to table the letter from our Chief Medical Director at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre and the accompanying menus.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. PAWLEY: On a point of privilege and I do believe that the Minister would wish to clarify his statement. The allegation that hamburger was being served three days in a row were not made by myself; they were made by cooks who were working in the institution in question. However, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest that the honourable member is not speaking on a point of privilege, probably a point of personal privilege or a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue questioning with the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is he prepared to table the menus for September and October, 1977, in this House, as well as the menus that he made earlier reference to?

MR. JORGENSON: I am now beginning to know what the United Nations meant by the Year of the Child.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, at best, in the light of the eloquent —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to members of this Chamber, if they ask for information or ask questions, that they extend the courtesy to the Minister to listen to his reply. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the eloquent response from my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate affairs, anything I could say could do no more than gild the lily in this ridiculous situation. However, Sir, I will attempt to obtain those menus. I will table what I can obtain. I will not promise the Leader of the Opposition that I will do it tomorrow. There are other matters of urgency in front of the government and in front of the department, but I will do it as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. There is a report issued by the League of the Physically Handicapped that the concourse under Portage and Main only has one entrance for those who are physically handicapped or disadvantaged. I would like to ask the Minister if he is prepared to investigate that situation in light of the fact that no surface crossing is being allowed, whether this contravenes The Human Rights Act in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice. I would like to consider whether that is a matter that is within the sole jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg or whether or not the province has any jurisdiction over that particular matter.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, may I have a supplement to perhaps assist the Minister in that examination. The question I am asking is that because the City is totally not allowing any form of surface passage on the corner of Portage and Main and has only one access route for those who are in wheelchairs or other forms of limitation, does that in fact contravene The Human Rights Act just in terms of basic rights of passage and transgression. I would also ask him to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that asking for a legal opinion is not a proper question for the Legislative Assembly during Question Period. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for a legal opinion; I am asking if the Minister would examine whether that in fact is a matter that should be brought before the Human Rights Commission to determine whether it is transgressing The Human Rights Act, of which he is the guardian and custodian. That's the question I am asking, not for an opinion.

MR. MERCIER: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice because of my concern over whether the city in fact has the sole responsibility over that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a news program this morning, information was issued that females have gone to the Human Rights Act with objections created on the grounds that they were being fired because they refused to exchange certain favours with their employers. The Human Rights Commission indicated that they were not prepared to handle such cases awaiting amendments to The Human Rights Act dealing with such matters. Could the Minister indicate to us, first, if the Human Rights Act Commission is within its purview in not accepting such complaints, and secondly, is he planning legislation pertaining to these cases?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice too and review that matter with the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephones.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, in responding to . questions relating to the MPIC operation yesterday, I referred to the Throne Speech proposal for review and in my remarks I used the present tense. I merely wanted to correct the record that the review is to be undertaken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the answer by the Minister responsible for Crown corporations — in his answers of yesterday — could he advise us as to why staff additions to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation must be processed first through Management Committee here, Treasury Board, while Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System additions are processed through their own corporate entities.

MR. CHERNIACK: He wants to limit their competitive ability.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the restraint program as it applies to MPIC is being exercised in advance of any review that will be undertaken of their operations and it is the desire of government, of course, to keep a careful understanding of the requirements of that Crown corporation.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister indicate to the House that he draws no distinction — no distinction — between the commercial operations of MPIC and the regular automobile insurance underwriting section?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, requests for additional staffing for both operations, are being carefully considered by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed, I wonder if I could have permission of the House to allow the Honourable Member for Swan River the temporary use of my seat in the Chamber. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Despite the fact that my honourable friends think that the bedding and food of patients in health institutions are a laughing matter — I don't — the honourable member said that unfounded charges were brought with regard to health patients last year. I want the Minister to tell me whether that includes the information that was conveyed to me and later conveyed to the Minister personally, that a patient in the hospital arrived there on the 12th, left on the 19th, and had her sheet changed once during that period. Is that one of the unfounded charges that my honourable friend is referring to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is incredible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable the Minister whether the lady who came to see him personally, at his request, following his consultation with me, who told him that she was in the hospital, arrived on the 12th, left on the 19th, had her sheet changed once during that period, made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that this time his question is repetitive.

MR. GREEN: Indeed it is, but the honourable member said that it is incredible. I will ask him whether what he is now saying is that the lady who came to him in his office told him of her circumstances was making an incredible statement?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, no, it's the performance of the Member for Inkster, or the Opposition, that is totally incredible.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a question of privilege because my honourable friend has now said that what the lady told him was correct. Earlier today he said that unfounded charges were made. I am suggesting that those charges were founded in every respect and that the Minister, in saying that they were unfounded, breached the privileges of a member of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, some days ago, a question was raised with respect to certification of the Environmental Laboratory in my department. I assume that the certification had to do with the ability of the laboratory to test for lead, although the member didn't specify that. I am advised that our laboratory is not certified but I am also advised there is very good reason for that, Mr. Speaker, in that there is no certification procedure in existence in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: I thank the Minister for his answer. I would like to ask the Minister if he could determine with his colleague, the Minister of Labour, why the Minister of Labour, under Item 4 of his plan for the monitoring of the lead level poisoning in Manitoba states that the department laboratory should be certified, and would be certified.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment.

MR. RANSOM: I am not going to answer questions for my honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, who is quite capable of answering his own questions, but I should point out that because there is no certification process in Canada, it does not in any way mean that the standards that are achieved by the laboratory in my department are inferior to standards that might be exercised

by a laboratory that for instance might be certified in the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Is the Minister familiar with the problems of the pupils and parents at Elmwood's George V School?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular problems there.

MR. DOERN: Since the pupils and parents have been given the runaround for about eight months concerning the closure of a neighbourhood school, they have attended dozens of meetings, had three contradictory engineering reports for an amount which they applied for to the Public Schools Finance Board of some \$200,000 on a budget of some \$200 million, would the Minister be prepared to personally investigate?

MR. COSENS: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether he would be prepared to meet with the parents concerned and with the Winnipeg School Trustees concerning this matter?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am always very pleased to meet with groups who have particular problems that they would like to discuss with my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to pose a question to the Minister responsible for MPIC. In view of his answers to the Leader of the Opposition and in view of his answers that he gave during the first week of the session when he indicated that he did not know that there was any impact on the City of Brandon about staff reductions or staff freeze with respect to the General Insurance Division, is the Minister, in light of the report that he tabled for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the last year, is he now prepared to admit that that government has totally frozen out the General Insurance Division in view of the fact that premium volume has virtually not increased at all from the year 1977 to 1978, whereas it doubled in the year of 1977?
—(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. George that the purpose —(Interjections)— Order please. May I now point out to the Honourable Member for St. George that the purpose of the Question Period is to elicit information, not to make statements. I have to rule the member's question out of order. If the honourable member has another question or would care to rephrase his question, he is entitled to go ahead.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister now indicate that his government is totally committed to killing the General Insurance Division of Autopac rather than selling that insurance division and at least gaining back some money rather than forfeiting it to the private sector the way they are doing now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Autopac.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Finance. Can the Minister inform the House whether the government called for tenders for the provision of fire insurance on government buildings for the calendar year 1979?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, if it has been done, it hasn't been done through the Finance Department.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Treasury Bench. Could any Minister inform me whether the government called for tenders for the provision of fire insurance on government buildings for the year 1979?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice for the member.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, presuming that the government in fact did so, as it did the previous year, would the Minister be prepared to furnish the House with details as to how many tenders there were, who was the lowest bidder, and for how much was the contract?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I believe we did so last year by way of Order for Return and if the member would care to submit it in the same manner as last year, we would be pleased to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a final supplementary.

MR. WALDING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. While the Minister is finding out that information, could he also confirm at the same time that MPIC was the successful bidder?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite catch the member's first two or three words. I presume they are on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member care to restate his question.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would request of the Minister that at the same time that he is enquiring into the other information, whether he would be prepared to confirm that MPIC was in fact the low bidder for the provision of fire insurance coverage on government buildings for this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that would automatically be contained, if the member were to file his Order for Return, he would have all the rates then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: What, if any, discussions has the Attorney-General or the Minister of Health and Social Development had with the province's Director of Child Welfare relative to the Ombudsman's recent declarations about the illegality of juvenile detention facilities at The Pas jail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've had a number of conversations with the Attorney-General about it. I'm not sure whether the honourable member asked me what recent conversations I've had. I've had conversations with him dating back over a period of some months and I've also had very recent conversations with the Minister of Government Services on the subject.

MR. CORRIN: Will the Honourable Minister instruct his Director of Child Welfare to commence habeas corpus proceedings in the courts in order to effect release of these illegally detained children?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, but what we are continuing to do is seek a solution to that juvenile problem independent of the correctional institutional problem for adults.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a final supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: Could the Honourable Minister, or the Minister responsible for the Department of the Attorney-General, advise this House whether or not there will be any attempt made to resist such an application for habeas corpus, if one is made, either by the Director of Child Welfare, and he could do so under his own initiative, Mr. Speaker, or by a guardian or parent of a child detained in that particular facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the question is hypothetical and out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate to the House if his department's so-called lead control program is mandatory or voluntary for lead-using industry in the province, and can the Minister further list the companies that will be asked to participate in that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it's been voluntarily accepted by the industries and the unions and workers here in the city at this particular time.

MR. COWAN: Yes, if we can assume that the program is voluntary, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, can the Minister confirm that a letter suggesting that a baseline lead-in-blood survey is being initiated, has gone out from his department to Canadian Bronze, and can he inform the House as to what other companies have been sent similar requests?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, could the member repeat the first part of his question. I just didn't quite get it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill repeat his question.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister if he can confirm that a letter has been sent from his department to Canadian Bronze suggesting that a base level lead-in-blood survey is being done by the Workplace Safety and Health Division, and what other companies have been sent a similar request?

MR. MacMASTER: It's part of the program, Mr. Speaker, to establish in fact what the lead level is in the blood of the workers within the industries here within the city at this particular time, that's part of the program. I'm sure the Member for Churchill is aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that to date, none of the unions have been officially notified of this baseline lead-in-blood survey being done at plants they represent, and can the Minister assure the House that the unions will, in the future, be kept better informed of any unilateral decisions and actions that his department is imposing in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the representative of the particular union involved with the majority of the employees that are unionized was in attendance at a particular meeting. He did concur in general with the program that's been established. As of a day ago, two days ago, we have been in contact with the co-chairman of the safety committees within the industries here within the city and they concur with our program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In the past few days, Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada has reported that Manitoba's rate of economic activity has been the poorest of any of the ten provinces in the area of overall retail

trade, in the area of department store sales, and in the area of restaurant receipts. This is December, 1978 over December, 1977. In the light of that, I wonder if the Minister can advise the House

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that the Question Period is for the purpose of seeking information rather than supplying it.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am in the process of providing the Minister with the question. In light of this information, in light of the relatively weak economic activity in these areas, can the Minister advise the House whether there is any evidence in a drop in the sales tax revenue for the month of December, or has there been any drop in the rate of increase in sales tax revenue in the month of December, 1978 over 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for getting his statistics confined to the proper month rather than applying the 3.8 percent to the entire year as was done by the Leader of the Opposition last week on an earlier question.

Mr. Speaker, the specific answer would be that if the sales are up, whatever percentage, then the sales tax would be up by an equal percentage.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think if the Minister went back to his staff, he'd find out that the statement he just made was not correct. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House whether his advisors, whether his staff, have provided any reasons for this relatively weak performance in this area, particularly in the area of overall retail trade compared with the other nine provinces in Canada.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the general question, we've asked the Economic Council of Canada. I notice that Stats Canada has brought out some overall figures with regards to the impact of the sales tax reduction. There's some evidence that the so-called large ticket items accelerated during the period of the sales tax reduction and slowed down after. That would probably be the principle reason for the December statistics being somewhat lower. The same thing is true for the month preceding December.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Yes, I thank the Minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that the rate of increase, while it slowed down in December, that the rate of increase in December was the lowest of all of the ten Canadian provinces, and indeed less than the rate of inflation, which means a real cut, would the Minister undertake . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member is being argumentative and again he is attempting to supply information rather than seek information. I have to rule his question out of order. Would the member care to rephrase his question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, he wants to rephrase it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister, in light of this serious deterioration in the level of economic activity, would the Minister undertake to have his staff investigate the matter and report to him and then to the House as to why we are comparing so poorly in this winter of 1978-79.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in part, Manitoba is still pulling out of the slump that preceded that date. I want to advise the member that the average increase for the entire year of 1977, was 4.4 percent, for the entire year. He is now talking about one month following the increase in the sales tax which occurred in October, and he's talking about the month of December. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to a matter of concern, naturally these statistics are all viewed with a matter of concern, regarding to try and analyze them as far as possible. But certainly, you don't take one month and extrapolate it without of context with the rest of the year, which I think the member is tending

to panic on, and I suggest that he not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day — the Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

SUPPLY — MINES, NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 63, Main Estimates, Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment. We are on Resolution 81, Administration, (a)(2) Salaries — pass; (3)— Pass; (b) Administrative Services: (1) Salaries — pass — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I don't have a transcript of the Min Honourable where he ister's remarks yesterday, did try to help us by summarizing just what has happened to his Estimates, and therefore perhaps my question has been answered, perhaps not. I have gone through the entire department, and at the end of it, we come to a decrease of roughly \$5.5 million, if we take these figures without attempting reconciliation. And I do this under the Administrative Services because it was in this area of the department that I tried to obtain a global view of the Estimates, where the increases were, where they were not. Now, if we look at \$62 million as against \$57 million, I think we are talking about approximately \$5.5 million on the reduction without a reconciliation.

I have been able to ascertain with regard to Acquisition of Physical Assets, that the reduction is \$5.6 million from \$14.8 million to \$9.1 million, that's the last item of the Estimates — the last item, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, which is 91 on his Estimates, on Page 69. So we get \$5.7 million reduction in physical assets purchases. I would think that that is correct.

And then, Mr. Chairman, if we look at the Mineral Resources, we see a diminution of roughly, well, pretty close to \$700,000; that's line number 83. So those two items would total about \$6.3 million, which is greater than the amount of the reduction in the entire department.

At this point, I am not making a criticism, I am trying to ascertain whether my calculations are accurate, and therefore, when we deal with the increase that you indicated and I haven't seriously analyzed⁴⁵ that, I think you said it was about 8 three percent. It would include dealing with those items where you show a reduction of \$6.3 million, one of which I would assume is related to the Department getting out to a great extent of mineral exploration and sharing the costs of mineral agreements. where you have a saving of That would be under Mineral Resources' almost a million dollars; also in the purchase of Physical Assets. With regard to the Mineral Resources that's entirely a different philosophical argument as to whether you are actually saving money or costing the people of the Province of Manitoba money and I know that there are two sides to the question and even though I believe I am right, and you wrong, I am not going to discuss the two sides at this point.

With regard to the reduction in the Acquisition of Physical Assets, would my honourable friend agree that that is not a reduction, that there is nobody, no accountant, and furthermore the Federal Government would put you in jail if you did it, if you said that you have reduced expenditures by not buying a building because when you buy a building or you buy a piece of land, it is not an expenditure. Indeed you may be in a better financial position, particularly if the land went up in value next year, then you are this year and therefore that acquisition or the construction of a physical asset is not a reduction in expenditures, it's a reduction in wealth producing on the part of the Minister of Mines. Because every one of those expenditures, I would venture to say that if you go over them in the years you will find that the money that you have left in the bank for those years or you would have left in the bank and the assets that you would have acquired, that you would be much better off having the assets then the currency. And this is where I say that my honourable friends who seem to think that currency is of more value than real wealth, that they are the ones who regard money as being wealth and don't know what wealth is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell on the subject. I really want to find out if my figures

are wrong and they could be. I am just looking at them at their face value. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets is going from \$14.8 million to \$9.1 million, that's a difference of \$5.5 million and I am being quite conservative there. The reduction in Mineral Resources is going from \$3.7 million to \$3 million, a decrease of roughly \$650,000, so the total of those two is over \$6.4 million, which more than represents the reduction in the Estimates. Now I am really interested in seeing whether my calculations are correct, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps I can clear that up, Mr. Chairman, but before I do I would like to assure the honourable member and other honourable members of the House that I am not a Bolshevik, I have never been a Bolshevik and I have no intentions of becoming a Bolshevik. I also can assure him that I am not prepared to debate the philosophical aspects of mining policies at this stage but I also can assure him that I believe that he is wrong and I am right. And with respect to his specific question here, it would be my understanding that \$6,725,600 which was the capital carry-over should be subtracted from the \$14,867,300 to get \$8,141,700 as a figure that can be compared with the \$9,182,000 we have this year, for a total increase of a little better than a million dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I say, comrade minister that it still doesn't explain my dilemma. If you take the figures out and you take the capital carry-over out, then you've got to take the figure out of the year ending March 31, 1969 and not have it at \$62 million or \$14.8 million.

Well then the entire picture and if that's been done throughout, then we don't know where the reduction is because this \$62 million to \$56 million on your entire department is added up into the total expenditures of \$1.774 billion and is used by your Finance Minister in showing that there has been an increase of two percent. Now you are telling me that I can ignore those figures. If I am to ignore them, then are we saying to the people of the Province of Manitoba, ignore what the Minister says about \$1.7 billion, ignore what he says about the increase being 5.6 percent because these figures are not correct. That you have to reduce the \$14 million expenditure which you had last year to read \$8 million and actually there has been increase this year. I mean you said now, that last year once we take out the capital carry-over we're back to \$8 million instead of \$14 million and this year we're up to \$9 million and actually we are spending money. And what your Finance Minister says is wrong, we are on a spending jag, we're going from \$8 million to \$9 million, which is an increase of more than 10 percent, much more than 10 percent and the real reason that you have been told that it is 5.6 percent is that we have figures in here that don't mean anything. Because that is, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister has said. The figure that he has just given me, that this \$14.8 million, if you move the capital carry-over, would read \$8 million. These figures are reflected in the figures that the Minister of Finance gave us, \$1.680 billion as \$1.774 billion against and he says that comes to 5.6 percent. If we remove, which is exactly what the previous Minister of Finance said, remove the capital carry-over then what we are saying is that the increase for this year and it's reflected, Mr. Chairman, in this one department already. Already in one department it is 7.8 percent which, Mr. Chairman, is higher . . . what was your last budget, what was the increase?

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Eight.

MR. GREEN: Eight. Well, Mr. Chairman, the difference then between the budget this year and the last budget in 1977 from these guys who were spending like it was going out of style, is .4 percent and in actual dollars it is probably more because we were dealing with a smaller base.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you can't have it both ways. You can't come in and say that the expenditures, that the Estimates are not correct. I am reading from the black and white Estimates. The Minister comes in and shows a reduction on his total budget of \$62 million to \$56 million. No doubt about that. The Minister says that he is buying less assets, \$14.8 million last year, 91 this year, a reduction of 5.6. That takes care of the entire reduction that he is talking about.

Then we go over to Mineral Resources and we find that that there \$700,000 less on one side, which I would attribute primarily to the fact that there is a different program. It is not an efficiency reduction. It is a statement by this Minister that we will make more money in the Province of Manitoba by selling ourselves out to the private sector and saying, with our hat in our hand, please develop our resources, please leave something else over for us, and not having a separate input.

Now, that's the difference in politics and I can't argue endlessly on that point. —(Interjection)—

Pardon me?

A MEMBER: What are we arguing?

MR. GREEN: Well, we are arguing at this point, Mr. Chairman — I really tried to find out from the Minister whether the Estimates really reflect the fact that there is not an efficiency program here, that there is a reduction in the purchase of fixed assets to the extent of \$5,700,000 which wasn't an expenditure at all. If you showed it on any balance sheet — you've got accountants in front of you — when you buy a fixed asset, it does not show as an expenditure, it goes on the balance sheet as additional assets. If you tried to include it as an expenditure when you filed your return with the Income Tax, they will put you in jail — well, they are really not that tough, but they will certainly correct it. Therefore, when the Minister is talking about efficiency and restraints, it is not restraints at all because the less money that you have in fixed assets and the more money that you keep in cash —(Interjection)— Pardon me?

MR. RANSOM: . . . didn't mention the word.

MR. GREEN: What word?

MR. RANSOM: Efficiency or restraint.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I yield to my honourable friend. If there is no efficiency and no restraint in the budget, I withdraw everything that I have said, because I have been merely trying to show that there is no efficiency and no restraint and if comrade Minister admits to me that there is no efficiency and no restraint, then of course I can sit down and not proceed because the admission is made and I don't have to be concerned with it any more.

But I thought that for eight days, I've been hearing about efficiency and restraint and incompetence, where it wasn't practised. Now, if you will accept the fact that what was termed incompetence before continues now, then I am not going to attack the Minister, I am going to congratulate him and leave it at that. I will go to a different item.

I ask now for the figures that I had last year. How many staff man years, and that I ask again under Administrative Services? How many staff man years are employed by the department and I want them, Mr. Chairman, in every category imaginable. In other words, if there are still contract, if there are still term, if there were casual, how many staff man years do you have with the department this year as opposed to last year? How many are filled this year as opposed to last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, we have been subjected again to the honourable member wandering all over through the Estimates and debating points that are not within the item that we are supposed to be considering. Yesterday he was allowed some additional time to make a general statement and didn't deal with the issue of the total amount of money whatsoever. I pointed out yesterday in my presentation, my introductory remarks, that we have a 2.3 percent increase. I pointed out the technical adjustment that had been made. The honourable gentleman made a great issue of this last year, that it wasn't included, Mr. Chairman. It now has been shown as being included. It was tabled last year. It is now shown as being included. They can't have it both ways. It is there and we have not said that we have a decrease in spending in the department; I have said there is an increase in spending in the department of 2.3 percent. As we go through it line by line, we will come to where there have been expansions and reductions and we will be able to explain what those expansions and reductions have been.

Now, we are going to go on the Administrative item now then, Mr. Chairman, where we should be. I am quite happy to provide the honourable member with the information that he asks.

Mr. Chairman, for 1978-79, the total staff man years were 2,117.22. The 1979-80 request is 2,033.37.

I believe that the honourable member wanted some breakdown into the different categories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, it's not the Minister's fault, but I don't know who to blame. Last year I was able to deal with a certain set of figures. You are obviously going to give me figures this year that relate to twice as much activity, because this year you are going to give me the Mines

and Natural Resources, which includes parks, which includes land, etc. Is it possible to give me comparable figures to what I got last year? If not, then I understand it, I will know that either by design or otherwise, and I will say not by design, that I am going to be completely confused because I am going to be comparing watermelons and grapes. But if you can give me this year's figures as they compared to last year, okay; if you can't, then you can't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can come pretty close to providing it by division. There is some difficulty, say, with Administration, where there have been some amalgamations, and in some of the divisions where they have been split. But the Environmental Management Division, the 1978-79 figures was 179.13; the 1979-80 request is 171.25. The Mineral Resources Division, 1978-79, 157.28; 1979-80, 132.26. Water Management Division, 1978-79, 381.25; the 1979-80 request is 360.25. Regional Services Division —(Interjection)— You don't want to get into —(Interjection)— well, it's in this department now.

MR. GREEN: I wanted the ones that were only in last year. Those are the ones. I think you've tried to give me everything but the administration, I would think.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'll give you the figures for Administration.

MR. GREEN: Yes, give me a total figure for Administration.

MR. RANSOM: It was 52.26 prior to . . . that would have been last year's figure. Now, the adjusted 1978-79 one is 105.42 because of the amalgamation.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. RANSOM: . . . and the request 1979-80, is 107.42.

MR. GREEN: Thank you very much. Now, could you give me the number of positions that are filled in 1978 and 1979. These are the staff man years that have been budgeted for. Could you give me the number of positions that were filled on the average through the year for 1978?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think we can, Mr. Chairman. I have figures as of January 27, 1978, and I have figures as of January 26, 1979. The total filled, and this includes regular, term, departmental and contract, the total filled to January 27, 1978, was 1,894; as of January 26, 1979, the total filled is 1,758. I can probably give you some additional detail but as we get into the additional detail, there might be some slight variation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is that the Honourable Minister has given me the total filled based on the different system of the positions that he gave me earlier. The positions that he gave me earlier showed 1978, 823.08 — at least that's my calculation. That's Environment, Mineral Resources, Water Management, and Administration, totalled 823.08. I don't suppose you're able to give me the number of those that were filled on January 28th, or on the average during the year. Can you give me your approximate vacancy factor during the year? If you gave it to me in percentage terms, that would deal with it.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think I might come closer, Mr. Chairman, on the actual figures. I don't have a vacancy rate that I would want to hang my hat on right at the moment. In Administrative Services last year, January 27th, 99 filled; January, 1979, 89 filled. Environmental Management: last year, 169; this January, 165. Mineral Resources: January, 1978, 122; and January, 1979, 129. Water Resources: January, 1978, 401; January, 1979, 374.

MR. GREEN: Give me a second. Mr. Chairman, your people there can check these very quickly. I have the four areas that you referred to as having a staff man years complement of 823 people in 1978. I have the number of people employed on staff man years for the same four categories as 791, which is, Mr. Chairman, a vacancy factor of about 32 employees, just from the figures you have given me, that there was a staff man year feature of 823 people and people employed of 791 for 32 vacancies.

MR. RANSOM: I don't have that figure totalled in front of me. I would assume that it's approximately

correct.

MR. GREEN: I wouldn't assume it because I've just written them down and added them up. I'll give them back to you. The first, Environmental Management: 179.13; Mineral Resources: 157.28; Water Management: 381.25; Administration: 105.42 — total: I get 823.08 — and I could be wrong, I did them quickly and I haven't done them with a calculator. Do you people get the same figure?

MR. RANSOM: Well, there's some difficulty there, because when you try and compare the vacancy rate for a regular position with a term one — a regular position can be filled with only one person; a term staff man year, you might have five people in it at a particular month.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that could well be, but I really want to know whether the 823 is right and the 791 is right. If they're not right, then . . . whether the addition is right. . Yes, I've got the other figures: 169 for Environmental Management, 122 for Mineral Resources, 401 for Water Resources, 99 for Administration. I got 791. If I'm right, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with 32 vacancies. I now know that what you are saying is that there may be two from one staff man year, things of that nature, but still, we have an approximation of a vacancy factor of 32 over 823 employees, which is a vacancy factor of less than 5 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: The figures that I gave were actual people in positions last year and this year. That is a reduction; that is not a vacancy rate, because those aren't the staff man year figures. Those are the figures of actual people hired.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I did get the staff man years at 823.08. Those were staff man year figures. Then I said, how many people were actually employed? I got 791, and I would gather the difference between staff man years and the number who are actually working at the time represent the vacancies between those two figures. Unless you have eliminated the vacancy factor, which would make my argument much stronger than it is, there is a vacancy factor. —(Interjection)— Well, I gave you the two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, as far as I can tell from adding, and subtracting, and so on, it would appear to be more or less correct for the moment. We can work it out. We attempted to anticipate the information that he might want, but I guess when you supply information, then there will be a few different ways that it can be worked.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, given what we are used to getting, more or less, ain't bad. And if we are more or less in the right ball park, then I merely wish to make the point, that your vacancy factor has done exactly what I said it would do. It has gone from something like 10 percent to maybe in the area of 4 percent. And with regard to this department, what it means, is that you are effectively employing as many people as you employed in 1977-78, because at that time your vacancy factor was 10 percent and if you take a vacancy factor of 10 percent on 800 employees, you get 80 employees less. You now have approximately 80 staff man year positions less, but you have reduced your vacancy factor by over 50 percent, and the 50 positions that you add by hiring people faster, makes up for the 50 positions that you say you have reduced to staff man years.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making a criticism of the Minister for doing this; I say that that has to happen. You cannot make this department operate effectively other than by eliminating programs, and I will concede that there has been an elimination of one program. I question whether that is in the area of efficiency. I question whether that is in the area of saving the people of the Province of Manitoba. I assert, on the contrary, that it is going to cost the people of the Province of Manitoba money. With regard to the other alleged reductions in staff, they are made up by the vacancy factor, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to apply the similar calculations in this respect to other departments of government, just as we did last year.

We found out as we went from department to department, that the whole was much greater than the sum of its parts. You know, in geometry we learned that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts. That is what is called an axiom. I don't know whether it was the first axiom, or the second axiom, but they taught us axioms. Maybe my school teacher friend can help me. The whole

is equal to the sum of its parts. Under progressive conservatism, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, because we went through every department, and we found that although they alleged — and I intend to deal with that — that 1,800 civil servants less were working for the department, when we asked in each department how many civil servants were working, we found that either the same number or more, were working. And we are going to do it again, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Pardon me?

A MEMBER: . . . given you the actual figures.

MR. GREEN: I have the actual figures, and they bear out what I am saying, Mr. Chairman. The Minister said last year on the record, the vacancy factor in his department, when I was the Minister, was 10 percent. They hire much quicker and faster, and the vacancy factor was reduced to less than 5 percent. The amount of staff reductions did not equal the vacancy factor, and it's not only in this Minister's department. My colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, did the same thing, and I was sitting there when he did it with the Department of Consumer Affairs, Mr. McGill's department, where the staff man years were down, and the people employed were up.

And those two features of my honourable friend and comrade's Estimates are going to be reflected in other departments. First of all, that there is not a reduction in expenditures; that a reduction in the Acquisition of Physical Assets and an elimination of programs is not an efficiency, it represents a different philosophical direction which is going to cost money, not save money. And I am happy that my honourable friend said we're not talking about restraint, and we're not talking about efficiency. I am glad that they have stopped talking about them, because they don't exist. And that the number of staff man years and the number of civil servants that have allegedly been reduced by this government, Mr. Chairman, is the greatest pretense that anyone has ever tried to perpetrate, and when we go to the global figures, you will see that what I am saying is correct.

The Conservative Party, when they came to power, told the public that they were going to spend less money. And you know, many people, when they heard that the governments were going to reduce the Estimates, actually believed — although it was a naive belief — that whereby we had spent \$1 billion \$550 million, that the Conservatives were going to spend less, less actual dollars. As a matter of fact, some of the news reporters phoned me and said: "They say that they are going to cut \$30 million from your Estimates." \$30 million from our Estimates. In other words, instead of having \$1 billion \$550 million, they were going to have \$1 billion \$520 million. I said, my God, if they do that, then I am wrong. But I cannot believe that they will cut money from our actual expenditures. They must be talking about cutting money, not from the Estimates that were tabled, but the departmental requests.

And when they came to the House, Mr. Chairman, they indeed walked in on their very first budget, not spending less taxpayers' money, spending more taxpayers' money. Oh, they had an answer for that as they always had, "Oh yes, we're spending more money, but if the New Democrats were elected, they would have spent \$500 million more money." Well, Mr. Chairman, if my auntie had wheels, she would be a street car. The fact is, that we did not bring in the Estimates for 1979, they were brought in by the Conservatives, and they were higher. And this whole notion that they were going to reduce expenditures — and I never expected them to nor would I charge them with bad government for not reducing expenditures. They can't reduce expenditures. They can reduce to some extent the rate of expenditures, but that comes as a very hollow answer to the promise they made to the taxpayers, that they will spend less money, and that we, in our expenditures, included huge sums of money that could be eliminated. And they talked about Saunders Aircraft, not a penny of which, found its way into the Estimates of 1978, so how are they going to reduce from that figure?

So, Mr. Chairman, we intend, not because we are criticizing government spending, but that we are criticizing what amounts to a fraudulent representation to the people of the Province of Manitoba, that the Conservative Party is saving them money. What is saved in these Estimates, is the Acquisition of Physical Assets, which is not saving money. Anybody who has money now, is losing money every day that he has it. I mean, I bought shares, I spent money in Great-West, I paid \$72. If I kept my money, I'd have \$72 plus interest at 7 percent. Because I bought assets in Great-West, the shares are \$105. Did I spend? Absolutely. Now you can call me whatever you like. I have never tried to earn less money. The fact is, that by having the asset as against having the money, I have made money, and by having the money as against keeping the resource, we will lose money. That's what is happening with one item of expenditure. Every time you save money by not building a building, and renting space, you're going to lose money, and the Member for Lakeside can laugh as much as he wants.

The fact is, that the asset that was built by the former Minister on Sherbrook and Logan, will

be worth more than the money that was put into it, and every time you dispossess the people of this Province of Manitoba of some of its land, you are costing them money. And every time you abdicate governmental responsibility by letting our resources be explored and developed, and reaped, and harvested, by private concerns as against the people of the Province of Manitoba, you cost the people money, not save them money. And on your Estimates, in two years, they have gone up by \$200 million, somewhat more, and I will deal with that in the Budget Speech debate, because that's where the real story and sleight-of-hand is going to come out as to how much money is being saved on these budgetary expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the honourable member is following his usual line of inferring that certain things have been said, or haven't been said, and positions would be taken or not taken. The point that I tried to make to him was that I had not at any point in the introduction of my Estimates said that the change in spending was due to restraint or efficiency. Now, he then tries to twist that in his typical fashion into saying that we are admitting to inefficiency, and that there is no restraint. That is the sort of argument the honourable member used, but after a while, it doesn't wash, Mr. Chairman, that's all, the same as a lot of his other figures don't wash, and if he wants to play around with vacancy rates and try and make it appear as though we have not reduced staff, then I can't stop him from doing that. But I gave you, and I've put on the record, the actual figures, Mr. Chairman, and the fact is that in the Administrative Division, there are ten fewer people this year than there were last year. In the Environmental Management Division there are four fewer people than there were last year. The Mineral Resources Division happens to have seven more because of changes in categories. Water Resources has 27 fewer people than it had last year.

Now, you can do whatever you want with vacancy rates. The fact is that the department is employing fewer people, and as far as the public are concerned, they are interested in how many people the government employs to provide the programs that the government is trying to deliver. Now, if he wants to talk about vacancy rates, you can't talk about a vacancy rate, and make any sense, when you try and include a category of employment where you can employ more than one person in that category. If you want to deal with those that you can talk about vacancy rates, the permanent staff man years, then in those areas that he refers to, there was a vacancy rate in January of 7 percent this year — 7 percent in the overall department, January 26th, 1979; regular employment there is a 12 percent vacancy rate; 153 vacant positions out of 1,250 staff man years. There is no alleged reduction, Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction in the number of people that this department employs.

Now, again, with the usual type of twisted logic that the honourable member uses, he tries to make out as though we had said we were going to reduce the total budget of government in one year. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that last year this government had a level of spending that was lower than any other government in Canada. Now, you may not . . . the percentage increase . . .

MR. GREEN: The level of increase, the level of increase.

MR. RANSOM: . . . the percentage of increase in our budget was lower than any other.

MR. GREEN: Right, that's different, that's different.

MR. RANSOM: Lower than any other. Now, if you want to say that that is not an achievement, is not an achievement that was in line with what is now generally recognized as being necessary by all governments in Canada, the necessity to control spending, including the Premier from Saskatchewan, and including the First Minister in Ottawa, now recognizes some necessity for spending. The honourable gentlemen opposite don't realize any necessity for spending and persist in indicating that by spending money on public works that we don't need, that somehow that puts us in a better position, Mr. Chairman. That may be the sort of logic that makes sense to them; it certainly doesn't make sense to us, and it doesn't make sense to most of the people in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Before I recognize the next honourable member, we are in the process of discussing Administrative Services under (1) Salaries. I've allowed a great deal of latitude for the sake of convenience, but I would ask the honourable members if we can concentrate on the items that are under discussion, and I would recognize the Honourable Member

for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the item under discussion deals with that portion of the department, Administrative Services, which provides a financial accounting and statistical data on employment for all of the department. That's why I've done it under this item, and we did the same thing under this item last year. I won't go back to it. There's no other item. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, tell me which item under Mines where I can now discuss what I'm discussing other than this section. There isn't, Mr. Chairman, this is the item, they are the ones who used to give it to me, and the reason we are able to get answers is that they are able to give it to the Minister. If they leave the Chair and Dr. Bowen is here or somebody else is here, they will not be able to give it to me for the department generally. That's why I'm asking it while these gentlemen are here.

I do want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that despite my honourable friend's statements about perverted logic or things of that nature, and that's not germane to the entire issue, although I raised it and it's perfectly legitimate for him to respond, I asked him about ten minutes ago whether he could give me a global vacancy rate. He stood up, said, "I can't give you a global vacancy rate; I will give you the actual number that are employed in each area." He's since calculated a global vacancy rate . . . Well, at least we've made some progress, Mr. Chairman. What he couldn't do ten minutes ago, at least he is able to do now. Maybe we have done something to achieve that. And then he gave me a global vacancy rate for a department of over 1,000 people which relates to items which I am not able to compare with the ones that I got last year, which were the areas of the department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when he says that the department is employing less people, actually employed in January of 1979 than January of 1978, I never dealt with 1979. I dealt with 1978. I believe that the Conservatives were there in 1978, in January of 1978. That's where they said that people were being laid off, and that's where we had the figure of 791. I said that they hired people because they closed down the vacancy rate. If we take the 1979 figure, I am sure that we will come out with a not much different vacancy rate.

We have 165 employed for positions of 171. It's a very small vacancy rate. You gave me staff man years 171, employed 165 — 6 vacancies. In Minerals, 102; 129 employed — 3 vacancies. Under Water Resources, 360; 374 employed — no vacancy. In Administration, 107; 89 employed — there's a fairly higher number of vacancies. But on the overall, the comparison is very similar to 1978. When my honourable friend says that they employ less people, they have to be able to compare those with the figures that were available in 1977. We did that last year and we came out last year that there was no change, that the number of people employed, when one considers the lesser vacancy rate was the same number of people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are some fewer number, but the figure of 1,800 is outrageous. It will not be substantiated. We will find that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, the honourable member can say that the figure of 1,800 is outrageous if he wants, and perhaps he will attempt to substantiate that. All I can say is that in giving you a total figure from January, 1978, to January, 1979, in the total area of this department, there are 136 fewer people employed in 1979 than there were in 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, before we move off the item, I just wonder if the Minister could give us the similar calculations in term of staff location, whether he has a geographical breakdown of where these staff are located, whether they're in the City of Winnipeg, or northern Manitoba, or rural Manitoba, whether they do keep records of that.

I wonder, too, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could indicate whether there's been yet another change in the classification of staff, because he used the term "permanent staff man year," which was a familiar term in the House, but then he used the term, "term staff man year" to describe what used to be called a casual staff man year. It used to be that a term staff was the same as a permanent staff except the term staff was employed under a federal-provincial agreement that had a time limit on it and that was the only distinction between the two categories. So I wonder if there's been yet another change in categories to make the layoff process, even though the layoffs are much less than they've indicated, to make their layoff process fit within the Premier's statement that there would be layoffs by attrition only.

I wonder if there has been a change in the classification of civil servants since 1977, and I wonder

if he has that regional breakdown for staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: There have been no changes in categories, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to make anything appear different than it is. The allegation that is contained in the honourable member's question is not the case. The categories of employment, they are defined in The Civil Service Act, are regular, which is the same as permanent, temporary, and departmental. Then there are temporary employees include term staff and casual staff.

We have no geographical breakdown as to where people are located. It might be possible to identify the areas of reduction if that's what the honourable member is interested in, where the reductions have taken place.

MR. McBRYDE: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in the location of people, whether this is a centralized Winnipeg department, or whether it's a decentralized department. I would like to see the figures in that regard.

The other thing I would like to know then, Mr. Chairman, in the figures that the Minister has given so far, I wonder if he could break the totals down then between regular, as he defined it, and casual. That is, break it down between those positions where one person fills a position for a year, and break it down of those positions where there is a position that can be filled by a number of people during the year, which is called the casual classification, or in some cases a departmental classification.

MR. RANSOM: If you want the staff man years that are requested, the estimates, regular or permanent would be 1,300; the term, 135.03; contract, 2.34; departmental, 574. Now I've got a category here that I'm not familiar with. So that actually term instead of 135, is 157.03.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that the Minister and I are defining the words the same way. Does he define "term" as a position that can be filled by a number of people throughout the year or intermittent employment? If so, I wonder if he could then explain the difference between term and departmental.

MR. RANSOM: Well, the term employee means an individual, (1) who is appointed to a vacant continuing position until such time as a qualified person is appointed, or for such period of time as the Civil Service Commission may determine, or (2) who is employed for a specified period of time, ending on a specified date, or on the occurrence of a specified event on the authorization of Management Committee of Cabinet which would now be Treasury Board.

A departmental employee means any person employed in or under the Department of Highways, Department of Resources, Department of Tourism — that's all of them, I guess — whose appointment is made to a departmental employee classification contained within a component sub-agreement. The departmental staff— the example that was given of the type of people who are employed there — are the seasonal individuals such as fire rangers and special officers, whereas a term employee might be somewhat similar to the same type of person as would be hired into a regular position but it is for a specified period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid any confusion about changes in staff man years, etc., I think the only way to make some logical sense out of it is to then have the same figures for regular, term, contract and departmental, of these components that are now in this department for 1978 and for 1977. I wonder if it is possible for the Minister to obtain that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I guess we can get 1977, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how far we are going to go back here in the review of these Estimates. We have got categories that are outlined for the 1979 Estimates that we are talking about. I have got them for the year that we are in and I have got them for the previous year. Now, you are asking that we go back a further year and put those together. I suppose we can do that, Mr. Chairman, but just where do we draw the line on how far we go back to dig out information?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister will make some commitment to do that

or not because if there is going to be any accurate comparison at all of staff changes, staff reduction, then we need those overall figures broken down. Because there is quite a difference between reducing the number of departmental employees and theoretically estimating that you are going to need less casual work this summer, than changing the number of permanent positions that you have in the department. Unless there is that kind of a breakdown, then a comparison really is impossible and very very meaningless and I don't think the Minister can talk about any reductions unless he clarifies in what category he is talking about, bringing about a reduction in staff which he seems to be claiming that he is making here, is a reduction in staff.

The other question, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the Minister said he would get a geographical breakdown or if he made a commitment on that one way or the other.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'll undertake to see how much difficulty there is in getting those figures, Mr. Chairman, but because of the amalgamation involving three different departments, it may be very difficult to get them. I'll have to determine how much effort is required to get them.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister and his staff can clearly understand why that information is necessary. For example, if they were to take 100 regular staff positions and now call them term, then the Minister could stand up and say, "We reduced the staff by 100," if we were just talking about regular staff. So the only way we can get an accurate picture is to have the classifications of staff and where the reductions have taken place, or have not taken place, or where things have basically stayed pretty well the same, which is more than likely the situation we are following.

I am not clear if the Minister heard me repeat my question. Did he say he would also attempt to get the geographical breakdown, or did he comment on that?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I didn't say that I would get it, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know that it is recorded in that fashion, that the records have not been kept in that way. It is a matter of going through and tabulating where individual people are located. Again, if that doesn't require a tremendous amount of effort, then we will attempt to give you a distribution of where the people are.

In respect to your other question, whether they are departmental people or whether they are regular people, the figures that I have given you here are "people" as I read it. So that there shouldn't be any misunderstanding here in that we are talking about people, total number of people. I suppose it is conceivable that five of these people might be in one of those staff man years, in one of those term categories, for instances. The total number of people, comparable date this year in January, is 136 fewer than the comparable date January last year. I can give it to you by regular and so forth.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister is going to have to do that, because it makes it even more confusing. Because if the Minister talks about people employed and he has in that particular reference, casual employees or departmental employees, whichever of those two categories he wants to use, if he has people in there and he says the number of people, there could be ten people filling one position last January, and this year, one person filling that position for ten months. Therefore, he would have nine people less, but no reduction in the Civil Service. So, Mr. Chairman, that is why it has to be clarified.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it absolutely escapes me. We can't clarify it any more. We have given you the staff man years; we have given them to you by the categories; we have given you the total number of people. Now, you can refuse to recognize the reduction if you want, but we have given you the categories; we have given you the number of people. There is no more information to give you.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, having sat on the Treasury Bench on that side, I know it is possible to change people from term to permanent, to switch casuals around, to switch contracts around, and unless the Minister is able to give that information, then his figure of 136, as he said himself just a minute ago, is completely meaningless. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, then I wonder if he could define those 136, whether they are regular, term, contract, departmental or casual?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, from the changeover from 1978 to 1979, Administrative Services: regular category, two reduction; term, three increase; two reduction for departmental; nine reduction for contract; for a total reduction of 10.

Environmental Management: regular, reduction of four; term, reduction of two; departmental,

no change; contract, increase of two.

Fisheries and Wildlife: regular, reduction of 21; term, reduction of 15; departmental, reduction of 45; contract, reduction of 10.

Forestry: regular, reduction of four; term, reduction of three; departmental, reduction of 31; contract, reduction of two.

Lands and Surveys: regular, increase of 27; term, reduction of eight; departmental, reduction of one; contract, reduction of 10.

Mineral Resources: —(Interjection)— They asked for it, Mr. Chairman, that's what they wanted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not arguing that point. The hour being 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19.2, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. We will return to the Chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business under Private Members' Hour is Private Bills, second reading of Bill (No. 10), An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to let this bill stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement to let it stand? (Agreed) Then we move on to Private Resolutions.

PRIVATE RESOLUTIONS — RESOLUTION NO. 1

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that:

Whereas the right to perform productive work is essential to enable maximum self-realization of the individual; and

Whereas the economic system under which we live fails to my previous intercourse with them to the political position that I had been advocating, and particularly to the aspirations of the citizens of society as reflected in the New Democratic Party program. These people came to me and said that I was against the Right to Work, that they had read somewhere that the New Democratic Party is opposed to the Right to Work and that my friends in the trade union movement were opposed to the Right to Work.

I determined, Mr. Speaker, that this phenomena was the result of a skillfully presented program on the part of people who were determined that they were going to destroy one of the main elements of free collective bargaining, who were determined that if they clothed their negative purposes under a high-sounding principle such as the Right to Work, that they could somehow put people on the defensive with respect to that allegation. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, I then saw numerous segments of the trade union movement, some of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, talking about being against the Right to Work legislation, or against Right to Work legislation. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to determine who are against the principle of the Right to Work. Because as I saw the legislation that was being advocated, it was for society to intervene in free collective bargaining, arrangements that had made by employers and employees as to how seniority and how security of employees would be protected by means of either a union shop, grand formula or an agreement which predated any legislation which was arrived at between the parties themselves, that people belonging to a particular association would be employed.

And, Mr. Speaker, interestingly enou the First inister of M/ this province - - after the resolution was presented by the way, but I don't say that he knew the resolution was presented - - referred to the Right To Work Campaign as being a misnomer. He referred to it as being an attempt to break closed shop agreements and having nothing to do with the right to work. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister made that observation, and I think that the Minister of Labour also is aware of what this insidious campaign is trying to do. And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that one could have let well enough alone and say that , well, the Premier is up to their tricks, the Minister of Labour is up to their tricks, despite the rantings of certain of the backbench, they're not going to be silly enough to pursue a measure which would interfere with their stated, and I repeat, their stated suggestion that they do not wish to interfere with the collective bargaining process and the

freedom of both sides to obtain such conditions as they are prepared to accept.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to let it rest at that. Because I really think that it's time that society and the citizens of the Province of Manitoba were able to ascertain who is for the right to work and who is against the right to work. Because all of the citizens who approached me who said that they are for the right to work and why am I against it, were for the right to work, meaning that if an individual was seeking employment that employment would be available so that he could realize himself as a human being. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe, contrary to what I hear from many Conservatives, that every human being has within him a desire to achieve, a desire to be productive, a desire to contribute to society, and that it's only society which has in many cases, and by following quote—well, I won't quote, I'll quote my friend, the Member for Logan - - "Regressive conservative policy which have extinguished that spark and degenerated the human being", and that with a different organization of society, Mr. Speaker, we would find people not only willing to work but anxious to make a contribution to the well-being of themselves and through that to well-being of everybody collectively.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I want people in this community to stand up and be counted as to whether they are willing to do those things that are necessary to give human beings in our society the right to work in a very meaningful way, in a way which would see to it, Mr. Speaker, that we would not be talking about 5.7 percent unemployment. We would not be talking about the fact that hundreds of people are on welfare and that through some generations of the welfare syndrome that some people have - - and I regret to say it, but I see it happening sometime - - have almost been put into a position where they have lost any desire to either improve themselves or to improve society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution I was asked why I was putting it, and I said that I want to see whether the Chamber of Commerce and the Builders Exchange and the Conservative Party, who talk about being in favour of the right to work, will support this resolution because I believe that they will not may support it, I don't know, I'll wait to support it. see it.

But I know that everything that I have heard from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and every resolution that they have ever presented speaks against this resolution and if, Mr. Speaker, - - and I got a letter from them saying that they have not taken a position on the right to work - - if they take a position, that they are in favour of this resolution and indeed in favour of the Legislature taking such steps in the public and private sector of seeing to it that there is a right to work on the part of everybody who wishes to it then I will welcome such support from the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, but I won't stand on one leg waiting for them to support it because they have never supported this type of concept in the past.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution I also want to make clear who are the party that believes in institutionalized relief, institutionalized welfare, institutionalized social assistance. And, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is part and parcel of the philosophy of the Conservative Parties and the Liberal Parties that it has nothing to do with Socialism and has nothing to do with the New Democratic Party stands for. It is the philosophical position of the Conservative Party that there shall be unemployment, Mr. Speaker, that there shall be a big pool of unemployment, that that pool of unemployment will drag wages down, that by the virtue of having low wages we will have more investment, and by virtue of having more investment, a certain number of people will get rich and society will gain. That is their position, but germane to the position is a pool of unemployment. What do they say should be done about that pool of unemployment because we can't just have a wild, hungry, angry - - although the First Minister of this Province can't understand why everybody isn't happy - - he says that if you will go to the Manitoba Club and see somebody sitting in his nice soft chair and having a nice afternoon and having a drink and talking with his colleagues, he says those people are happy. Why are you stirring up discontent, why can't the guy who is unemployed, can't find a job, can't bring up his children in the way which he would aspire to do so, why can't he be just as satisfied, why can't he be just as satisfied, why are you stirring him up to hate? That's the position of the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, it's that Party over there that believes in unemployment and that believes in relief and believes in welfare. There's only one difference, Mr. Speaker, between our views on this question which has caused them to label us as the welfare party.

We are taking the position continuously, Mr. Speaker, that we do not believe in welfare, we believe in full employment. We have also taken the position that we want to eradicate poverty; we don't want to give charity to poverty. But we have said, Mr. Speaker, if in their eyes it's to our discredit, I plead guilty, that we have sympathized and said that the people on welfare are not gouging the community. We have said that those people are a result of the inadequate social structure of our society as to have put them in the position where - - to live off the state they have and we have said it's not their fault. And for that reason, they who do nothing but continue to degrade these people and deride them and to make fun of them and to call them names and to call them lazy

and to say that they lack initiative, and those statements, Mr. Speaker, have been made for all of the twelve years that I have been in this House. They say that when we refuse to do so obviously we are the welfare party.

But, Mr. Speaker, I read from Will Durant's book some years ago in this house and I showed that before there was a Socialist Party, before there was any degree of Socialism in the early 1800s there were in England — which I think that you people would say was a wonderful capitalist society - - there were over 10 percent of the people living on the dole at that time. A higher percent of people were in a dependency situation in the 1800 than there are today, with no socialism, everything was free enterprise, every man for himself, as the elephant said when he danced among the chickens. And it should have been a perfect society, but there were more people on welfare in that day, Mr. Speaker, than there are today. And one of my Conservative friends said if they don't say it articulately it is the necessary inference that stems from their society. They say unemployment is not only endemic, it is necessary, that if you had no unemployment, you would have employers competing for employees. This would drive up wages, this would drive out investment, therefore we must have unemployment.

And not because really we're that humanitarian about it, not because we don't want these people to starve because we feel sorry for them, but if they are not feed at least a little bit and if they are not clothed however inadequately and if they are not housed even though we will attach a stigma to their housing, we will have terrible things happening. We will have them stealing, we will have them being ripe, Mr. Speaker, a ripe group of people with whom to try to ferment an insurrection. So they say we need them unemployed but we have to keep them from starving. And that's the position, Mr. Speaker, of the real Welfare Party because we have said and howsoever inadequately we have sometimes been at achieving it' it doesn't mean we should stop trying. We have said that we wish to eliminate poverty to the extent that it can be eliminated, that we will have employment programs in Northern Manitoba which on the individual balance sheet will not show a profit, but on the global balance sheet which will show well-being in our society. And we are prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, in order that people will have the right to work.

Because, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the right to work is necessary from the individual point of view and from the global societal point of view. We say that a human being cannot achieve the kind of happiness that each person is entitled to a share of on this world if he does not have a self-fulfilling activity. And we believe that the state of dependence that some of my honourable friends think people will go to if they are secure, that if somehow security is provided by the state that these people will start to do less is an inadequate state and is a state of unhappiness.

And, Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. When people's security needs our taking care of, I find that without variation that they tend to work harder, that they start involving themselves in other things, that they become involved in community serving organizations without fee because they want to make contributions to their fellow man and to themselves and I don't sell that short.

So we say, Mr. Speaker, that the right to employment, the right to be productive, the right to not be in a state of dependency involves the right to work and that the individual needs it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we say society needs it and in this we have a more profound argument with my honourable friends, because my honourable friends say that society is too poor to employ all of its people and that somehow there is a destruction in wealth if people are working and producing material things. Don't they say that, Mr. Speaker?

The Honourable First Minister said it yesterday, he tried to slide around it, he said that in a war we find that we are able to produce much more but we give up our liberty. How much liberty was given up in the United States during Vietnamese War with the exception of conscription which has nothing to do with production? What civil rights were violated, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: What civil rights were violated? Well there was some violation by the government in giving people information, but in terms of the freedom of the individual, what freedom was violated for this country, the United States of America, to be able to produce \$30 billion a year — think of it, 15 times the entire budget of the Province of Manitoba, at that time I think the entire budget of Canada, but I'm not sure, so let's leave it at \$30 billion a year — to house, clothe, educate, feed, supply sophisticated buildings, equipment, machinery, airplanes, automobiles, the great percentage of which was to be destroyed. And it made the United States wealthier, Mr. Speaker. Somehow the system of employment and the economic system which they adhere to is geared, Mr. Speaker, to make us wealthy by destroying goods but we cannot convert it into making us wealthy by consuming the same goods which we destroyed. They have never been able to answer that dilemma.

Probably, Mr. Speaker, the best parliamentary picture which I can conjure as to how this was

done was the one that was done by Mr. Douglas in 1938 when he entered the House of Commons and Mr. Dunning was the Finance Minister. He made a statement very similar to our own First Minister with regard to money growing on trees. Tommy Douglas asked Mr. Dunning why the Government of Canada couldn't mobilize itself so as to have a program to produce hospitals, schools, roads, and to take the unemployed people and the capacity of our resources and our labour, and to join the two and to have a program which would take the unemployed people off the roles. Mr. Dunning got up, and I cannot tell the story the way Mr. Douglas tells it, but Mr. Dunning got up and said, "My young friend, my young socialist friend, he doesn't realize that these things require money, and he thinks that money grows on a mulberry bush." Mr. Douglas got up and said, "I cannot say whether or not money grows on a mulberry bush, but I can tell the House of Commons this: that if a war comes, Mr. Dunning will find the bush."

Within a very short time, Mr. Speaker, the war came and far more money than Mr. Douglas ever requested to be mobilized in terms of war was mobilized to produce for destruction, and we, in this party say that providing employment, provided that that employment is directed to socially useful things, will make us wealthier, not poorer. It's the Conservatives who say that people working impoverish our society.

Mr. Speaker, to take one dramatic example, in 1978, 3,400 employees were laid off by the International Nickel Company of Canada in Sudbury. I'll ask for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. The reason for the reduction was that there was a declining demand for nickel and huge inventories in the stockpile of the company. The effect of the layoff was the unemployment of 3,400 people whose total payroll was 68 millions of dollars. There will be a decreased realized product, the amount of product which we will lose by virtue of that employment not proceeding would be \$150 million. Our gross national product for the year would accordingly be reduced by \$150 million as against what it would be if these people were working.

There are, Mr. Speaker, however, additional factors to be taken into consideration. First of all, in addition to losing \$150 million, the public will be asked to contribute \$30 million a year to unemployment insurance for these people who no longer are permitted to produce.

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

MR. GREEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether I could prevail upon the honourable members to give me a few minutes in which I will try to finish.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there consent of the House to let the member proceed?

MR. JORGENSEN: You organize your speeches the same way as you organize government, you have no concept of time or money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, right now I am trying to be productive and to achieve some self-realization — the Right to Work.

MR. JORGENSEN: Within the limits that are placed upon you.

MR. GREEN: (French translation not available.) Okay? There are additional economic factors, which would be taken into account. First of all, in addition to losing \$150 million — no doubt about that — we're going to pay \$30 million to the people for them to do nothing, because they will be on unemployment insurance. This will not affect the total amount of money that is available in society but it will mean that everybody else will have to put up a little bit of money to pay that \$30 million. Society will have the same amount, but each of us will have to put up a little bit to pay the \$30 million, especially when the Unemployment Insurance is running at a deficit, or if it comes out of the fund, it doesn't make any difference, it still comes out of somebody's pocket.

There will also be a decline of purchasing power on the part of those employees which will affect grocery stores, other retailers, the tourist industries and what have you. All of this impoverishment — and we will agree, it is impoverishment, \$150 million in the GNP. You people always talk about the GNP; it's a good argument. We will have to pay them \$30 million. All of this impoverishment is tolerated, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is encouraged on the specious assumption that it makes us richer. That's the dilemma. We accept poverty because we say it makes us richer.

It is estimated that as a result of this cutback, millions of tons of refined nickel and copper will not be produced. Translated into commodities, this could mean six million automobile radiators, — just look — well, it would be a new radiator for every car in the country —(Interjection)— which

they don't need, Mr. Speaker. Do they need cutlery?: Do they need a new radiator on every car in the country?

MR. ORCHARD/

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member from this argument says that I'm suggesting they build six million radiators, it merely means he has a lack of imagination. You know, there's something which my honourable friend . . . What about if it would produce another six million cars?

MR. ORCHARD: Six million customers, good business.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to me you will have six million customers if you had everybody working so that they could earn money to buy. And that's what my honourable friend doesn't understand. It would, Mr. Speaker, produce enough stainless steel pipe to circle the globe 30 times. —(Interjection)— Yes, he's suggesting that I produce that much pipe. If, accordingly, we were able to convert this productive cutback into a combination of socially useful, desired and utile commodities, we could re-employ 3,400 people, provide a payroll of \$68 million, increase the wealth of our society by adding to it the products which could be manufactured from the refined nickel and copper, and maintain all the multipliers which are affected by the cutback. If somebody could devise a system whereby purchasing power was available to buy the commodities, which we prefer not to produce, there would be an apparent solution to the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the members of the House to consider . . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, you know everything that Social Credit said that was not wrong, and everything that the Progressive Conservative Party say is not right, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, and I'll conclude with this, I ask the honourable members of this House to read a paper given by Rubin Bellan, a Doctor of Economics, who is neither Social Credit nor Socialist, nor I am happy to say, Progressive Conservative, he is a recognized economist in this —(Interjection)— No, he's not a Liberal either, I don't think. He is a recognized economist in this country; he is the head of the Department of Economics at St. Johns or St. Pauls —(Interjection)— Yes, St. Johns.

He wrote a paper, Mr. Speaker called "Let's Declare War on Great Britain." It is a serious paper, serious in its message if not in its tone. He says, "We are having great trouble with our economy." And this is the gist of it; you have to read it for yourselves. But he says, "We are having great trouble with our economy. We find that this trouble could be solved if we have a war and yet the war causes all kinds of problems. But if we could devise a war which would not cause these problems, we could have both the benefits without many of the problems. If we are going to do this, surely we should do it with one of our friends rather than with one of our enemies. I mean, we could help each other. Great Britain being a friend, it is much better to declare war on Great Britain than to declare war on an enemy power, because why should we help the enemy. We should more help our friends, and then society would start moving again."

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say that when we conjure up a war, there is the notion that people are going to get hurt. He says we could see to it that nobody got hurt. 90 percent of every missile that was launched in the last war failed to hit its target, and he said that it would be an easy proposition to make sure that the balance of the 10 percent also failed to do any damage.

Mr. Bellan makes the point that there will be people who say that this is not good economics, it doesn't fall in the mood of restraint, it doesn't conform to what those people who have been governing in our society say is good for us. But it will, Mr. Speaker, result in us being possessed of much more wealth than we have been under the present system of economics.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this, that it's all right to talk about the Right to Work, it's all right to agree, yes, I believe in the Right to Work. This resolution says that the Legislature will implement steps to achieve full employment and that everybody seeking a job will be able to be employed, and that the performance by that person of socially productive work will make us richer, not poorer, and it will also do something, Mr. Speaker, far more important. It will result in dignity to many human beings in our society whom the existing system has degraded to a degree of dependence, some of whom will never recover from.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to clear up a particular point. The Member for Inkster doesn't specifically say it, but he implies, as others have implied, that the right to work, as some deemed it to be the right-to-work legislation and the proposal for it, was somehow, in

some way, agreed to by this government, or we were part of this scheme, some place, somewhere, that's the insinuation that the Opposition would like to have some people in the province accept.

Our particular government, Mr. Speaker, when we receive resolutions from organizations, be they or municipal organizations, urban organizations, Chambers of Commerce, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, whatever, I don't know of a time where we've told them beforehand, or on their way to meet us, or when they got to meet us, to throw out some particular portion of their presentation, we just weren't even going to consider it, we weren't going to look at it, we weren't going to think about it.

The reason I make this point I think is fairly obvious, and it bears repeating, that I walked into the . . . Municipalities Convention with 500 to 600 delegates. I was told, as I walked in the door, a cup of coffee in my hand on the way to the front stage, that they had just passed a resolution by 85 to 90 percent that they were going to be asking the government to implement right-to-work legislation.

That particular day, and since, I'm still not convinced that they had a real understanding of what that was. I've had some who criticized me for, when I was asked on the platform that particular day, they have said, "Why didn't you tell them to throw it out if you never had any intention of implementing it? Why did you even hang around?" I think I've just explained to you, at least I hope I've explained to you why I did not say to them that you can throw that particular resolution out; this government is never going to look at that thing.

I've no intention of saying that to any particular organization. I think the answer I gave at that time when they asked how I would deal with it, I said, "With great difficulty." The makeup of myself is that I would have great difficulty dealing with that particular resolution.

What was the question from the . . . —(Interjection)— I didn't say that at that particular meeting.

Let me tell you, the Member for Elmwood, seeing as he chooses to question. He talks about resignation and I received a letter from an organization in Thompson called The New Democratic Party. The president of it —(Interjection)— We'll talk about that too if you want. The president of it, a good acquaintance of mine, sent me a letter outlining some comments I had made one time when I was, I think, at a nominating convention or something, where I said that I did not want to be part of a party that would destroy the bargaining procedures of unions. To the Member for Elmwood, to anybody in the province who wants to listen, I still say that. I haven't changed. So it is easy for me to explain that particular comment.

So we did not advocate or be part of formulating this particular piece of legislation. I would like to take the resolution and we'll just talk about it word by word. I learned rather quickly and I suppose many years ago that the Member for Inkster is an expert with words and I think you have to look at the precise wording of what he is saying. You just can't take it, Mr. Speaker, for really what it appears to be. Because it appears as one appearance but you have to really look at what the words are saying.

"Whereas the right to perform productive work is essential to enable maximum self-realization of the individual. . . ." Good words. I remember, and it's strange that that type of wording is coming from that side of the House because I remember during my Estimates last year in this House, I think it was the Member for The Pas saying to me, you let some people go in a particular area of the Department of Northern Affairs, and I remember saying, yes, there was such a massive duplication of certain functions that they weren't really being fully employed. I remember him saying, "any type of employment, as long as they are working, as long as they are doing something, they feel better." That type of philosophy, what he was saying, is that anything, any type of work, it doesn't matter whether it is self-fulfilling, that doesn't matter. It doesn't matter if it's two hours worth of a day, that doesn't matter. That was his philosophy. But here we read the fine words of my friend from Inkster where he says, "maximum self-realization." So he is saying "maximum." His colleague didn't really care; it didn't have to be maximum, anything at all.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas. Does he have a point of privilege, a point of order?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I said I had a point of privilege. Do you want to hear it or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas state his point of privilege.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister who is speaking is alleging that I made certain remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I don't recall those remarks being said in the way the Minister is indicating that they were said.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has no point of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabour the point, or I don't want to be chastizing in any way but I remember very well the debate between the Member for The Pas and myself over and over where I said that if a person is fully employed —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for The Pas that if he wants to enter the debate, there is a time and a place for it.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly feel good about this, what has taken place. I really sincerely felt that the discussion had taken place before so I won't dwell on that any longer in the absence of the Member for The Pas.

But I can agree with the Member for Inkster when he says "maximum self-realization of the individual." I have expounded that and I have said that on many many occasions.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we are being asked in this resolution — if we were to pass it, and I have thoughts about this — I am wondering if what the Member for Inkster is saying in the last paragraph, "Therefore be it resolved that this legislation approves of the principle of the Right to Work and urges the implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining the same." If you tie that in with the first wording being, "maximum self-realization," what kind of a society does the member really think that we have? What kind of public input, what kind of public funds would have to be expended to create a society where everybody had the ideal job or he received maximum self-fulfillment? Those are the type of words. I suppose it is an utopia. It is some type of heaven where you can just quit and come and go. That's his exact words. The reason I look at them is because I know the gentleman. I have known him for a long time and I know that that's the kind of thing he is saying. If this was to pass, he would say, then, this Legislature is bound to create the type of employment so that we all feel very comfortable in our work and it is a maximum self-fulfillment. That is the way I read it and over the years I have learned to read things reasonably well.

Is he then saying too that if this type of thing was to pass, there is no limit to deficit, there is no limit to what you spend to create this type of society? It is extremely difficult for anybody who is elected to be the caretaker of the taxpayers' purse, I suppose, to say that it doesn't really matter what we are going to spend our money on, we're going to employ everybody in the ideal type of employment. Beautiful society, but I just really don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can ever get to that exact type of society, if that is what he is trying.

I think that we are concerned; we are trying to do something about the unemployment situation. The unemployment in this country, and nobody agrees with the fact but it is a fact, has been creeping up and creeping up during the years previous to the NDP, during their years, and unfortunately during ours and the national party's. But I think we are working at doing something about the unemployment situation. We have recently demonstrated it. We recently signed a relocation program, one that I happen to feel kind of good about, in Flin Flon. We are working like heck now trying to build a greater one in the Leaf Rapids area. We signed some DREE agreements that may have some value in this particular area. Just recently — I can't tie it in with the fact of what my good friend the Minister of Mines is saying about mining programs, but I do know today that in my home town of Thompson, there is a major new exploration job taking place by a company called INCO. It is going to employ in the neighbourhood of 50 people, maybe more, for the next year. So some little bit of activity is taking place.

We have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a great degree of talk about out-migration, in-migration and this type of thing. Some people opposite have tried to take a bit of it out and they don't want to talk about the whole situation on the migration bit. The one point they don't want to talk about is that there are 22,000 more people working in Manitoba in January of 1979 than there were in January of 1978. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that as critical as they want to be, as the Member for Inkster himself says, their role is to embarrass us — that's their role. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he is really interested in Manitoba — I think he is — I wonder why he allows the others to carry on painting this gloomy story, this story they cook up about how poor things are. Does he not really believe in the philosophy that if you keep pounding away that some

place is a horrible place to live, that eventually people start thinking that particular way. —(Interjection)— Well, there was real room in those days to do some criticizing, there really was. Yes, I agree, that a lot of things changed on October 11, 1977.

The member talks about the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party believing in unemployment. He seems to talk in circles about why they believe in this. He doesn't specifically tell me as a member of that particular party that I believe in unemployment. I think he would have difficulty establishing the fact that I particularly believe in unemployment. I think he is going to have difficulty now, or in the future in this House, trying to establish the fact that when we are making efforts in working towards easing the unemployment situation — the efforts are substantial in a lot of areas. We are reviewing the present efforts that have been made over the last few years to see where we can improve them. I think he is going to have difficulty, in face if nothing else, standing up saying that we believe in unemployment when we are working like hell trying to do something about it. I don't know where he gets the idea; it is concocted somewhere, I suppose, in his line of thinking. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Elmwood wants to ask something about the construction industry. What particularly do you want to ask about the construction industry?

MR. DOERN: I would like to ask the Minister whether the efforts of the government to create employment include the construction industry, architecture, engineering, and the trades, contractors?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy the Member for Elmwood. —(Interjection)— There's a few. Enjoyment you can enjoy for a variety of reasons. You — I have my own reasons. I like to hear your chatter.

The construction industry as a whole, there is something taking place today which, even I think the Member for Elmwood would hope that it reaches some pretty solid conclusions, and that is the study, the workforce, the group that is working on the problems that entire industry has faced, not just last year but in other years. The problem faced by the construction industry last summer, it is debated by many whose fault that disaster was and I personally think it was a disaster. The same type of disaster was happening in Saskatchewan. I happened to be in there at the time and I believe there was some of it in Alberta, so it wasn't solely centered in Manitoba. But I don't really care if it happened here or if it happened any other place. My concern and the concern of this government, was that it took place in Manitoba and we think that something different should be done about it, rather than just cry about it. So, I think you are aware of the fact that Cam MacLean's Committee, which is the old Woods Committee, has been asked specifically by myself to look at what took place. Now I wouldn't expect the Member for Elmwood to understand a thing about industrial relations or the problems that take place within them. —(Interjection)— Do you want to ask a question too? Do you want to suggest it to the Speaker or do you want to suggest it across the table?

This particular committee is going to review the entire happenings, I hope, of what took place last year, and I have great hopes for it, Mr. Speaker, that some conclusions will be reached by all parties involved, and that if legislation is necessary to assist the groups of people that are involved in studying the issue, then I have assured them that we would certainly give it reasonable consideration. Now, does this satisfy the Member for Elmwood? He is not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that this government is trying to resolve a situation in a responsible manner, that I might add has never been done before in this particular industry under the setting geographically that we are trying to do here. It's never been done before. I'm not completely satisfied that it's really been done the way we are outlining it to be done, or hope it's going to be done, in any other jurisdiction in the country.

I think that other jurisdictions may be reasonably pleased with the outcome of this, and maybe it might have a spinoff effect of helping other provinces. I would think that the Member for Elmwood is probably as selfish as I am, when I say that I certainly hope that it is going to help Manitoba first, and if others can reap some benefits from it, then so be it. I suppose what he is trying to say outside of that, in addition to that, or around that, is the problems that he perceives that architects or engineers are having because we are not building other buildings — (Interjection) — well, I think we've talked about the garage so many times that I don't think we should necessarily talk about it again.

But what we are trying to do is expend moneys what we think are in the essential areas. We think the taxpayers of the province have asked us to do that. We think, Mr. Speaker, just in closing, I suppose, that we think we are making reasonable efforts, acceptable efforts. Maybe the efforts are never big enough to do something about the unemployment situation. We are reviewing also at the moment, the employment programs that are in place. We are prepared to add to them if

necessary if we can find that there is a good future for them and they are very beneficial. I would like to believe that the north is going to pick up. There was a tremendous thing took place in a lot of people's minds in northern Manitoba just in the last few days, and that was the signing of the agreement in Thompson between the steel workers in INCO, and I think that even those opposite would share the view that we hope this is a setter of the pace for the mining industry in the north, that it may in fact have a good effect for the future of the mining industry in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes that I have, I would just like to start, because there are a couple of statements that the previous speaker made that I think need a bit of clarification, or at least need to be pursued a bit further.

Firstly, I have to say that the members on this side are pleased that the settlement occurred in Thompson just the other day, and we do hope that it signifies a brighter dawn for the mining industry in northern Manitoba. And when we're talking about the mining industry, the Minister brought up the fact that INCO is starting a major new exploration job in the Thompson region and that will be 50 new jobs created by this new exploration effort on the part of INCO. What he neglected to mention, is that since his government has come into power since October of 1977, there has been over 1,200 workers laid off by INCO. Excuse me, I have to correct that. There has been over 800 workers laid off, fired, and let go by INCO and there has been an accompanying 400 workers or so who had to leave because when INCO lays off that number of people in a community as small as Thompson, the rest of the community is going to suffer, just as the rest of the north suffers when they cut back on Hydro. I think we have to make that point and I wouldn't let it stand for any longer than the five minutes it takes me to stand here and give it to the House.

The other point I think we have to make is, the Minister talked about how many more people are employed today than before. In 1977, Mr. Speaker, there were 432,000 people approximately, working in the Province of Manitoba. In 1978, there were 445,000 people working in the Province of Manitoba. There are more people employed. But in 1977, Mr. Speaker, there were only 27,140 people unemployed in the Province of Manitoba, yet, after one full year of his government, there are now 31,416 people unemployed in the Province of Manitoba. There are 4,276 more people unemployed today than there were a year ago, and that is much as a result of his government's refusal to act, his government's refusal to play an integral part in creating an economy that will serve the needs of people and one of those needs is to have productive work available to them.

Mr. Speaker, for every statistic they throw our way, we can throw a statistic back their way, and we can become mired and bogged down in throwing statistics back and forth, and I don't think that is what we're here for. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Member for Pembina asked me for some solutions. Well, I would just like to give the Member for Pembina notice, that when next I stand before the House to speak on this resolution, I fully intend to speak about some solutions, and I hope that his government fully intends to listen to those solutions. I have a sad feeling that perhaps they won't, that they aren't willing to make the commitment to full employment that is necessary in these times of economic downswing.

But I do intend to talk about those solutions, and I also intend to talk about the problem a bit more, because I don't think they fully understand the problem when they sit here and throw the statistics about how many jobs they have created; 50 new jobs in Thompson because of INCO, and they conveniently ignore the 1,200 people who have been forced onto welfare, the 1,200 people who have been forced out of the province, the 1,200 people who have been forced onto the unemployment rolls because they refused to live up to their obligation as a government when INCO first said: "Because we are pursuing the almighty dollar, because we want our \$77.8 million profit for 1978, we are going to lay off 1,800 workers in the community of Thompson." So we will be talking about that a bit in the coming days, and we will be talking about the solutions more, and more, and more, as this Session goes on, because there are solutions. This government would have you believe that there are none. Mr. Speaker, there are solutions. They have worked in other jurisdictions, they have worked in other provinces, in other areas of this country, and in other countries, and we are going to talk about them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee at 8 o'clock.