

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Tuesday, May 31, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can confirm whether in his discussions with the Polar Gas group there has been an indication that Manitoba will be prepared to help finance the pipeline if the pipeline goes through all of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the answer is an unequivocal no. It would not be our intention, under any circumstances, to become involved — if I understood the question right — in the financing of the pipeline. Which pipeline financing would be in the order of magnitude of \$7 billion plus or minus.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government in its discussions with Polar Gas has indicated that they are prepared to finance additional studies supporting the alternative of coming through Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: There will be studies, Mr. Speaker, but we do not intend to duplicate efforts. I might add further that the determination as to the route to be followed by the pipeline, if and when it's built some several years from now, will be predicated in such things as whether it's a 48 inch or a 42 inch, that will determine route alternatives and also the size of Canadian domestic requirements, the amount of export, etc. It will not be determined by whether or not a provincial jurisdiction is prepared to get involved to the extent of some few millions of dollars in equity shares.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that Polar Gas have informed the government that they intend to prepare the alternative studies for the routing through Manitoba, taking into consideration the matters that he's already brought to the attention of the House, and I wonder if in that proposal Polar Gas have indicated that their intention is to finance that study entirely on their own.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that to be the case. There are already tentative or preliminary, I should say, studies as to the pros and cons of 48 inch pipe and one given route, and a 42 inch pipe and another given route. The province has some preliminary studies with respect to the multiplier effect of one route as opposed to the other. In the final analysis there has been, I can say, no request by Polar Gas that the Province of Manitoba expend funds to carry out costing exercises on their behalf. As far as the province's concern is involved, we have the obligation to avail ourselves of information and material that is worked up on preliminary studies by Polar Gas and to attempt to refine it and to ensure that the National Energy Board is familiar with these different figures.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, in reply to a question by the Member for River Heights this morning as to whether the unemployment forecast, as revealed yesterday in Ottawa, has any bearing on Manitoba. Strictly for information, we do not necessarily accept the data, the projections two years forward would seem to indicate that Manitoba's unemployment rate would remain not only at two full percentage points below the maximum average, but should widen to 2 ½ percentage points below the national average.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. Final question.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder whether the First Minister would indicate the forecasted unemployment rate two years from now in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind it is not my forecast, but that of the federal authorities, emphasizing again that it is a forecast, it shows Manitoba's unemployment rate averaged for 1978 at 5.4. That is a forecast which I do not believe takes into account anything beyond a *status quo* projection, it does not take into account any winter works or accelerated special job creation efforts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environmental Protection. In view of the large amount of chemical spraying that is taking place in the province, both in provincial parks and otherwise, can he indicate whether his department has undertaken any special measures to monitor the amount of chemical contaminants in the air and whether there is any changes in degrees, and have that information supplied to different publics and areas which are concerned about this?

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

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that all of the programs that take place have to be filed with the Environmental Protection branch, so they should be able to have, first of all, an idea of what is occurring, but I will check to see whether they do on-the-spot evaluations as to what is occurring as requested by my honourable friend.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, can the Minister indicate whether it is a common procedure for the department to provide for ongoing monitoring of the changes of air content and chemical content in the air, and also determine whether there is any availability of advice that people can receive on hand, as to where the spraying will take place, and what the impacts might be upon people with special respiratory or other ailments?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are air quality tests taken and I am of the opinion that with regard to certain spraying, in any event, done by various groups that there is advice given, both by the city or other authorities, as to what you can do if you want to avoid the spray, what you can do if it is a problem, but particularly what special requests can be made to the authorities so that individuals would not be subjected to the normal amount of spraying. However, I will take the totality of my honourable friend's question as notice and try to respond as quickly as I can.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I can to another Minister, to the Minister of Agriculture who announced that he was going to propose that there be liability assurance applied to those who are undertaking spraying, and it was my understanding that one of the conditions of licensing, under the Clean Environment Commission, that all those who are using sprays would be carrying insurance. Can he indicate whether, in fact, spraying is being undertaken by agencies that are not carrying proper insurance credentials?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge is obviously referring to the new Pesticides and Fertilizers Control Act which has been proclaimed and regulation passed effective July 1st next.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave to proceed with the First Reading of a bill that notice of, or indications of which I gave some two to three weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL (NO. 86) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE ELECTIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER introduced **Bill (No. 86) - An Act to Amend the Elections Act.**

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can tell us when we might expect to receive the Annual Report of the Economic Development Advisory Board.

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I believe, it was explained to members of the House last year that the terms of reference of the Economic Development Advisory Board had been changed. This goes back well over a year ago I believe now, Mr. Speaker, and that the Board is not now required to present a report to the Legislative Committee on Economic Development. Mr. Speaker, this is for a very good reason. The reason is that most of their work is of the nature of engaging in and conducting seminars, discussion groups and conferences on economic development questions, and all of its reports from these seminars and conferences are made public, and indeed in some instances published reports are made available to the public. So indeed therefore, all of their activity is of a public nature and there is simply no need therefore, for a special report to be made to any Economic Development Committee. I say that, Mr. Speaker, reminding members again that the original concept of the Board had been changed, or has been changed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Can he inform the House what the status is of the issuance of licence for moped operators in view of the fact that the amendments to the Highway Act have not yet passed, and that instructions were given by the Motor Vehicles Branch, that licences would be available on June 1st. Can he indicate what status operators of those vehicles have? Would they be allowed to use these vehicles or will there be temporary licences issued?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTNIAK, (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to say that the honourable member has been given some information which is not correct. I am not aware of any instructions given by the Motor Vehicle Branch to anyone that definitely June 1st the bill will be proclaimed and that that will be law, that mopeds will be allowed in Manitoba. There was an indication that it was hopeful that perhaps by June 1st, but I'm not aware of any definite date given by anyone to anyone.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate however, that there would be temporary arrangements made for licensing for moped operators to cover the interim period before the passage and proclamation of the bill so that they can operate their vehicles?

MR. BURTNIAK: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to do so, because I believe the bill hopefully will receive third reading shortly, and anyone that has received or bought a moped, bought it with the hope that someday he may be able to use it legally, and surely I think people can wait another few days until the bill becomes law, without having to go and pass any temporary permission to use those vehicles until the bill becomes proclaimed.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Minister if he can give assurance that on immediate passage of the bill, that it would be proclaimed and that licences would be issued immediately so that operators could use their vehicles during the summer months?

MR. BURTNIAK: That is understandable, Mr. Speaker, that upon proclamation, that that will be made, the bill will be proclaimed as soon as is humanly possible to do so, and make sure that everything is in order so that we can proclaim that bill, and as I say, it certainly should not take months. It will take a matter of a few days, I would think.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can confirm whether the expiry date for applications by small business for the Job Program, for assistance, will be June 15th, and whether the government has any intention of extending that time?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if there has been any lack of information in the community at large, and apparently there must be, I'm very pleased that the Honourable Member for River Heights has asked that question, because we did issue a news statement I believe on Friday, and the First Minister I believe alluded to it during the debate on the Job Creation Program, that the Jobs and Small Business Program deadline has been extended by one month from the middle of June to the middle of July. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very innovative program, a program that has never been experienced by the business community of Manitoba. It has taken some time to gather steam, but I'm pleased to report that it is gathering steam, and it looks as though we are having a considerable impact in job creation among the small *entrepreneurs* in Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to inform his advertising agency so that the advertisements saying the expiry date of June 15th will be changed, the ones that are now appearing on the radio stations. I wonder then if the Minister is in a position to indicate any evaluation that has been made by his department with respect to the number of jobs that have actually been formed since the beginning of this program.

MR. EVANS: I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for River Heights is also asking that question. There are tabulations now being made and a statement will be available for all of the Job Creation Programs, I believe, within a matter of two or three days, and I am hoping that the First Minister will be able to make a statement on the comprehensive Job Creation Program that we now have in operation in the Province of Manitoba. So that information will be made available, Mr. Speaker, to members of the House and to the public in general within two or three days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. Final question.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether it is anticipated that the unemployment figures for this past month which will be published shortly will, in fact, be reduced by the government's program.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY, Minister of Labour (Transcona): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear all of the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister of Labour is in a position to indicate whether the unemployment figures to be issued by Statistics Canada for the past month will in fact show a reduction as a result of the program by the government.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, one cannot really answer a question I suppose, but I anticipate that in the forward thrust by this government in the field of unemployment, the chances are it will reflect a reduction, but that is only my guesstimate as against the guesstimate of my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights who I think would guesstimate a different figure in order to satisfy himself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond precisely to the information that was requested by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell pertaining to the fatality inquiries of the Manitoba School for Retardates. The dates of the inquiry will be Tuesday,

Wednesday and Thursday, June 28th, June 29th and June 30th this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Can the First Minister indicate to the House that a settlement has been reached between Manitoba Hydro and Northern Trappers Association for damages caused by the Nelson-Churchill power development and is there any percentage of compensation offered to the Northern Trappers' Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is any protracted difficulty with respect to the Trappers Association. There is admittedly difficulty for several years, quite some time, insofar as the Northern Flood Committee is concerned which is an entity that is presuming to negotiate on behalf of the Treaty Indian communities involved. That is where the difficulty lies; it is a problem in law. The matter has not been resolved but insofar as the trappers are concerned, I am not aware of any undue difficulty.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, the First Minister says he presumes there is some difficulty. Can he indicate what he means by that? I just wonder, has there been any offer made by the Manitoba Hydro based on yearly production and what the loss would be as a result of the development so there would be a percentage settlement or percentage of damages paid to them? Has there been any kind of indication by Manitoba Hydro that this would be acceptable?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, offers have been made to trappers with respect to demonstrable damage incurred and as part of the policy, none of the trappers are required to sign any quit claim, so that in the event that there is need for adjustment, their final adjustment on compensation is not prejudiced. I am not aware that there has been any undue difficulty. Indeed the matter really is understood to be subject to an arbitration procedure in the event of disagreement as to precise amounts. The spirit insofar as the negotiations with the trappers are concerned has been good and has been practical. I wish I could say the same with respect to the other group.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps I can . . . a last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister indicate to the House what is the progress of the Northern Flood Committee, and is it holding up any hydro development at this stage or not and what is the progress being made?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not holding up any hydro development although it has been constantly on the verge of so doing. The situation is not quite analogous to difficulties now being experienced in other parts of Canada, such as the Mackenzie Valley, James Bay. We have not had any work stoppages or injunctions to date and we have proceeded according to the schedule. The matter, we hope, will come to a construction conclusion within the next 30 days but I cannot guarantee it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and ask him, the question has to do, Sir, with the income support programs now available to the beef producers in the province, one the province started several years ago and now the national program. My question to the Minister is, can the Minister indicate whether or not there is any significant amount of switching taking place? Are Manitoba beef producers availing themselves of the federal program or are they by and large staying with the provincial program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the activity to date, it appears that we don't really expect more than about 200 to drop out of our provincial program. That's the way it's shaping up, although it's hard to determine at this point in time, there's another month to go.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question and it may be out of order. Is the provincial program carrying on, and that is to the extent that are you accepting new applicants at this time?

MR. USKIW: No, we have announced some time ago, Mr. Speaker, that new applicants will not be accepted in 1977 so that for those people only the federal program is available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In light of the announced increase in the milk prices by the Milk Control Board, can he indicate whether the Consumer Affairs Department has assessed this price increase and determined whether it is within the general guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Program or whether it's in excess of that in terms of milk prices?

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): No, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of duplicating what we consider to be a fair assessment by the Utility Board.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I assume the Minister means the Milk Control Board on this. Can he indicate whether the Consumer Affairs Department entered any briefs or submissions on behalf of consumers to that Board, in terms of the question of milk prices in the

province?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we, at the department, have not submitted any briefs directly to the department itself.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the report that there are many families which are not any longer able to afford the purchase of whole milk, particularly those who are on lower income or who are on social assistance, is the Minister going to inquire or look into any means of providing for a supplementation so that they would be able to afford that, or find a way that they would be able to engage in adequate milk purchases in the province?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, that's something that will have to be looked at by respective governments, whether it be the municipalities, the province, the Federal Government in regard to adjusting rates of payment to those that are considered to be in need. So there's, you know, there's nothing that is contemplated, Mr. Speaker, by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to that effect. We can consider the increase being a hardship on some people, but it had to be adjusted by other means, we have to think of the producers, we have to think of the consumers, and that's the role of the Milk Marketing Board, and we believe that they have done an adequate job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answers, that it would take a combined effort by different levels of government, does he plan to initiate such an effort to see if there can be some answer provided, so that there is a proper supply of milk for families that need it?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, we can only look back at the record and in regard to the policies established by this government pertaining to adjustments of payments to those in need, and payments made to same by the Department of Health and Social Development, directly or indirectly through municipalities, and that will be done, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should inform the Member for Fort Rouge that the Government of Canada substantially subsidizes the dairy industry, to the tune of a half a billion dollars this year, and that, of course, benefits all of the consumers of Canada, including those involved in the consumption of fresh milk. We, in Manitoba, of course, derive benefits through the fact that we have integrated our milk program in this province, an objective that the other provinces have yet to realize, but are working towards. And, indeed, the most recent federal policy changes are directed very much in that direction. So, I think the consuming public, Mr. Speaker, has been subsidized and continues to be subsidized, and we appreciate that degree of support from Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and while I appreciate that essentially we are dealing with the price of fluid milk, but we have a pooled integrated dairy policy in Manitoba, and my question is, do the recent price increases at the producer, wholesale and retail level in any way place the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board in a better position to resolve its outstanding difficulties, contractual disputes with the cheese processing plants in the Province of Manitoba? Is there any extra elbow room that is being gained here for those negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there isn't because it is obvious to me that milk prices for cheese production in Manitoba should relate to milk prices for cheese production in other provinces across Canada. And really we shouldn't use the fresh milk market as a means of indirect subsidization of the cheese plants in this province. That would be an unfair means of loading the consumers of this province, in order to maintain some of our cheese plants in the province who may or may not be viable, Mr. Speaker.

While I am on my feet I would like to also point out to the Member for Fort Rouge that we have maintained the lowest milk price in Canada for two years. This recent adjustment it is going to be the second or third lowest of all provinces in Canada, but there are adjustments pending fairly soon in other provinces which will likely put us back to the position that we have maintained for the last couple of years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister, or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. A week or so ago I asked the two Ministers if they could get their heads together to resolve what appeared to be a problem that was developing with respect to Hydro being unable to give estimates of hydro bills in apartments blocks which were going on demand billing, thereby, causing the property owner to run into trouble with the Rent Stabilization Act. Can the First Minister or the Minister of Consumer Affairs report whether they have had any success in this resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I did ask for that report. I believe that I could give my honourable friend that information perhaps tomorrow in the forenoon or at 2:30.

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

BILL (NO. 40) — AN ACT FOR GRANTING TO HER MAJESTY CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE PROVINCE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING THE 31st DAY OF MARCH, 1978

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 40 please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my colleague from River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal with this bill, and in the main deal with the Job Creation Program of the government. But, I would like to make two or three observations with respect to the matter in which we deal with the Estimates of government spending, and in the final analysis with the bill that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded that the rules and procedures that we now have for the examination of Estimates are accomplishing, even in a limited way, the results that we are supposed to achieve in a proper examination of the department spending. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real need for an alteration and change of our system if, in effect, we are to carry out and fulfil the responsibilities we have in this House, and in examining what has taken place this year one would have to say that we have only superficially touched on the Estimates. In many cases the specifics have been ignored, and the government has been successful in masking, in a very real way, the detailed spending that is within their capability once this bill is passed, and once the Estimates have, in fact, been approved, and once the session is finished.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the procedures have to be changed, I believe that the interdepartmental shifts of money that can occur within the framework of the Estimates either have to be altered or there has to be a production into this House of all the information relating to the history of the way in which the votes that have been approved have, in fact, been utilized by the government. The information supplied by Public Accounts are not sufficient for us to understand fully the manoeuvrability that government has with respect to spending, and, I believe, if that change occurred that would be another check and balance on the government.

And, further, I believe, as well that the examination procedure has to be altered, and this is a responsibility both of the government and of the opposition.

And further, I believe, that there is a very different kind of role for the Provincial Auditor that has to be played in a real specific manner, so that, in effect, some of the recommendations that he has proposed this year would be introduced, plus other refinements, which would give us a far greater ability to examine spending in its detail and to have the direct accountability that government, any government, must have with respect to its spending in this Legislature.

And, this isn't really an attack on the particular government of the day, it is really a basic perspective that I see with respect to the way in which we handle our Estimates, and it is resolved of the degree in which government has now become so much part of our life, the increase in expenditures, and the failure on the part of the Legislature to respond to the change that is actually occurring. You know, in many respects as politicians we are afraid of staying behind our public in the sense that we must legislate so that we are, in fact, with them or ahead of them to show leadership. But, with respect to the way in which we handle our spending we are far behind, because if the public had any idea of the superficiality which really characterizes the approach to the investigation of the Estimates, I think, they would be appalled. If the public were aware of the failures of the system to adequately protect and check the interests, their interests, I think they would be appalled and rather surprised, and therefore, I think it is necessary to speak out, and I do this in a preliminary way before I make my general remarks about unemployment and the Job Formation Program and the state of the economy, to indicate that this need for a change has to take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very taken with the fact that the First Minister today, in answers to questions about unemployment and forecasts, referred immediately to the TED Commission to more or less fuzz up the whole issue as to whether his government had any responsibility for any kind of forecasts of what unemployment would exist or what job formation is needed in the months to come. I have periodically in this House, asked the government, I asked during the Estimates for information as to who is preparing what, to be able to understand whether the fiscal policies are in fact adopted and adapted to meet the specific goals and targets that the government has set for itself, based on some understanding and some value judgment, based on information and fact and forecasts which are based on the abilities of those to be able to do the analysis and present to the government a basis

for decision making.

It would seem to me that the government is really void of any kind of analysis and responds by trying to go back to past moments in history and suggesting that somehow or other, the information supplied in 1969 which was the TED forecast of expectations was, in fact, the way in which government should operate and therefore, they are not going to operate that way. And when the First Minister mentioned the TED Report, I immediately thought of the 1973 election and the document called The Guidelines for the Seventies. The members opposite were very upset when a whole series of documents were placed on the table by myself, there were reports, and I knocked it down on the floor and suggested that that's where they belonged really, in the garbage can, because they really were of no value even though a lot of money had been spent.

And Mr. Speaker, you know when one realizes that it was only in 1973 that the Guidelines for the Seventies, which was in fact the First Minister's TED Report, was presented to the House, that realistically, Mr. Speaker, all that was was a bunch of rhetoric, a writing which was window-dressing, writings that were presented so that there could appear to be some philosophical basis for the "*ad hocery*" which has really marked the government's basic programs in dealing with the economy through them. The fiscal tools that are available to

And, Mr. Speaker, it is rather shocking to sort of meet the situation today when unemployment is rising, both on a national level and here, to find that that *ad hocery* is still occurring and that what is being proposed really is less than even a Band-Aid solution for the problems that we have today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you have been in government for eight years and you've set certain goals, and you know, we should try and judge how you've achieved those goals. I want to quote from the Guidelines for the Seventies and I want to indicate just, in a specific way, the basic understanding of the government at the time they issued this document. "The government believes that unemployment in Manitoba can be further reduced over the next eight years, 1973-1981." The Premier accepts today that unemployment, two years from today could be at a 5.4 percent figure and yet that is inconsistent with the government's belief that unemployment in Manitoba can be further reduced over the next eight years.

Mr. Speaker, the next statement. "The province's commitment to full employment will require an integration of planning of manpower policy, fiscal policy and development policy." What development policy, Mr. Speaker? What fiscal policy and what manpower policy? You know, Mr. Speaker, manpower policy doesn't simply come about because a sub-committee of Cabinet meets on a few occasions to discuss manpower problems. It comes as a result of research and study and forecasts and targets and the development of policies that will in fact achieve that in the long run, not in terms of short-term responses to every situation.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue. "The actual numbers of unemployed" — now this is very important as far as the statistical data that we have. "The actual numbers of unemployed and the involuntary underemployed, are, therefore, larger than indicated by Statistics Canada, particularly in a province like Manitoba with a large agricultural sector and a high population of Reserve Indians." There is therefore an acknowledgement of something that we know to be true, that the statistical data understates the degree of unemployment in this province, it is much higher and as a result, one has to recognize that with respect to the statistical data, the two point difference is not a two point difference as the First Minister has suggested. In fact, there may be no difference at all. And the reality is that unemployment is a serious problem, has been a serious problem, and I suggest will be a serious problem in the months to come.

"The Manitoba government," quoting from the Guidelines, "will be developing its capacity to guarantee jobs to those who wish to work regardless of the federal policies which may prevail." Well, we have a response today of a four-month program and I suggest to you that if the government had been on the ball, that the government had known what they were doing, if, in fact, they had a manpower and development policy their program would have been introduced many many months earlier because the lead time acquired to fulfil even the limited scope of what they want to accomplish would have required a thorough amount of time and response, and a creation of jobs not in the way in which the government has operated in the last little while.

Mr. Speaker, we have the Guidelines for the Seventies, but this government as well as other governments in our country, and as well as the Federal Government, have, as they travel the road, in terms of their economic policy, followed their ruts of the Seventies. And I am going to explain three of them.

First, there is too much expectation by the people of our province and the people in this country of what government can possibly do for them. And that expectation, Mr. Speaker, is causing frustration in understanding the limits to which government policies can in fact solve their particular human situations. It's high time that the politicians talked in realistic terms of what we can actually accomplish.

Secondly, the other rut is that there has been little encouragement, Mr. Speaker, or reward for initiative or for productivity. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we talk in terms of reward, the members

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

opposite always talk about big business. They talk about the giant conglomerates. They talk about it as if they are our friends, when in effect they loan money to those conglomerates. The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that in our system at the present time, the encouragement for initiative and the reward for productivity has not been given, and it may very well be too late, Mr. Speaker, to turn the corner on this, but this is necessary, otherwise we will travel nowhere on the road that we are going, to try and achieve some economic recovery and stability for the people of our country.

And the third one, Mr. Speaker, is that the protection of the consumer and the public has become in a very real sense, interference in the lives of people where, in fact, government is making the choices rather than the individual. And the justification for control, for regulation, has in fact become the basis for debate on control. And Mr. Speaker, this is the tendency of governments at all political levels and it has been the quality of the present government and it has been unfortunately the polity of other governments as well.

The time has got to come where the politician has to recognize, in a very real sense, that the choices have to be made for people, that the degree of protection is required but that the regulatory role which in fact would control, is something to be exercised with discretion and to be exercised sparingly.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in this country, a deterioration in the climate for private investment, in the country, Mr. Speaker, as well as in this province. The growth of employment, Mr. Speaker, was relatively small in 1976 and the problems we face today were forecast by those who understood what was happening and the government knew what was happening. And their failure is one really of lethargy, lethargy in being able to cope with the issues that face them, confronted them, and that lethargy is not answered simply by a make-work program of four months, Mr. Speaker.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there has been a sharp rise of young persons in the labour force. That is known, that has been understood for some time. And along with this there has been a strong expansion in the participation by women in the labour force. The result, Mr. Speaker, has created the problem for Canada and for Manitoba now and one has to examine fiscal policies on a federal and provincial level to see whether those issues that were clearly before the politicians were understood well enough to be able to justify the policies or to be able to create the policies that would have assisted and helped.

Mr. Speaker, there is a public apathy which has developed because of this expectation that government will in fact solve all the problems which has been combined at different times, depending on the political expediency of the moment, with an over-reaction and, Mr. Speaker, this does not provide sane, reasonable policy; this provides the *ad hocery* that I referred to and the attempt by governments to try and claim credit for a policy which is either piecemeal or superficial at most in dealing with the specific problems.

I believe that our expectations in this country are outrunning the reality of what is taking place and that is what's going to happen here in Manitoba unless there is a significant alteration and change with respect to the policy formations, with respect to job creation in Manitoba.

A much more imaginative, energetic, effective, co-ordinated approach to the continuing problems of general employment is necessary. The cost of unemployment in terms of wasted resources and cost to taxpayers are enormous and they really are ugly and unacceptable in a country as rich as Canada. We must face the fact, Mr. Speaker, that combatting unemployment is going to be an ongoing program for the next several years and there is need for long-term planning and action to create jobs. It requires a long-term attack, not a short-term attack, not a make-work program for four months. It requires advance planning; it requires integration of policies and programs by the three levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, we will require for years to come a permanent program of winter works to be established by federal-provincial agreement which will permit maximum provincial flexibility, otherwise the rates of unemployment in Canada and in Manitoba will continue to be characteristic of the Canadian economy. There must, therefore, be this set of co-ordinated federal and provincial programs which are pursued and executed on a preplanned basis and integrated with policies of housing, wealth and welfare, resource development, economic development, tourism and recreation policy and fiscal policies.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to examine the Estimates that have been presented, the Budget that has been presented, the statements of the government, and I would ask you to show me, or for the members opposite through you to show me, where there is an integrated policy on housing that really is not a piecemeal policy; where there is an integrated policy on health and welfare; where there is an integrated policy on resource development; where is there any policy on economic development; where is there any policy on tourism and recreation which will in effect provide employment in the service sector, and I want to find out from the members opposite where they think their fiscal policies are going to assist in the job formation that is necessary which is a cost in human terms to those who are unemployed, and a severe cost to government to be able to provide the minimum resources to be able to sustain those unemployed and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the *ad hocery* which has characterized this basic program in job formation is the *ad hocery* which we have had for so much of the government's program, which was the *ad hocery* in producing the Guidelines for the Seventies which were really the guidelines for the election in 1973, which we forget about after the election. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, you accomplished exactly what you have been attempting in the last two years. You fooled the people, all right, you fooled them, but the question is whether you will fool them this time. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, we did not campaign on the targets; you campaigned on the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I think that this is essential, we do not have a shelf of capital projects in this province; we do not have it but the Premier suggested it in one of his statements when he brought in the job formation program. There is no shelf of capital projects, useful, necessary, socially desirable projects which can be brought forward for early starts and concentrated when unemployment level rises. If we had such a shelf of projects, the program that the government announced could have been and should have been announced many many months ago. The planning and decisions of government here and in Ottawa have been characteristic of erratic behaviour with respect to the continuing problems of unemployment in this province. At the federal-provincial level, the lack of planning, the lack of co-operation, the lack of co-ordination, the lack of consultation and other policy failures prevent realization of such necessary programs at this particular time.

There has to be an acceptance, Mr. Speaker, that the maintenance and achievement of full employment is a shared responsibility between provinces and the Federal Government more or less equally. There are needs for clear national policies, for regional balance, and there must be guidelines within the province respecting the needs for provincial regional balance. That, Mr. Speaker, we do not have. There is nothing that has been announced that would indicate it. You know, when the kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about are the incentive programs that would affect a lot of industry and create the climate for industry and stimulate industry to develop in the north and the regions. They don't come from the kind of taxation policies that the members opposite have nor from their speeches nor from the few policy declarations that they have.

There must be far greater emphasis and I say this as an example, Mr. Speaker, for repair and rehabilitation of privately owned homes in this province. That kind of a program as a support program is important because it will in fact create jobs and further, at least it will bring to the long suffering wage earner who has paid his taxes over the years, some benefits directly of the government programs.

Mr. Speaker, there was a need in this province for tax cuts of a substantial proportion. There was a need for the government to alter the economic climate in this province by its taxation policies, but this did not happen because I suggest that their policies have, in fact, stifled and retarded development here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we have no records of any particular targets to meet; we have no information supplied on job formation that can be contemplated in the next year or two; all the information requested on unemployment and job creation is really presented on the basis of an immediate problem. We are going to solve temporarily by so many government positions being created for three or four months, by some assistance to small business and by the time you get the program organized, it will already be finished. So, depending on what the statistical data will be for the Federal Government, then we will know whether we are going to continue or not.

None of this, Mr. Speaker, is really adequate. In fact, it is so superficial that the whole program in many respects becomes ludicrous. To the people who are involved, to the people who are employed short-term, it is not. It at least is something, but it is ludicrous in relation to what we now face for unemployment in this province and for what forecasts have in fact been presented and for the general concern that people have expressed with respect to what is happening in this province and in this country.

A MEMBER: All we have is the First Premier's good looks.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the unemployment program here, the announced unemployment program of the Federal Government, the information has been far out-furnished by the Federal Finance Minister is really a testimonial to failure on the part of both governments to carry out their responsibility. They have ignored the taxpayer's position; they have taxed small enterprise into a position where it will be, in fact, eliminated; they have not allowed the opportunity for small business to be able to create the reserves that are necessary for expansion and to be able to deal in credit for all the things that are necessary; they have not encouraged the investment in efficiency; they have not, by their policies, in any way encouraged research and development, and as a result our people in the small business field do not have the resources for the technological change that is required for them to compete.

What we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is the elimination within this province and within this country of small enterprise and the development of big government and big business and the members opposite are satisfied with that and this, I find, and have found for some time, to be the most surprising result of

the programs which they have announced. You know, either it is through real ignorance that they do not understand what they are doing, and that's possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then by god there should be a change. If, on the other hand, it is not sheer ignorance, if it is on the basis that it's consistent with the policy that they want, then I think they at least should declare that. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, they can talk all they want about closing hours to try and protect small business — and that appears to be a government committed to small business and to the family store — but the reality, Mr. Speaker, is that in terms of the overall tax policies and the effect of what is happening, that all one has to do is analyze what is taking place in this province.

There has to be a recognition that small enterprise is not expanding and that will be the future where job formation will take place; that the policies are discouraging that development, and as a result what we are having is a lessening of that development and with it the failure to create the new job opportunities that are necessary to be able to meet the employment needs for people to be able to stay in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— No, I am with it because I have listened to the former Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and I remember his whole attitude with respect to the White Paper and to the Carter Commission, and I remember his discussion at that time, because he had acted for some small *entrepreneurs* who somehow or other had taken some of their investment and invested it in real estate, which he thought was a bad thing. He felt that they should be paying taxes instead and not to be able to shelter. But the reality was, that as a result of that capital investment and its appreciation, they would have had the resources for developments in terms of future opportunities. Mr. Speaker, the kind of incentive that would have been given to small business to expand has not in fact, taken place.

If we lack productivity in this country, Mr. Speaker, it is to a large extent the failure of the governments, who have not encouraged productivity, but to discourage those that are resourceful, and those who apply their skills by excessive taxation, by waste in government programs, and the need to be able to continue the high taxation level or raise more, and to a certain extent by the universality of social programs, some of which, Mr. Speaker, have in fact encouraged people not to become productive. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the present government is not prepared for the battle that it will have to face with respect to unemployment in the months to come.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: They do not have an arsenal of effective policy weapons to be able to deal with the issues and the kind of programs that have been announced are so piecemeal that they can be dismissed as being meaningless in terms of the total unemployment problem that they have to face.

So, Mr. Speaker, we deal with the Estimates of government which appear to indicate really a continued escalation of government programs that we have in the past, with no attempt to try and rationalize and provide reductions as a result of some cost - benefit analysis that should in fact be made.

Secondly, we have a refusal on the part of the government to reduce taxation to try and develop a greater consumer demand and the opportunities for expansion as a result of the sale of goods that would occur as a result of the consumer demand. We see the continued waste in a whole range of government programs which are justified on some social responsibility they have, but which in effect have been sheer waste of taxpayers' money and we find a program which is short-term rather than long-term and we do not have from the members opposite any kind of comprehensive, economic forecast or plan for the future. There is nothing in the Estimates under Capital Supply that will indicate that this is happening. The lethargy that existed before, in dealing with the problems of the day may appear, Mr. Speaker, to have in fact dissipated as a result of the period that we're in prior to election where it's necessary to posture for the people, that in effect we have control and we know what we are doing.

But I must tell you in terms of the long-run problems of this province, it would appear to me that in effect, our results in the future, Mr. Speaker, will be fairly dismal. The kind of forecasts we could really predict now are really not encouraging but in effect are discouraging and at this point, Mr. Speaker, are becoming more serious because of the fact that the expectations still exist because of the posture that has occurred that government will

correct the situation. We need summer employment, the government provides summer employment, and whether it's socially useful or not we are going to need winter employment, and there will be some winter employment programs developed.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the long run dealing with the persistent problem of unemployment, and it's a persistent problem in our society in Canada because of the way in which we have developed, Mr. Speaker, those problems are not being met, and the programs of the members opposite at this particular time do not appear to be the kind of reaction to be able to solve those situations.

Now I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see what is happening. We can get into a

philosophical debate of what we should achieve in our society, and you know, we can debate that from here for the next five years, whoever will be here, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: We'll all be here.

MR. SPIVAK: But the fact of the matter is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: I have to say, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour, I know that he won't be here. — (Interjection)— Well, that's what they say in the New Democratic Party. In the Conservative Party it is something else, but I'll talk about that later. — (Interjection)— Well, even that has to be a terminology that has to be used.

But I want to say that with respect to the debate as interesting as it may be, and as interesting comments it may cause from those who would like to talk about that being the basic programs of the government, Mr. Speaker, those are not the programs of the government. The philosophical argument which sometimes gets the degree of demagoguery in this House and outside, really is not essentially what is happening in this House. What is happening is the expenditure of government money, the raising of money by taxation to meet that expenditure, and the proper analysis by the members opposite of those programs that are being paid for by the taxpayer, and to understand in what way it achieves a socially desirable result, and achieves the aims set forth by the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have a comprehensive program before us, if we do not have targets to reach if we do not have forecasts which have some realism as to what our situation is today and to be able to adjust as continuing changes occur, then, Mr. Speaker' how are we to accomplish what we are doing? We can continue that philosophical debate but to what point?

We accept it and the Minister of Mines and Resources accepts it. He's not going to change it, he's going to live by the system as it is now and he can't do very much to change it. He tried it through public corporations which was one means and he's failed, and he knows that, he acknowledges that.

So, Mr. Speaker, the problem we face is, how are we going to meet the challenge which is ours in this year and in the years to come? And I, Mr. Speaker, have to say to you that we are not going to meet it by short-term programs no matter how valuable they appear and how necessary they are. We are only going to meet this as a result of long-term planning and the kind of co-ordination that must take place by the three levels of government.

And there has been a failure, the failure is not just in this province, it's in other provinces as well, and the failure is not of the Federal Government. And until, Mr. Speaker, that failure is corrected, then those who are unemployed have nothing but a gloomy future in the years to come; and those who believe that somehow or other we are going to work ourselves out of our problems, are mistaken. And until there is some recognition that we are not doing our job in this House, that is both in opposition and the government, to try and correct that and until that recognition takes place, then the kind of bandaid or less than bandaid programs that have been announced, may appear acceptable. And all the advertising that appears on television and on radio and in the media which supports the program for jobs, may appear in some way that the solution to the problems is forthcoming. It will not correct the difficulties for those who are unemployed, nor will it improve the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go through and deal with the various solutions of those who prepared the Guidelines for the Seventies suggested, like a guaranteed employment scheme. Do the members opposite remember that? That's called GES, Guaranteed Employment Scheme. — (Interjection)— Well, there's no Guaranteed Employment Scheme, Mr. Speaker. We talked about a stay option, then we philosophized about the stay option. But in many respects, Mr. Speaker, the stay option is for people to stay unemployed and that's what the option is going to be. And unless, Mr. Speaker, there is a dramatic change in terms of the approach to the economic problems, unless there is an exceptional adjustment in the taxation system that we have, and a recognition that within this province small enterprise is going to be the one area in which there can be the development of permanent jobs rather than in government make-work programs. And unless there is a recognition as well that within our system there is a public presence that is needed, and I accept that, but that public presence has to be based on long-term planning rather than on short-term planning and *ad hoc* situations. And unless that develops then the kind of persistent unemployment that is now surfaced will remain and the optimism of those who say that it will be corrected will not be met. For those who are in that unfortunate position and those families who suffer, they are really being put into a position of almost permanent poverty, which in effect is the direct opposite, Mr. Speaker, of the announced aims of the government, not just in the guidelines, but in the other pronouncements that have been made.

And I don't think the members opposite want that, but the problem is you have to wake up to the fact that you haven't accomplished what you should have and, Mr. Speaker, you haven't, by your actions in this session, demonstrated the fiscal policies, the economic policies, the manpower policies, the development policies, the co-ordinated policies with the Federal Government which, in effect, Mr. Speaker, would at least give some indication of leadership in trying to solve these problems. It has not come about and, Mr. Speaker, that really is a mark against the present government.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take members' time. I don't want to talk very long but the Honourable Member from River Heights has prompted me into making a couple of comments. I always appreciate listening to the Member from River Heights. He's full of enthusiasm, he has lots of ideas, he has certainly got the interest of the Province of Manitoba at heart, he certainly does. We happen to disagree on how to achieve the best interest of the Province of Manitoba, but he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: . . . and as my colleague from Radisson mentioned, whispered to me maybe, during the Member for River Heights' discussion, you know, the Member from River Heights would be more — we could accept what he said, and take to heart more what he said, if his party hadn't shafted him, you know, in the past year. Because there's a lot that the Member from River Heights says that I agree with and he's right on. The Member from River Heights has great ideals, he has a concern for the economic prosperity of Manitoba, he has concern for the small businessman and I believe his sincerity and I appreciate what he said. The only trouble I have, Mr. Speaker, is that he's saying all of these things and I'm here sort of agreeing with him. I don't agree with everything, mind you, I don't agree with some of the techniques he's suggesting. I don't agree with his criticisms of our Guidelines for the Seventies etc., but a lot of his ideals that he sets forth, a lot of his objectives, etc., one cannot disagree with. But I say, Mr. Speaker, a lot of what he says, if it's supposed to represent the Conservative position in Manitoba, is simply not credible because the Conservative Party in Manitoba, unfortunately for the Conservative Party in Manitoba, in my personal view, the Conservative Party of Manitoba has done the traditional thing, has deposed the Honourable Member from River Heights from the leadership position. And I think they are the worse for that' that's my personal view, but nevertheless they have done it. But if they hadn't done it, I would have — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: I would have taken to heart more of what the Honourable Member from River Heights has just told us. You know, we've talked about the Guidelines for the Seventies and so on and I would only say this, that maybe we were over-optimistic and over-ambitious in the Guidelines for the Seventies, but nevertheless it's much better to have these ideals to strive for, that maybe a man's grasp should exceed his reach, you know, maybe we should exceed our reach, maybe we should try the impossible at times. Far better to do that than to do what the targets for Economic Development suggested.

The TED Report, and I want to remind all my friends from rural Manitoba what were some of the objectives in the TED Report, it was for a depopulation of rural Manitoba. And we've said in the Guidelines that we want to try to stop that. We're not sure that we can do it but we'll try at least and maybe we've exceeded our reach. Maybe we have, but at least we're going to try. Maybe we are too idealistic, but let us try. It is much better to venture out and try and fail than not to try whatsoever, or as Shakespeare said, Mr. Speaker, as Shakespeare said in that famous play, "It is much better to have loved and lost than to never have loved at all." And I'll take all the criticism from the members opposite . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: . . . I'll take all the criticism from members opposite for not meeting the Guidelines for the Seventies, but I say, I'd rather live by the Guidelines for the Seventies. Perhaps they were overoptimistic. Then the objectives of the TED Commission Report, because the TED Report did indicate — my colleague from Elmwood says maybe we should call it the Sid Report, I don't know. I know the honourable member was very much involved with it. But the fact is I do believe that some of those objectives were to recognize a certain rural depopulation. As one member of this House I just can't accept that.

And the other thing that puzzles me about the comments by my friend and colleague from River Heights is that he talks about the lack of government planning, and Lord Almighty, I don't understand his criticism in that respect, from a philosophical point of view. I can accept that maybe we should have more economic planning, maybe we should, but when the senior member, a frontbench member of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, that if anything, if anything they are telling the people of Manitoba that they are the party of free enterprise. Is that right? Are you the party of free enterprise? Are you the party of *laissez-faire*? —(Interjection)— Let alone, you know, the Adam Smith

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: Members are speaking from their seat and I can't hear them . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me suggest to a couple of members who insist on interrupting, I have their names on the list; they will get the opportunity to have the floor next, but if they insist on speaking while the member is on the floor I shall have to name them and tell them to get out. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the members opposite, are you the party of free enterprise in Manitoba? Are you? Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek state his point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If the Minister is going to keep asking this side or myself as an honourable member a question, can we please answer him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister, proceed.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the answer I heard by listening to previous speeches said, it's a positive answer, yes, they are. And if I ask them, are they the party that believes in *laissez-faire*, you know, the ideals set down by Adam Smith — and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in his day Adam Smith was quite a radical, he was a real radical in his day but, at any rate, he has become supposedly some sort of Conservative economic philosopher in this day and age.

But at any rate, you know, I understand — I thought I understood — the position of the Conservative Party but I get more confused when the Member for River Heights gets up and criticizes us for lack of planning because this is a contradiction. How on earth can you say let private enterprise alone to do their thing on the one hand — leave free enterprise aside, let them do their thing; and on the other side, argue for economic planning. It's a contradiction. I fail to understand it, it's a contradiction.

I appreciate the comments from the Member for River Heights. I just told the members opposite that I agree with a lot of his objectives, well, I think many of us do. It's a matter of how do we achieve those proper objectives. At any rate I just don't understand the comments, or the criticisms rather, of the Member for River Heights about insufficient planning by this government with the purported official position of his party, stated by his Leader, and by policy documents of that party, etc.

Now, I haven't explained my confusion, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that the Honourable Member for River Heights, with all due respect, has purported a number of viewpoints, has put forth a number of viewpoints which I really believe are mythical. I think we've heard comments on a number of myths. Myths. M-Y-T-H-S. Not fairy stories, but real myths. For one thing, the honourable member talks as though we should co-ordinate fiscal with policy, we should co-ordinate other spending policies, we should co-ordinate various programs, we should integrate our policies, we should have more planning, and so forth and so on, and I can sit here and say, yes, that sounds pretty good, as though that will be the answer. That will eliminate unemployment, it'll bring unemployment to zero, it will increase our levels in personal income, and will create great economic development in the province. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights speaks as though we are an island unto ourselves, as though we are a national economic unit, and we are not.

We do not print the money supplied to this country, we don't have the Bank of Canada at our disposal, we don't have any printing press in the basement of this building, — (Interjection) — Pardon me? I am dealing with your myth, Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the myth of the Honourable Member for River Heights. He spoke as though we are an island unto ourselves, as though we just had to do the things that he suggested and then everything would be fine, in so many words.

But the myth is that a province, any province in a confederacy, or a federal state, can dramatically and totally affect the levels of unemployment, can dramatically and totally affect the level rate of the economic development, can dramatically and totally affect inflation — the honourable member, on past occasions has got up and talked about rising prices of housing etc., as though all those decisions and all those factors were in the laps, were in the hands of the Provincial Government. And I would say that no matter which provincial Legislature I happened to sit in or stand in, the fact is that no province in Canada is an island unto itself, and no province can nearly have the power to do all the things that the Member for River Heights, I think, implies that they should have. Okay, that's one myth.

The second myth, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights talks as though this government and government in general is the enemy of the small businessman. Again, Mr. Speaker, I get confused because the Honourable Member for River Heights' on more than one occasion, in fact for the past two or three years, has criticized the size of the Department of Industry and Commerce, the amount of spending that goes on in Industry and Commerce, and I would point out to him that about 40 percent of our money is for programming for small enterprise in grants, etc., etc. And the fact is that we've got probably the most significant Department of Industry and Commerce; I think one of the most efficient departments of that type of any province in this great nation of ours. I think that alone demonstrates our concern for the small and medium size business, because that is where 90 percent of our effort is directed.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the great opponent, if you wish, or the great enemy, — really, if you want to use that term, if you want to be dramatic — the enemy, the great opposition to the small entrepreneur or small business in Manitoba and in Canada, and in the western industrialized society is not government, whether it be a federal government or provincial government. What is driving the small businessman off the face of the business world is the big corporation. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: The mama and papa stores, we were told the other night in the Legislative Committee on Law Amendments in Room 254, we had representation from an organization — I've forgotten the name but I think this organization represented, I understand the bulk of the so-called colloquial expression, mama and papa, the retail stores, the corner stores. And he told us a great percentage was disappearing each year. Those stores are not disappearing because of any policies of this government, or indeed the Federal Government. They're disappearing because, Mr. Speaker, they are not, unfortunately, able to compete with the large corporations. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, if my colleague, the Minister of Labour is doing anything, he is helping the mama and papa stores with his Sunday closing legislation. And that's what the delegation told us. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: The delegation representing 90 percent of the mama and papa stores — the Honourable Member for Roblin and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says we're protecting the chain stores. I'm afraid they've taken that one page ad to heart, because that one page ad, as we were told by the person who said he represented 90 percent of the mama and papa stores said that that one page ad did not represent the views of the small corner store in this province. It did not represent the views of the small corner store, including the Town of Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, you only have to look at history. You can look at many industries and you'll see that over a period of time, the small give way to the large, and you can look at the automobile manufacturing industry. Historically, it started off with several dozens of automobile manufacturers, and eventually, over a time, those automobile manufacturers, the smaller ones either disappeared or were amalgamated with the larger ones, or with some other manufacturers, and eventually you got down to just a handful, a dozen or so. And then eventually they contracted to a very small handful, and at best we have, in North America today, maybe three or four manufacturers, and before you know it, we may only have three. And maybe some day we'll only have two.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the economic milieu, the economic system, if you will, is causing the small to give way to the large, and I say therefore that it's not the government that the small business need to fear, it's the big corporation. It's the big corporation that is, through the competitive system, through the free enterprise system, is going to get rid of the small businessman. —(Interjection)—

Taxation policy, all right, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Honourable Member for River Heights raised the matter of taxation policy, because that's the third myth that I'll talk about this afternoon.

The first myth was that we as a province are an island unto ourselves; the second myth was that government was destroying small business, but really it's big corporation that's destroying small business; and the third myth is that taxation policies are the panacea of the small businessman.

Taxation policies — all we have to do is change taxation policies and then small enterprise will be sustained, employment will be created, and so on. And Mr. Speaker, that is a myth. That is a myth. I would suggest that at very best, taxation policies can only have a marginal influence. At very best. I say that, Mr. Speaker — you know, we're spending \$30 million, \$32 million, we're spending \$32 million, \$33 million, in a provincial job employment program. We're discussing a provincial job employment program in excess of \$30 million, and Mr. Speaker, Manitoba stands foremost among all the provinces in Canada in its concern for creating jobs for people, and as demonstrated fully by the \$30 million program. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin from his seat says, "Don't kid myself," and he's got no evidence to contradict me, I know. If he has, I'd like him to get on his feet later and stand up and explain to me, to his constituents, and the people of Manitoba, that I'm kidding myself. Because I'm not. Manitoba stands in the forefront, Mr. Speaker, of being concerned about unemployment. It's doing a job that Ottawa should be doing, it's doing a job that all of the provinces in Canada should be co-operating with Ottawa in, and we're standing alone at this time in history. We're in the forefront of job creation.

Mr. Speaker, if we used those \$30 million plus in tax incentives, we said, "Here's this money, we'll give it away, we'll reduce this tax, we'll reduce that tax, we'll provide this incentive and so on", I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we would get only a fraction of the number of jobs that are being created through this direct Job Creation Program. There is nothing that succeeds as a direct job creation and this is a very innovative approach and it is not traditional. It's an innovative type of approach and I would suggest that it's this kind of program that is going to create jobs and is creating jobs in the province of Manitoba.

So when you talk about taxation policies, Mr. Speaker as the be-all, end-all panacea for job creation and economic development, you're talking through your hat. You're simply talking through your hat, because taxation is a very limited factor in incentive. And when you talk about incentives, and when you try to compete with other provinces in terms of attracting industry, you just try to compete with big brother Ontario, or try to compete with oil and gas rich Alberta, and you'll see how far you're going to get in competing in terms of tax incentives. There's just no way.

The fourth myth that the Honourable Member for River Heights alludes to, is productivity. He talks

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

about the need for productivity, and then he goes on to criticize the government as though it's the responsibility of government to create productivity. Mr. Speaker, I always thought that productivity was the responsibility of the management of the enterprise. The management of the enterprise, the owner of the business, whether it be small, medium size or big, ultimately productivity, the output per person has got to be responsibility of that economic unit, of that enterprise. And for you to say, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for River Heights to allude that productivity is the responsibility of government, makes me believe that he is really an economic status, that he really believes that the state is responsible for economic productivity within private enterprise, that the state is responsible for economic development within enterprise. —(Interjection)— My colleague from Radisson says that the Member for River Heights is really a socialist. Well, I don't know. I'm not saying he is or he isn't. I'm just saying that it's another myth. He is purporting another myth. He is espousing a myth when he says that government is to blame for lack of productivity in industry. My God, if you believe at all, if the Member for Swan River at all believes in private enterprise — and I know he does — surely to goodness, — and he ran a small business of his own — don't tell me that the government, whether it be federal or provincial, and provincial of federal governments of any party, don't tell me that the government, no matter which party is in power, is responsible for the productivity of the enterprise that used to be owned and operated — unless he is still with it, I don't think so — of the Honourable Member for Swan River. Certainly not. —(Interjection)— Taxes, Mr. Speaker, there have been taxes since before the Roman Empire. And the fact is, productivity stands alone. Productivity is productivity. In fact, the more productive you are, maybe the more income taxes you'll pay. But productivity stands unto itself. —(Interjection)— Well, maybe that is the case, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is the case. But don't tell me, Mr. Speaker, that productivity is the responsibility of the government, because it isn't.

Well, I listened, and I wrote it down, Mr. Speaker. I wish the honourable member would read his speeches —(Interjection)— Read them in Hansard and see what you said.

Another myth, Mr. Speaker, is that there's lack of co-ordination in government policies. One always wishes that there was greater co-ordination. He mentions housing policy, recreation policy, a policy to promote tourism and so on. And one does wish. But really, you know, when we do get down to the capital Budget and the current Budget, and we look at the totality, the Cabinet and the caucus the government of the day, the party in government does look at the comprehensive picture and does look at the total spending. In fact, indeed, this Legislature I would hope, would look at the total picture. We do look at the total picture. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, that is another myth when he says that there is no integration of policy. There can never be perfect integration, but certainly we are not unmindful of the moneys that we spend in one department as opposed to another department.

I want to say this most specifically about housing because a lot has been said about the \$33,500,000 Job Creation Program, and I would remind members that we do have an accelerated Capital Works Program, and perhaps the Minister of Public Works may wish to speak to that, but we are —(Interjection)— accelerating the spending there. I want to remind the honourable members that this year, Anno Domini, this year of our Lord, 1977-78, we'll go to the fiscal year, we intend to spend between \$55 million and \$65 million for new housing and then an additional \$5 million, \$6 million and maybe \$7 million dollars for the Home Repair Program. We're accelerating the Home Repair Program and we're doing our very best to put in place new housing for those people who can't least afford it. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is done very deliberately, and this in itself, will be very conducive to job creation.

There you go. You see, you have a dilemma. The members of the opposition have a dilemma and it goes back to the observations that I made in the first place, about always talking about the role of government. Because, you know if you really believe in free enterprise, if you really believe in leaving the businessman alone to do his thing, you should have a minimal of government. The less government the better. That is the philosophical position. (Applause.) I'm glad to hear the members confirm that and I accept your position. It's a logical position, there's nothing wrong with it. I don't agree with your position, but I'm glad to see that you recognize this. But I'm a little confused when I listen to the Member for River Heights, because that's not what I heard from his speech. You are always talking about what government should do for business, and really if you believe in *laissez-faire* you should be arguing there should be complete reduction in government spending, a reduction in taxes, a totality, there should be a gradual diminution in the significance and role of government in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, hopefully in conclusion, that we have to recognize that without a positive role being played by government — I don't mean the Government of Manitoba — whether it's the Ontario Government or the New Brunswick Government or the British Columbia Government, or whether it be government of the State of New York or whether it be government of West Germany, or whether it be the Canadian Federal Government or whatever, I say to you, whether you like it or not, the fact is that in order to achieve a minimal amount of unemployment, in order to achieve a maximum amount of economic development, in order to contain inflation, in order to try to stimulate

a greater expansion in personal income, government has to play a role. Government has to play a role. And the Member for River Heights agrees with that, I think. He does. But that's what makes me so confused, because part of the time I hear from my friends opposite, that governments shouldn't be playing much of a role, that we should allow the *laissez-faire* system to take place, and I say unto you, Mr. Speaker, I say to all members of the House, in this latter part of the twentieth century, governments simply must play a role. I say in the Province of Manitoba that we have to be more conscious than ever before of the role that government plays particularly in the creation of jobs for our people. There is nothing so degrading as being without a job. There is nothing so detrimental to the morale of society than mass amounts of unemployment. Our experience of the 1930s should prove that and I suggest to you that you read about it if you don't remember it. I don't remember it, but I have read about it and I've heard of it from my father. There is nothing more destroying of society. There is nothing more conducive of revolution and radical change than unemployment, massive unemployment. So we recognize that and I think we recognize that on both sides of the House.

So government must play a very positive progressive role in eliminating unemployment and keeping down the rate of inflation. I say at this point in our time, at this point in our history, and in this debate, Mr. Speaker, we seem to be zeroing in on the question of creating jobs. I say that although unemployment is worse than we like to see it and therefore we are trying to take some action, I repeat, we are not an island to ourselves, we don't have the printing presses, we don't control the commercial tariffs, we don't control the freight rates, we don't control the natural resources that we have in our province — they are given to us. We have to live with them. We have to live with their climate. But I say, taking all these things into consideration, realizing that we are not an island unto ourselves, realizing that we have these limitations, I say this, Mr. Speaker, that even though we have an undesirable high level of unemployment and even though we may not be satisfied with other characteristics and features of our economic situation, I must compare the situation of the 1970s with the situation of the 1960s. Because, Mr. Speaker, it was said when this government was elected in 1969, "Will the last person leaving Manitoba please turn out the lights."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that since we have been elected there has been a fantastic amount of economic development. The population has expanded and, Mr. Speaker, we have fewer people leaving the Province of Manitoba than we had in the 1960s; there are fewer people leaving Manitoba today than there were leaving Manitoba in the 1960s; there are more jobs today in Manitoba in the 1970s than there were in the 1960s and there has been more economic development in general in the 1970s than in the 1960s, when the Conservatives were in power.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think that explains CFI. It explains CFI. Do you know what explains CFI? I'll tell you what — it was a legitimate concern on the part of the Conservative Party of Manitoba to create jobs. — (Interjection) — I am not saying that it should be done at any cost. — (Interjection) — Manitoba was on its knees for jobs. The Province of Manitoba figuratively speaking was on its knees for jobs, and that explains the give-away under Rex Grose of the MDF. — (Interjection) — Well, look I can tell you — (Interjections) — How about Columbia Forest Products, Lord Selkirk Navigation Company, Simplot and there is a whole list of companies, even Flyer Industries. — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: You know, there is a long list, long long list. And I remember, Mr. Speaker, when Rex Grose resigned. Immediately members opposite got up — the Member from Fort Garry said I should be forced to resign because we lost the Bobby Hull of the industrial development world. So, I, the Minister of Industry should resign because — (Interjections) — The Member for Riel, I'm sorry. I thought it was — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. EVANS: I think it was the Bobby Hull. — (Interjection) — Gordie Howe. It was Gordie Howe. I don't follow hockey very much. But you know — (Interjection) — Buffalo skates. At any rate, the members opposite said that I, as Minister of Industry, should resign because Rex Grose had handed in his resignation to me. Remember that. Well, I'm not going to get into personalities, but I tell you that maybe this government or maybe the previous government, I think the previous government, the Conservative Government of the day, you know, was on its knees trying to create jobs and did take extreme measures.

They had a disguised form of public investment. Because that is what it was, disguised investment in Simplot. Simplot was public investment not private investment. CFI was public investment not private investment. Columbia Forest Products essentially was public investment not private investment. And there you see, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, the great free enterprise party of Manitoba was using the instrumentality of a government agency to create jobs, because Manitoba was on its knees for jobs. People were leaving in droves and jobs were at a premium.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I am going to suggest to all those members who wish to speak, would they kindly wait their turn. It is almost impossible to hear what the Honourable Member, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, is saying. It is just not possible when there are ten

people shouting.

The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the rise that I am getting out of honourable members opposite must mean that I am getting pretty close to the truth. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, my main point is this, I think if anything this is my main point, and the Member from River Heights recognizes it but then I get a little confused in him.

If we are going to do anything about job creation in Manitoba it is going to be through the instrumentality of government, whether you like it or whether I like it or whether anybody likes it. But I just plead with the honourable members opposite to recognize this, and I say to you, you can talk about all the incentives in the world, it is not going to create as many jobs as the Honourable Minister of Finance's Job Creation Program is going to do. He is going to create many times more jobs, many-fold more jobs —(Interjection)— What? —(Interjection)— For four months. Well, look, Mr. Speaker, two months, three months, four months. Well we will see what happens in the future. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, we are filling a breach that has been left, in my view, by the Federal Government. It is historically and by precedent and for decades it's the Federal Government of Canada. Well honourable members opposite may smile, but the Federal Government, the Canada Manpower Centres, the Unemployment Insurance Programs, is recognition that the Federal Government has been the lead agency to tackle unemployment.

You know, we can tackle unemployment very successfully in Manitoba, but we can't prevent the unemployed coming to us from Ontario, for example, or from British Columbia, and as a matter of fact there are people coming here from B.C. and Ontario. They know that Manitoba is concerned about people.

A MEMBER: Coming here for welfare.

MR. EVANS: Coming here for welfare. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to a Manitoban, a man who was born and raised in Manitoba, and he decided to move back to Manitoba. He had a small business. I'm not even going to tell you the place that he comes from because I want —(Interjection)— No, it wasn't from Brandon. It was in western Manitoba. I spoke to him this weekend and he said "You know, I don't know what the people in this province are complaining from." He said, "I am from Manitoba. I spent forty years in Ontario as a small businessman," and he said, "You know, I want to tell you something right off." He said, "Mr. Evans, I voted Conservative all my life for the provincial government but when the Federal election came along, I voted Liberal." He says, "I am telling you that." But he says, "I have moved to Manitoba." He says, "It's fantastic." He said, "I paid \$110 every quarter for my wife and I for basic and supplementary health and medical insurance." He said over \$440 a year he paid for medical and hospital insurance. He said, "I don't pay anything here." He said, "We don't have anything called Pharmacare in Ontario." —(Interjection)— Well, he doesn't pay it as a premium. That's the point. Well, we all pay for it, but it is paid for on an equitable basis. And then he said, "Autopac." He said, Mr. Speaker, "I've got the same truck I drove in Ontario. I only pay 25 percent of what I paid in Ontario for the —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY: I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce if he is aware that the Honourable Member for Swan River has been on the public payroll all of his life. So when he is talking about rugged individualism, he really doesn't know what he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. EVANS: I was very surprised with his conversation because I had never met this gentleman before. I don't know him. I met him for the very first time. And he says, "I don't know why people are complaining, this is a terrific province to be in. I am sure glad to be back in Manitoba." And then I said, "Yes, I guess you paid a seven percent sales tax in Ontario instead of the five percent that we pay in Manitoba." And he said, "Oh yes that is right too."

At any rate, things are not that bad in Manitoba, and even in terms of unemployment. They're a lot worse in parts of Quebec. They're a lot worse in British Columbia. They are certainly worse in the Atlantic Provinces. As a matter of fact, as one person who moved here from the Atlantic Region told me, he said, "What are you people worried about in terms of unemployment? You haven't got any unemployment in Manitoba compared to what we have got in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and so on." So everything is relative I guess.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, in this Job Creation Program we recognize the responsibilities. We are not hoodwinked by any myths. We are looking at the reality of the situation. Whether we like it or not we know we have to engage in government spending in order to create jobs for our young people, for our older people, for everybody in this province. And I say to you we are not confused such as the Member from River Heights, who seems to talk on both sides of the fence. We know where we are going and the people of Manitoba know where we are going.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say that if the debate that I have heard

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

issuing in the last forty-five minutes or so is an indication of what we can expect in the way of hard-nosed realistic assessment of the economic conditions of Manitoba, then God help Manitoba. Because I am afraid that the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is one of the senior Economic Ministers in this government, is describing and alluding to a set of conditions, which frankly are also a set of myths. They may be somewhat newer myths than the myths put forward by the Conservatives but nonetheless they are myths. They are not describing the kind of conditions, and I think that that has been our complaint, that this government is only prepared to brush-block economic problems and isn't really serious. It is attempting to take the short-term, quick answers as opposed to providing some leadership to this province, and asking people in this province to bear down and look at some of the really critical issues that they are going to have to face.

So, first, Mr. Speaker, let me just see if we can dispel some of the myths that the Minister erupted with. In a way it is unfortunate he got to his feet to speak, because I thought that last Friday afternoon when we had a similar discussion on jobs, it was a much more thoughtful and interesting and rational exchange about the question of how to go about creating jobs. It is unfortunate that the Minister reverted back to form and pulled out every old chestnut out of the fire that he could possibly refer to. Let's just break some of those chestnuts apart.

First, what is the Federal Government doing? In this Federal Budget a billion-and-a-half dollars is being used for job creation programs, which proportionate to the domestic expenditures of the Federal Government, is a much higher proportion than what the provincial government of Manitoba is spending. That is fact number one and the Minister knows it. There is no reason why he should contradict. A billion-and-a-half dollars for job creation across Canada, and there is no question that the highest percentage is going to the areas where there is the highest unemployment. Because it is a national government and it is putting its money where its priorities are.

Now let me also create fact number two. Fact number two, Mr. Speaker, is that the Economic Council of Canada, a body composed of representatives from all regions, suggested that one of the major problems in job creation and economic development programs in the last decade in this country, is that the provinces themselves have not been contributing their fair share to the alleviation of regional disparities or to the question of employment; and have been relying almost solely and exclusively upon the Federal Government to do that job. And that was fact number two and they analyzed it with some degree of economic evidence to show that in fact the intervention and initiative by a variety of provincial governments, including our own, has not geared itself to the problem of job creation.

So now the Minister comes along and says, "Boy, we are unique, we're innovative, we have done the magical thing, we are now going to step in and create jobs in Manitoba." And certainly, Mr. Speaker, when it was announced in the Budget, I think most of us said, "Great." There is no question that we welcome and applaud the fact that the provincial government is prepared to take some responsibility. But when we saw the end result of that program it left a different taste in our mouth. Because when the Minister talks about the creation of jobs, we go back to the simple point that we have been repeating time and time again, that unemployment in Manitoba is not a short term phenomenon. It is not a transitory situation that is going to last over the summer months. There has been a hard core rate of unemployment of 25,000 to 30,000 people in this province well over the past year and beyond. Twenty-five to 30 percent of university graduates this year will not have jobs when they come out of those institutions. The question is that within our own province it is not a transitory phenomenon. It is something that is much longer term and therefore, any job creation program must be geared to that fact. It cannot be a short start, pop-up program that will come to a sort of a crashing end sometime in September or October. Because all of a sudden you've simply multiplied the problem. You have created expectations. You have spent \$30 million or \$40 million and you have ended up really with no results, other than a three month respite, a temporary alleviation, a short-term holiday, without dealing with the basic cause of the problem. And that is the basic issue that we are trying to raise with you, not that you shouldn't be doing something, it's what you are doing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what you are not doing. You are not creating the kind of program or activity or incentive in the province that will open up job opportunities for people coming out of the schools, for people who are underskilled and underemployed in this province. Statistics bear out that it is a problem that will continue to be with us and be with us for the next five years.

That is where the Job Creation Program of the provincial government should be directed, not toward the short-term kind of activity that the Minister is so proud of.

Now, let's take a look at another fact, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EVANS: I can agree with many of his observations about long-term problems, etc., but with the honourable member knowing that we are spending \$30-odd million for a relatively short-term program as he says, three or four months, would he suggest to us how much money we should spend for an ongoing annual program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, the answer to that I think, Mr. Speaker, is first quite simple. I would not be spending the \$30 million in the same way that the government is doing. We put forward a program in our own Budget reply that had a very different allocation of moneys as to how you could get longer term benefit out of almost the same capital that is being spent. We also suggest that the large amounts — millions of dollars — that are going into a number of manpower programs is redundant, and we are not getting full value for those kinds of programs. And we have suggested very often in the past that we could be getting much greater value out of our capital investments if we were putting capital investments into basic services and infrastructure in the provinces, which provide a framework within which industry can operate. I'm not a great believer in CFIs or Saunders or anything else because I think we've seen right across the country that every time a provincial or a federal government tries to get into the business of doing the big gargantuan industrial loan, they usually end up with a lot of egg on their face and no money in the bank. And that's been the failure story across Canada for the last ten years. So it is about time provincial and federal governments got out of that kind of business.

But we do say that there are other ways of providing incentives for business to work, and one of the ways is to make sure that there is a proper economic framework in place in the province. That means the kinds of roads and services and utilities and it means the kinds of work force that's available, and it does mean that there is the kind of support for research and development and product marketing that is necessary. All things which have to take place. —(Interjection)— But we're not creating. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, we are not.

If you look at the Bank of Canada statistics for the past five years, there has been a net decline investment in services infrastructure in western Canada. We are not even replacing what is being worn out. We are actually putting less money in than we were ten years ago. We are not putting our money into those kinds of things. Look at some of the problems if you simply look at what is needed for an industrial framework in the City of Winnipeg. We are going to be desperately short of water in a matter of two or three years. We have now reached our total capacity for a water supply, yet water is one of the major ingredients for the development of any industrial purpose. Where is the Provincial Government's commitment to add another aqueduct line to bring in fresh water into the City of Winnipeg for industrial purposes? There is no commitment, and the Minister knows it because I've asked him several times when it is coming, and there is no one prepared in that government to say that we're prepared to put money into a basic ingredient for any industrial manufacturing process in this area. There has been no commitment in those areas and yet it is an absolutely necessary requirement if we are going to be able to say to manufacturers that want to settle in Manitoba, we can guarantee proper water supply through the next twenty years. Because right now we are not so sure we can. We've got a lot of patchwork programs but we don't have anything in the way of a definite economic commitment and goals in those areas.

We also say, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of the manpower programs . . . I can recall — guess it's three years ago — going through with each and every one of the provincial departments during their Estimates, Colleges and Universities, Education, Industry and Commerce, Department of Labour and saying, what's our manpower program? How are we beginning to try to allocate the money that we are investing in community colleges and universities and other manpower programs, to job needs? And what are we doing to ensure that when students start coming out of it, that there would be a proper fit to the skills that they have for the jobs that are required? Well, the answer at that time, Mr. Speaker, three years ago, is that there was no manpower program in place in the Province of Manitoba, and no one was doing it. We are now paying the price for that omission of three years ago, because it would have taken a three year lead time to put a proper manpower program in place in the province to make sure that there was proper match-ups between people and jobs, so that the skills that were being developed in our schools would have been suited for the kinds of opportunities that might have been available.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking from personal knowledge because I teach in a university, I happen to know a large percentage of our graduates, to get their first job, have to leave the Province of Manitoba, they're simply not here. And if you survey any graduating class in either of our three universities and say, where are you going for your first job, it will not be in the Province of Manitoba. We are simply losing them, because they don't see the opportunity. Now let's ask the question, why? Let's ask the question, why that's not taking place? The Minister says, you see, it's not our fault, because it is free enterprise and private business that is falling down.

Let's look at one thing that's happened in the Province of Manitoba in the past five years. We have now lost our place of pre-eminence as a major financial commercial management centre for western Canada, at the very time when the resource industrial development of the prairies was beginning to take off, when it was beginning to pass a threshold, and beginning to grow. One would have thought that that would have been the time when our city, which has always had major advantages as a commercial management and financial centre, would have been able to ride along with that growth; that we would have been the one that would have been setting up the companies for resource

development. But do you know where it's happening? It's happening in Calgary, Edmonton or in Toronto. We have not been able to build upon our natural commercial financial advantages as a centre for that kind of industry because they've been leaving.

And one reason is —(Interjection)— Yes, I do. I blame it distinctly upon this Provincial Government because they haven't known how to encourage the kind of commercial management financial resource centres in this province. Through every one of their actions they have demonstrated that they are not concerned with that fact; that they are indifferent to those problems; that their taxation policies have been designed to simply create outflows of capital; that we have not been able to take care of those natural advantages.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know when university students come along and say, where are the jobs for me? We have to say that the jobs have left because we have lost . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . our major advantages as a financial management centre for western Canada. I think it's going to be tough to regain it frankly, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, you know, now the Minister wants me to revert to a history going back 20 years.

A MEMBER: Well, so what?

MR. AXWORTHY: We're talking about recent events. We're talking about the kinds of things that have happened within the last five or six years, when the kind of economic growth in the prairies was beginning to move, we didn't move along with it. The latest report of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has indicated that Manitoba sort of has lost its protective position as part of the prairie, what they call island of prosperity. We are now a have-not province. We've dropped out of that position.

A MEMBER: Garbage.

MR. AXWORTHY: Now, you say, whose fault is it? It is a fault for a number of reasons, but where the major responsibility of the Provincial Government lies is that they have not responded to that problem. They have allowed it to become more depressed. They have allowed it to compound itself, and they have not taken any ameliorative steps to respond to it. They have simply let it slip away. They have simply let it slip through their fingers. They have not allowed themselves to see that that was probably one of the big opportunities that we had to create a dynamic economy and we simply let it go away. It is going to be that much more difficult to recreate it.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, you know you could find examples time and time again — and I used one in the House when we were debating with the Premier on Friday afternoon — I said the very kind of thing where the great pride that we take in our short-term programs is contrary, or contradictory, by the kind of examples where you get small manufacturers — the one who visited me said that he tried to get some assistance from the Provincial Government so he could hire two chemists to help develop a new paint product which he sells throughout North America — well, there was no assistance forthcoming for that kind of thing. You see, we're too busy creating those three-month jobs. We can't give him the kind of assistance he needs to hire some chemists who will work for a couple of years developing new products. We don't have that kind of support in this province. Now that's the kind of contradiction of the remarks he's made. He went to the Department of Industry and Commerce and they said, "We can give you some pamphlets about where you can go to the Federal Government to get some help." Well, that's not really very good, Mr. Speaker, he wanted some help here.

I could give him several other examples where business, trying to get into new product fields and new areas, and trying to get some support, and no question as to subsidy, no one is arguing it isn't a subsidy, but the point is it would be a self-liquidating subsidy. It would eventually end up paying for itself, there would be a cut-off point' it wouldn't continue.

A MEMBER: We have over \$2 million this year for those programs.

MR. AXWORTHY: Sure, and we're spending \$35 million in short-term start-up programs. Why don't we spend another \$5 million on that kind, or \$10 million, if that's a necessity to be? But you are the ones with the experts in the Civil Service analyzing those programs, and I think that comes down to the point and thrust of our argument, they simply haven't analyzed the problem properly. It's not for lack of wanting to do something. They're obviously prepared to do something. They're spending money. It's just that they are spending it in the wrong places because they started off with the wrong assessments of what's going on. And I think part of the reason is because they are blinded in a sense. The only answer is not to provide community employment programs, which is basically what you are doing.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister says this is innovative, it's innovative if Franklin Delanor Roosevelt was innovative, because they are going back to the old pump-priming techniques of 1932, you know. If you create public works and short-term make-work projects, that's the way to create jobs. We did that in the depression but we found out that it simply doesn't recreate an economic base. It's a stop-gap expedient measure, but it's not creating economic development in the province. —

(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree, I've said that. I've said that the Federal Government has got itself into a variety of manpower programs which they are now realizing have not worked as well as they assumed they would. Now, I don't argue with the fact that there is a place and role for community employment programs, but not exclusively and not in the way that they are being done this way. If community employment programs are going to have any chance of working, they must have a longer term to them than three or four months. You go and ask any federal official in the Canada Manpower Department about the assessments they have made of their short-term employment programs, they would tell you very honestly, don't do it, because it doesn't work very well. It's not a good way to spend public money. That's what they would tell you.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they faced up very well to the economic problems of the province. I think there is another problem which grows out of that, and I find it surprising, I'm still not sure I understand the reason why. I am told through the newspapers that the First Minister of this province takes great pride in his understanding and depth of knowledge about the problems of energy. And we have heard thousands upon thousands of words about how we are developing energy in the Province of Manitoba. And yet when I look at the measures that this government has introduced I find that the rhetoric far outstrips the performance, because one of the major factors in the whole question of economic growth is, what are we going to do about energy costs? When the Minister says government has nothing to do with productivity, he knows that's not correct. He knows that the whole question of productivity in industry has a lot to do with what government does. It is a result of minimum wages; it's a result of export policies; it's a result of transportation costs; it's a result of a whole number of utility costs that are set by public boards. The productivity is very much based upon the cost per unit of any product, and I would suggest the government affects 60 or 70 percent of those costs when the decisions are made. So to say that government has no role in affecting productivity flies in the face of economic fact again. And certainly one of the major questions on that is going to be the cost of energy in finding alternative sources. And what we tend to talk about with great exhaustion in this province is finding new energy sources. What we do not talk about is, how do we cut back on energy use? How do we find alternate ways of spending our energy?

We still have a Manitoba Hydro that has electrical hookups for heating homes which is the most wasteful use of electrical energy that man has ever devised. Heating purposes out of electrical energy is by any thermal ratio simply the worst and most excessive wastage kind of program. We have not developed pricing policies to give different forms of incentive for conservation. We've made no hard steps in those areas. We've done nothing in the public transit field to make changes. In other words we have not addressed some of the really difficult tough issues about energy conservation, and we haven't asked Manitobans in their own way to come up with the answers that they should have to do, or how do we provide for a stable rate of economic growth in light of exorbitant energy costs?

I haven't heard a Minister of the Crown opposite address themselves to that issue in any debate, and yet it is an issue that is going to take some leadership because it is not an easy one to resolve. And I don't pretend I have any easy answers either but it is certainly going to be one of the major critical questions of any economic development program, and yet, Mr. Speaker, we avoid it. We treat it as if it didn't exist. We say somehow there's going to be a bonanza, somehow we're going to get polar gas coming down from the north and all our problems will be solved. Well they won't be; we are still going to be paying. The energy prices are still going to be going up at exorbitant rates unless we find some way of beginning to reduce the costs of energy drastically. We had a debate this morning which I thought was a little bit silly. The Member for St. Johns says, well corporations write off their insulation costs, let them bear the cost of things.

But he didn't address the problem, neither did the Minister of Finance, neither did the Minister of Industry and Commerce, about what do you do with the exorbitant rise in energy costs and how that is going to severely detract from the economic potential and development of this province. It is a major major factor and yet no one on the Treasury Bench or any of the economic Ministers have addressed to that kind of question. —(Interjection)—

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I've heard the Minister make press statements to that effect. What he doesn't talk about though, is that what the Federal Government is also trying to do, is using pricing as a conservation mechanism. And the fact of the matter is at the present moment, as he well knows, is that we are now having to import close to 40 percent . . . —(Interjection)— No, I'm not, because I've said the same thing before, that we are having to import 40 percent of our petroleum needs from other countries where the international price is \$3.00 a barrel higher than what we're preparing to pay domestically. And the price is going to have to reach that international level to provide it; and that we are having to pay the subsidy out of the Federal Treasury to do it. No, the Minister never talks about that. —(Interjection)— There is no surplus, and the Minister doesn't know it.

The Minister is being absurd. There is no such surplus. —(Interjection)— There is no surplus. The money is going to pay for the additional cost of having to import 40 percent of our petroleum needs, and this Minister is not candid enough to say that. He is always simply trying to make his political

point without being honest about what the real situation of energy prices are in this country. I am simply saying to him that no one is going to get mad at him for telling the truth. No one is going to get upset for saying it as it is. So why doesn't he be? Why doesn't he start levelling rather than always trying to paint himself as Mr. Goody Two Shoes who has no sort of responsibility. It's those nasty guys in Ottawa who are to blame for everything, without looking at the fact of the matter, that they are dealing with a national situation, not just with a provincial one. So all he's simply doing is posturing. He has developed posturing to a high art form in this province. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, this Minister should go on exhibit in the Museum of Man and Nature as being one of the all time great posturers. He has become almost a new species within the whole field of animal generics. You know, homonous posturous, is what we can call the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He has almost created himself into a brand new species walking the face of the earth.

I simply am, frankly, Mr. Speaker, getting tired of it, because the more we hear that kind of posturing, the less we're going to be able to come up with a realistic assessment of how do we deal with the real problem that energy costs in the Province of Manitoba are going to rise, is going to have a high deterrent effect upon economic manufacturing growth in the province, and we've got to find some answers to it. Those are the kinds of things I wish this Minister would talk about, rather than going for his program of posturing. That I think, Mr. Speaker, would be the kind of concerns that we have. And that comes back again to this issue of the creation of jobs in the province and the way that we're spending our money. It simply is not addressing itself to the kind of economic realities over the next four or five years.

Let's put a couple of propositions to it. That we need to create in Manitoba in the next four years 100,000 jobs. We need to create 100,000 permanent jobs. How is this government going to do it? We know what they're going to do for the next three months. What are they going to do for the next four years? Well, Mr. Speaker, right now they have no answers to that question. And yet if they really want to have an answer, that is a much more serious question than what do we do in the next three months? The real question on the minds of unemployed students, of unemployed people who have been without jobs for many years because they don't have the skills, is how do we create 100,000 jobs over the next four years and what kind of answers does this government have? The answers we have heard up to this very moment, Mr. Speaker, is they have no answer.

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

MR. EVANS: A question to the honourable member. I believe he agreed with me that it wasn't entirely a provincial responsibility, and I was wondering if he was going to indicate to us, what is the Federal Government going to do to create those 100,000 jobs in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Does someone wish to be House Leader? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you call the bills, the adjourned debates on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: We have several speakers; if I could have about ten seconds, I'll get them in here.

BILL (No. 48) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE INSURANCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Bill No. 48. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. AOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first portion of Bill No. 48 seems to be mainly housekeeping but the latter portion of the bill pertains to some insurance companies which operate in Manitoba. At present I believe there are about four insurance companies that would be affected by the legislation in this bill; that is, these four insurance companies operate in Manitoba only.

Now, Manitoba law presently requires a much larger reserve than does the Canadian and British Companies Act under which all other insurance companies that sell insurance in Manitoba and in Canada operate. Federally-licensed companies do not require nearly as large reserves as companies that are licensed under The Manitoba Act.

One of the companies that is especially affected is the Red River Valley Mutual Insurance Company with headquarters in Altona. They employ nine people. They are the fifth largest fire insurance underwriter in Manitoba and they have premiums of around \$2 million, assets of \$2,596,000.00. They are required to have \$5,000 in reserve for the first million of liabilities and for every additional million dollars in liabilities, they are required to carry \$3,000 in reserves. Federally-licensed companies are required to have 115 percent of their liabilities in reserves, which is much less.

The free surplus of the Red River Valley Mutual Insurance Company now shows a deficit of

\$267,688 on their 1976 Financial Statement and they expect that this will not improve but the deficit will increase as the assets of the company grow, as the company experiences growth.

Now, this company, if it would have been licensed under the Federal Insurance Companies Act, they would have shown a surplus of \$434,000 in excess of that which is required under Section 103, Subsection 1, so you can see that this really affects the growth of that particular company and all these other companies that come under this Act.

Clause 6 in this bill is going to allow these companies to operate on a more equal basis with other companies and their reserve requirements are not going to be nearly as large.

So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend this bill to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance will be closing debate.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will close debate. I will simply thank the member for his comments and perhaps — I'm not sure whether it is permissible — perhaps the bill could go to Law Amendments the next time we meet.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WAER H. JORGENSEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would call Bill No. 6.

BILL (NO. 6) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE JURY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Gladstone, Bill No. 6.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this bill for the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this was a bill that was introduced in the Chamber very very early in the session and sat there for a couple of months and then just last week we had the second reading of it. I'm sure that when the Minister said there were some technical problems with this bill, that he was more than just being truthful. I think there has been quite a bit of trouble with the implementation of this bill.

As you know, Sir, the Law Reform Commission had done a study on the selection of jurors in the Province of Manitoba and under the old Jury Act, there were a lot of classifications that gave a person a fair degree of exemption from serving on a jury. For instance, in the field of the clergy, the clergy of all denominations were exempted from service on a jury. At that particular time, there may have been some valid reason for exempting the clergy but we find that the clergy is involved in other aspects. I know a member of the clergy is involved in the Human Rights Commission now, so I see no reason why a member of the clergy should not probably serve on a jury.

There are various other exemptions that have . . .

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GRAHAM: Certainly.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you. It just occurs to me quickly to ask, and I'm serious about the confessional as being maybe one reason, or confidences that would be imparted to ministers in the normal course of much of their work. I don't know if that's the reason but has the honourable member thought of that as a possibility?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I haven't considered that but if the Member for St. Johns considers that to be a sufficient reason, maybe he wants to make some amendments later on. I see no reason why a member of the clergy should not act as a juror on a jury. After all, there is one basic question, I think, that is asked of anybody when they are asked to act on a jury and that is basically that they are going to act in a fair and impartial manner and that they have no particular bias in any particular case.

There are some other things too, Mr. Speaker, that you have to recognize. When we are dealing with these amendments to The Jury Act, basically what we are dealing with is the provision of an annual list of people who have been recommended from various walks of life and have their names put forward. And there are several hundred names put forward from various walks of life and after all, they don't all serve. Those that are involved in any jury trial are names that are selected from the list and names are put forward then. I believe the prosecution as well as the defence have a right to challenge the qualifications of any member's name who has been proposed.

So there are numerous safeguards which are built into the whole system to provide for the assurance that the person who is going to be selected, I think, will act in a fair and competent manner.

But we find some strange things are occurring, Mr. Speaker, in the bill that is brought forward and I suggest that perhaps it probably hasn't been too well thought out when they make these suggestions. For instance, there is a suggestion that a particular section of the Act be repealed and that section that they suggest be repealed is one that says, "The selectors shall select the names of

those persons who, in the opinion of the selectors or of a majority of them, who are from the integrity of their character, the soundness of their judgment and the extent of their information, the most discreet and competent for the performance of the duties of jurors."

Now that section is being removed. No longer do they want the most discreet and competent for the performance of the duty of a juror. —(Interjection)— Well, if that's true, then they are somewhat inconsistent, because you go to another section which says, for instance, "In the Eastern Judicial District, the Board shall ballot for jurors until they have selected 1,000 names of persons who in the judgment of the selectors are from the integrity of their character, the soundness of their judgment and the extent of their information the most discreet and competent for the performance of the duties."

So they remove it in one section but they leave it in another. I just wonder, in the drafting of it, why they would want to take it out in one particular section but leave it in another. And that is not the only section that they have left it in because they have left it in in other sections too.

So I suggest that perhaps there is either something there that I don't understand or maybe they have put the wrong number, inadvertently put the wrong number on and the section that they have scheduled to be removed is maybe not the one that they intended to be removed after all. So, it could be a mistake in drafting but I just want to bring it to the Minister's attention that there seems to be some inconsistency here because I don't think it was their intention to leave it in for one particular judicial district in the province and not leave it there for the rest of the . . .

The whole thrust of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to widen the sphere of activity for people of Manitoba to serve on juries, but at the same time, I think we want to maintain that degree of assurance that those people who are coming forward for trial before a jury, that that competency and that discreetness is there in those people and that they are going to receive a fair hearing from people who are competent to use their judgment in a very capable manner. I think that should never be removed from any qualifications for a juror. The people of the province deserve that assurance.

Now, we have widened the field to include numerous categories of people that were previously exempted from jury service and I only hope that in that service, those that have been nominated for that service, that undue pressure on their own personal business is not a severe inconvenience. For instance, one of the qualifications or one of the classifications that was previously exempt was that of pilots of vessels in actual service. Now, that is now being removed and I would hope that it doesn't mean that, for instance, our Lord Selkirk, the queen ship in our Manitoba fleet, is not tied up because the head man in that operation is serving on jury duty. —(Interjection)— We have the assurance of the Minister of Labour that the Vice-Admiral will take over.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that maybe some of the mistakes or some of the points that I have listed were inadvertent and if that is the case, then I think that in Committee, those points can be brought to the attention of the Committee and the changes made. I have no objection to the basic principle that is involved, but I think that perhaps some of the wording could be cleared up and when we get to Committee I think there are a few things that could probably be handled there better than can be handled in the House on second reading.

So I would say that I would like to see this bill go to Committee for clause-by-clause examination so that some of the points that I raised can be clarified there.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Can I have this matter stand please.

BILL (No. 59) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 59. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. PAWLEY: I believe that the honourable member stood it for me and probably I could just, if

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there are no other speakers, the Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 59.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to comment in concluding debate with respect to this bill on the valid points that were raised, the major points that were raised. The point that was raised by the Honourable Meer for Birtle-Russell, a concern expressed by him that the bill might by itself bring about a greater problem, a greater problem to the extent that it might compel landlords, for instance, to make changes that would be incompatible with common sense and would only add additional expense and inconvenience to them.

Certainly it was not my intent to introduce legislation that would bring about unnecessary expense for anyone although the principle is there that we want to ensure that the physically handicapped do not face discrimination in employment and shelter simply because they are handicapped. They certainly suffer enough within society than to ignore the problems that they so often encounter because of their physical handicap.

I was concerned about the very pragmatic concern that was expressed by the Honourable

Member for Birtle-Russell in this regard and have checked it out. The interpretation that would have to be given to the section is that the handicapped individual would accept the premises as they are. For instance — I think the Member for Birtle-Russell referred to a three-storey home — the handicapped individual would accept the dwelling as it is. It would be up to him to decide whether that three-storey, the suite at the top of the three storeys was one that would interfere with his inhabiting same because of his handicap. Or, for instance, if the bathroom door, as was mentioned by the Member for Birtle-Russell was too narrow for his wheelchair, again, it would be a decision that would have to be arrived at by the handicapped.

But the physically handicapped person under this legislation could not compel that the door be widened in order to meet his particular requirements. It did not mean, for instance, that the landlord would have to find a suite on the first floor in order to accommodate the handicapped person if in fact the suite that was being advertised was one on the third floor. All that the bill states is that the handicap in itself is not to be used as a grounds for discrimination. That decision as to whether the handicapped individual would find him or herself in the position of not being able to use the facilities, would have to be one that would be arrived at by the handicapped, for who would be better than the handicapped of course to make that type of decision, a much better decision than the employer or the landlord.

But certainly it would not be intended, Mr. Speaker, that the facilities or the accommodations would have to be radically altered just to meet the particular problems encountered by the handicapped in that situation.

There is other legislation, I believe the Honourable Minister of Labour is dealing with the other legislation, building code legislation requiring that new buildings, public buildings, accommodate the handicapped in certain respects and that we are dealing with. But certainly, no intention to impose unpragmatic and impossible situations upon people that would be faced with problems encountered by these situations.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to forward this bill on to Committee. I hope that we receive public submission on this bill. I don't know whether we will hear from the Association of the Physically Handicapped; I hope we do. We look forward to the clause-by-clause debate there.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 67. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 72. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 77. The Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

Bill No. 79. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader. —(Interjection)— They are all done.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Speaker, we would go into Third Readings.

THIRD READINGS — AMENDED BILLS

BILLS No. 2, 7, 38, 33, 20, 27, 28, 4, 5, 31, 44, and 46 were read a third time and passed.

BILL (No. 68) — AN ACT TO AMEND

THE SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour. Bill No. 68.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 68, an Act to Amend the Social Services Administration Act for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just before giving third and final reading to this bill, I would like to register for the record once again the dissatisfaction of some of our members, and certainly my own dissatisfaction with the open-endedness of the provisions of the bill itself, which we have referred to in earlier debate in the House. We recognize, as we said, and as others in this House have said, the need for licensing and the need for some sort of regulation in this field, but we are not happy with the open-ended type of bill that provides the Minister of Health and Social Development with a *carte blanche* to lay down whatever regulations he prescribes or deems fit, and to apply those regulations across the board to the type of institution mentioned and covered in the legislation.

In Law Amendments Committee the Minister advised me, in response to a direct question, that there actually would be only one set of standards applied to the institutions, foster homes, day care centres, facilities of that kind covered in the bill. I recognize that all things being equal, one set of standards is desirable in society, but when you're dealing with the kinds of problems we're looking at

here with native children, people from disadvantaged areas, and people from advantaged areas, you get into a situation where I think more than one set of standards is necessary to preserve the opportunity for native children to be placed and maintained in their own environment in cultural terms. The same is true of others, not necessarily of native origin, but others from certain underprivileged or disadvantaged sectors of the community and the province generally.

That aspect I think should be re-emphasized once more for the record, plus the fact that the legislation contains no hint of what those regulations and what those standards will be. While admitting that we need such standards, I suggest, Sir, that it is perhaps a questionable position for us to be taking to permit legislation to go forward with that kind of open-ended uncertain aspect to it.

Our concerns will no doubt remain very high profile for the next little period of time, after the legislation comes into effect, to see just precisely what the Minister is doing to ensure that there aren't unfortunate restraints and constraints placed on certain elements of society and unnecessary expenses incurred by others, and also to determine that the regulations are considerate and democratic and conscientious in their development and in their application.

We feel the jury is out on the kind of results this type of legislation will have, placed in the hands of one Minister and giving him the wide-ranging power that it does. With those reservations, Sir, for the record, we are prepared to see the bill proceed at this stage into what will officially become law, but we reserve our judgment on how that law is going to work and we may be anxious to see some amendments made within the next 12 months.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: It does appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that it might be appropriate to call it a day at this time, unless there is an inclination, and I ask the Honourable House Leader whether or not he would feel that it's convenient to go into Committee of the Whole House for third readings on two bills, one, the Legislative Assembly Act, which I think is non-controversial, and the Statute Law Amendments on Taxation. If that would meet with the convenience of my honourable friend for the remaining time, then therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills for third reading: No. 11, an Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act and No. 78, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1977). Seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): (Bills No. 11 and 78 were read page by page and passed.) Bills be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

BILLS No. 11 and 78 were read a third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this would be an appropriate time for you to call it 5:30, and may I indicate to members that the Law Amendments Committee will be meeting this evening for consideration of bills, other than, as I understand it, the City of Winnipeg Act, Bill No. 62.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment being agreed upon, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.