

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 13, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return under Section 66 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position as yet to provide some rather more definitive information with respect to estimates of damage and loss connected with the tornado of last month, and also anything relative to possible senior government involvement and remedial action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have no further information from that which I gave to him in the House when the matter was last raised. I can't even give him an approximate date as to when we might expect to have a more definitive figure, but I would expect it shouldn't be before too long.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Attorney-General has been able to get any information with regard to the graveyard that I indicated I was advised was being bulldozed, this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, there was a delay, of course, in obtaining from the Member for Inkster the location of the graveyard, and the matter is being pursued now. But I have not yet received any further information.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Based on the information she gave us this morning, namely that there were 13,759 civil servants employed as of October 21, 1977, and given Statistics Canada figures that in September of 1977 there were 15,336, would she say, by virtue of those figures, that the New Democratic Party government reduced the civil servants by 1,700 people in one month?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, the figures from Statistics Canada varies from ours because of the interpretation that Statistics Canada have; their idea of departmental,

Thursday, July 13, 1978

we refer to as casual; what we refer to as casual, they don't refer to at all, so I think that's where the discrepancy in the numbers comes from.

MR. GREEN: Since each of those figures would increase the figure of 15,336, but would not affect the figure of 13,759, is the Minister saying that the New Democratic Party reduced the Civil Service by more than 1,700 employees in one month?

MRS. PRICE: No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary to the last question, I would ask the Minister whether it is conceivable that in the figures which have been tabled which include, according to the Minister's own words, permanent, term, casual and contract personnel, that those students who were employed under direct Provincial Government job creation programs last year, and which this year has been replaced in part by an exclusive private sector funding, whether, in that one item alone, there could be as many as 500 to 1,000 people, young people, deemed to be in the Public Service one year and not in the next?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Lately, I have been receiving some representations concerning private guest homes operating in my own constituency, where they provide accommodation for people who have varying degrees of mental and emotional disabilities, for which there appears to be no supervision, so that there is a fair degree of activity and in some cases, nuisances, going on in the neighbourhood. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there is any provision in his department to provide supervision of these homes, particularly because the residents do receive some form of social assistance. Or is there any form of licensing or regulation that can be applied to ensure that while the homes perform a certain service, that they don't do so at the expense of the surrounding community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, certainly, with respect to most group homes and community residences, there is continual supervision and monitoring and inspection carried out under the aegis of the Office of Continuing Care of my department. The honourable member has referred specifically to persons with some mental disabilities, whether it be post-mental illness problems or mental retardation. That would come under the area of responsibility for mental retardation and mental health services, under the Director of that department, and there is provision for regular supervision and inspection. I will have that situation investigated.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just to ask the Minister perhaps to elaborate within the circumstances. It is not a home that is being operated by any agency or association, but is totally under private ownership, and that the accommodation is simply being made available under these circumstances, without any trained staff available to maintain any kind of programming or any kind of control. And I wonder if, under those circumstances, the Minister is also able to provide the same kind of monitoring and supervision that he says is available for the other kinds of group homes?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, could I ask the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, if he can advise me whether the clientele in that particular home is being funded by the taxpayers through the Department of Health and Social Development, or the operation of that home is being so funded?

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the organization, or the individual who owns the home itself, does not receive any taxpayers' money, but that certain of the individuals in the accommodation would be under different forms of social assistance, and that there may be some form of per diem and allotment that is carried out, but it wouldn't be a direct subsidy to the owner of the accommodation. It would still be a private operation for which there may be a per diem drawn from the individual subsidy who are the individuals using the residence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member for the opportunity to meet

Thursday, July 13, 1978

with him privately on the matter and to pinpoint the address and the ownership and I'll certainly pursue the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development with respect to a matter that has been under consideration, and that is the withdrawal of medicare and health services to foreign students attending universities in Manitoba. I would like to know from the Minister whether the decision is final and irrevocable or whether it is still in the process of being formulated, that is the decision to cut off foreign students from medical and health care assistance under the programs that now exist for the rest of Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to my honourable friend's first question is yes. The answer to his second question is no. However, there has been an extension of the deadline to August 31, 1978.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Minister would consider, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the Organization of Manitoba Faculty Associations and that rather than withdraw the privileges and coverage in this matter for foreign students, whether the government would attempt to guarantee students from Manitoba who go abroad for educational programs the right to the same health-care benefits in whatever country they may be studying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the measure that is being taken here is in concert with a practice in five other provinces in Canada and certainly in concert with the practice in the United States of America which is a much healthier and stronger and more powerful economy than ours is. With respect to the other question from my honourable friend, students from Manitoba who are Manitoba residents and who carry Manitoba Health Service Insurance Cards can have access to medical and health services in many many countries of the world through that insurance program which is funded by Manitoba taxpayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a separate question to the Minister of Health and Social Development with regard to a project that was referred to as the Kelly Centre project in the City of Brandon for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholic offenders. I would like to ask the Minister whether that program is completely scrapped or whether there is a possibility that the government will move and establish such a centre in the City of Brandon within the foreseeable future.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that it is not scrapped and there is a very strong possibility of the kind he suggests. It might be a different location from the former Indian Residential School, as I discussed during my Estimates, but the concept of the Kelly Centre is still very much alive and being pursued by me with considerable diligence, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his answer. I wonder if the Minister would be able to indicate to the House at this time whether in his diligent pursuit of the matter, he could give us some time frame in which he expects to see things happen. Has he any idea of a timing of this program implementation?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that matter will be resolved within the next very few months. The possible solution that's being explored is one related to the new correctional institution now being constructed in Brandon itself. The problem, of course, is that the strike in the construction trades industry has postponed work on that project, but I would hope for a fairly swift solution during calendar 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Thursday, July 13, 1978

and it's with respect to the grants for capital recreation facilities that have normally in the past years been made available to the northern communities. I am wondering if the Minister can indicate if a decision has been made yet regarding the 1977-78, or the balance of the 1978 year, program. I ask this question in view of the fact that many of the communities in the north have applied for Canada Works grants and they have been approved for these grants, these grants being in the nature of allowing the communities the labour component of a particular project, and many of them require the capital recreation facilities grants in order to partake of the advantages of the Canada Works grant that has been made to them.

In other words, if they are not able to obtain some funds for the capital works of the project, they will have to forego the funds that have been granted to them under the Canada Works Program.

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, some of the grants were passed by Cabinet, I believe, last Wednesday. There will be some other grants, which will be coming forward hopefully within the next couple of weeks, for further consideration. I appreciate the member's concern with regard to this. There are many facilities that have already been completed and, as the member probably knows, once 75 percent of the completion has been done, the grants are then forthcoming. So we are dealing with the last series, Series V, Phase II, of the capital recreation grants. The applications had to be in before March 31st, 1978. They are being dealt with in a normal manner and once Cabinet has passed them, the people will be informed and work can then commence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe yesterday morning the First Minister took, on my behalf, a question as notice, having to do with some changes that are being made on the grounds of our Legislative Building, and I simply want to indicate to members who understandably are concerned, that there is of course no attempt being made to in any way seal off or make approach accessibility to the building any more difficult. The main entrance will remain just as it always has been, but from a traffic control position we are installing or closing off during the hours of midnight to six in the morning the additional approaches to the legislative grounds, namely the one on Osborne, two in the back on Assiniboine and on Kennedy.

For some strange reason, Mr. Speaker, there is an inordinate amount of traffic that is generated around the grounds. Whereas during the normal daytime business some 520-odd vehicles normally, by traffic count, use the grounds and facilities, that reaches up to 1,400 between the bewitching hours of 12 midnight and six in the morning. And there have been, not just to this Minister but to other Public Works Ministers, complaints generated by adjacent residents on Kennedy Street, by staff people, such as Hansard staff — as you are aware, Mr. Speaker — who, because of the nature of their work, leave the building between the hours of three and four in the morning, very often, after they have finished their diligent work in preparation of the Hansard. And also, I might say, from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor himself, who, of course, is a resident adjacent, or just about on the grounds. So, for these reasons, very modest barriers are being erected, the total cost thereof being some \$2,800.00.

I might also add that during any sitting of the House these would not be up, even at such sittings as last night, where I understand one Committee sat until 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, flowing from the Honourable Minister's reply, I suppose we can breathe easy and safely assume that, whatever the reasons for these barriers, it's not because of any seige mentality on the part of honourable members opposite.

I would like to ask, however, whether the Honourable Minister can look into the records and advise whether this particular bright idea, which may have its merits, how it compares in cost with a somewhat contentious measure that was taken with respect to the installation of fire exit signs in this building, which was deemed by some to be unnecessary — I believe there are some who would feel these barricades, after some 50 years of this edifice and grounds, to be hardly a matter of great urgency, either.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to take that as notice from the Leader of the Opposition, but I rise really to simply add to one further aspect of this thing. It has, of course, been brought to the attention of the government and the Minister by the law enforcement officers, the police,

Thursday, July 13, 1978

who are, unfortunately, all too often called on to the grounds of the building because of assaults taking place, and other unfortunate incidents, who then have the concern about which end of the maze did the culprit get out of, from the building? So, it is also specifically at the request of the police that these measures are being introduced, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in pursuing this rather interesting line of questioning, I would ask the Honourable Minister, since he has already undertaken to search the records with respect to cost with respect to fire exit signs, if he would also search whether in that case too, there was not a recommendation by officialdom, namely, the Fire Commissioner's office, that such action be taken?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Highways could advise us whether or not the barricades are required due to the significant increase in traffic caused by the citizens that are presently making representations dealing with family law and The Cattle Growers Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, that would not be in any way connected with the increased traffic counts.

And while we're talking about the phenomena of those traffic counts, the traffic is considerably heavier, for instance, in what is known as moonrise strip, that is, the east side of the building, which has less lighting. There is some consideration given, perhaps when the restraint program eases up somewhat, that better lighting might indeed help resolve the question, because the traffic is one-third less on the sunrise strip or sunset strip, partly because Osborne Street, with a better lighting, creates seemingly for safer conditions. But this was the pattern that preceded any events of any committee or the introduction of any bill in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to depart entirely from that rather interesting digression, I would like to ask the First Minister, given that there has been a press report in the past day which quotes, or presumes to quote, a Minister of the Crown to the effect that certain legislation is being prepared for a fall session, can the First Minister be definitive today as to whether or not that is intended or whether it is under serious consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I noticed with some interest, if not alarm, the comment to which my honourable friend alludes, which was attributed, I can only believe falsely, to a Minister of the Crown. I can say to my honourable friend that I am unaware at the present moment of the need for any fall meeting of the House, but of course one can never tell, and realizing that the Honourable the Member for Inkster, amongst others, loves the atmosphere in the House and loves to prolong the sitting of the House, why we might just find some business of public nature to provide him with that kind of digression. But I can say seriously at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that I am not aware of any requirement at this moment for a fall session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the interesting proceedings of the House for just a moment and ask leave that the name of Mr. Spivak be substituted for that of Mr. Orchard on the list of members to comprise the Special Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday the Minister finally advised the committee that he would be amending Bill 25 to allow cattlemen to completely opt out of the provisions of Bill 25, of the Act. Could the Minister advise if he intends to allow other information reporters this privilege as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES. E. DOWNEY (Arthur): I am not prepared to indicate that at this time, Mr. Speaker. However, it could be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister prepared to release the results of her efforts to ascertain whether certain Winnipeg employers are blacklisting striking and locked-out employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: The people in my department, Mr. Speaker, have looked into The Labour Relations Act and, outside of a final report from the Attorney-General's Department, we can see that there isn't anyone breaking the laws.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that a formal request by the Retail Store Employees Union to investigate certain alleged violations of The Labour Relations Act has been made to her department in regard to this blacklisting?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had a request from the Retail Clerks' Union and the department is checking into it.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Can the Minister verify that the Retail Store Employees Union has attempted to initiate proceedings to allow for the reopening of the Thompson Shop-Easy Store in order to alleviate certain shortages of essential groceries in that community, and can she further verify that Westfair Foods, on behalf of that Shop-Easy Store, is refusing to co-operate in their efforts?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting slated in Thompson last week for precisely that reason and it was moved back to Winnipeg when Mr. Christophe's wife was ill. They had a meeting here but the terms that the stores offered was not accepted by the union, and that's the last I have heard of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture to indicate to us just what position the Ministers took with respect to the implementation of the Chicken Broilers Marketing Board, the national agency that was supposed to be in effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, at this time it was indicated to us from the federal Minister responsible that they, themselves, are not proceeding at this particular time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether it's his position that the Government of Canada should be proceeding at this particular time?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the federal Minister of Agriculture would be quite prepared to discuss it, as he was, and I indicated what came out of the discussions, that he has indicated that they are not proceeding at this particular time.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps the Minister misunderstood my question. My question was: What is the position of the Manitoba Government in that respect? Do they wish the Government of Canada to proceed, and are they prepared to proceed or what position did they put forward at the

MR. DOWNEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, our position is the same as it was when we were originally approached after taking office, that we had certain conditions at which we would enter the national agency and if those conditions were met we would be prepared to do so, and at this particular time that isn't the case.

MR. USKIW: Yes, could the Minister then tell the House what was agreed to at the conference this year, were there any agreement as between the provinces and the Government of Canada, with respect to agricultural policy, in any field?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the main points of discussion were in the area of stabilization of the agricultural commodities that are not under the supply management system, such as hogs, beef cattle, barley and oats, soybeans and corn. And it was a consensus that there was need for a federal program to be initiated or to be further discussed and I think it was agreed that, as far as our position was concerned, that the guaranteed margin approach would be the best method to guarantee or to work with a stabilization program for the producers. The percentage in which they are prepared to guarantee was far too low and unacceptable to our province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate to us whether or not a position was taken on the question of beef import quotas in the United States and Canada, or as between the two?

MR. DOWNEY: I am not sure whether I understood the question correctly. Was it the beef import quota that has been opened up to Canada by the United States? That was discussed but as far as off-shore beef quotas and beef, they were not part of the discussions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, some time ago I asked the Minister of Education if he could give us some further information on the Interuniversities North Program and he said that in late June there was going to be a meeting to make some decisions in that regard. So I wonder if the Minister could now confirm that the Inter-Universities North Program will be reduced from 12 communities to three communities and from 27 courses to seven or eight courses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm the figures that the Member for The Pas cites. I do know that on the basis of a meeting held by the Inter-Universities North Committee on June 23, that courses will be offered at Thompson, Lynn Lake, The Pas, and Flin Flon, and the total of those courses is some eight. As well, there will be independent studies provided in several other communities. Independent studies, I understand, encompass a correspondence-type approach with some supplementary tutorial help for the students where communities are smaller in size and the number of students who would be available for a course are quite limited. So the figures that he cites certainly do not coincide with the figures I have been given by the committee and I would also state that there will be further figures provided as the independent studies aspect is developed.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer. His figures are almost identical to those that I used. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not the people in the communities who have expressed interest in these courses and have involved themselves in the surveys by the Inter-Universities North staff, have been fully informed of the drastic reduction in this program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the committee attempts to reply, respond to the needs of the people in the various communities and I understand that the courses that they will be providing will make a very reasonable attempt at meeting the particular need that has been identified in these communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible

for cultural matters in the province. In view of his announcement last week that the major performing arts organizations have been excluded from the Festival of Manitoba, could he also now confirm that the major performing arts organizations are also being excluded from any involvement in invitations the province receives to participate in cultural or performing arts exhibits or celebrations outside the province and that they are not being included in the invitation list or the involvement of the provincial support for that kind of involvement outside of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker' I can't confirm that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister then if he would consult with his Deputy Minister one more time to determine if that decision has also been made. Perhaps the Minister would also be prepared to tell us if there has been a specific policy decision made by his department or by his Deputy Minister that the major cultural performing arts organizations in the province are in some way to be downgraded or to be reduced in their scope and size of their support with preference to someone else.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been no attempt to do that. With regard to this particular program, we decided to give some other people a chance at this particular amount. We are funding these different groups to a level that is very close to what it was last year and we have no intention of downgrading many of the fine groups that we have within this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then. Considering the Minister's assurances, would he be prepared within the next day or so, to invite representatives of the major cultural organizations to meet with him, to explain his stand in order to clear up much of the confusion and concern that is presently existing amongst the boards, the citizens' boards of those organizations, and their management, that the Government of Manitoba is undertaking a deliberate policy of downgrading the major cultural organizations, which can only be clarified if the Minister himself is prepared to give them personal assurances and perhaps provide some compensation for the lost money that they will now have to accept because of the way in which the Department of Tourism and Recreation has handled this whole problem this summer.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member is assuming that I haven't met with them. I have met with most of the groups throughout the last couple of months. If they wish to talk to me again, they have just to give us a call and we'll try to arrange a meeting at a time mutually acceptable to both parties. But I have met with the groups; I have been in consultation with the groups and I will continue to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Honourable Minister of Highways. Can the Minister of Highways tell us whether he has made any progress over the lunch hour with respect to the bill respecting the length of a hang-over.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have made no personal progress on that matter but I have and I do want to entice the honourable members opposite to raise their level of expectation and their level of hope and also to demonstrate an acknowledgement that the government is always prepared to listen to constructive suggestions to any bill and subject to what the other members in the caucus will do, there may well be some changes to that bill, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. When the Minister of Agriculture was discussing price stabilization and guaranteed minimum prices to farmers, was he representing to the Federal Government that such minimum prices be made only available to farmers below certain income groups?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: No, I did not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Could he confirm that Ian Grant, who was the P.C. campaign manager in St. Matthews in the last election was recently appointed to a position with MTS?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I am getting some conflicting information in respect to the person referred to by the Member for Elmwood, however, I'll take his question as notice and respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and ask her whether she would investigate to determine whether the employment of 115 civil servants on the redeployment list has been circumvented in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I understand from my colleagues around me that the person who is being discussed was hired by the opposition. However, I can assure the Member for Elmwood that the redeployment committee is not being circumvented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take the opportunity to clear up something that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet asked me about the other day regarding Right Angle Farms. The information that I gave him is correct, that we are trying to negotiate it back and we have not heard from the Right Angle Farms' solicitor to date, but my staff reminds me that I approved the sale of six acres of that land, because we have not heard from the solicitor, to sell to the Rural Municipality of St. Clement for an arena.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago I posed a question to the First Minister and I believe he took it as notice for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, regarding land in Fort Garry west of Waverley that had been expropriated under a joint agreement, I believe, between the provincial and city governments, and now rumour has it that this land is being returned to the former owners at the expropriated price plus interest. I would wonder if the First Minister, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, could respond to that question and indicate what the government's position is with respect to this action on the part of the city government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, at either the end of 1977 or the beginning of 1978, the City Council asked the Provincial Government for our views with respect to the land banking proposals in Fort Garry and St. Vital. We responded by indicating briefly to them — and I could perhaps even table a copy of the letter which we sent to the City in response, which would set out our position in more detail — but we indicated in general that with respect to the land banking project in St. Vital we felt that that could be fairly quickly used for residential purposes and on that basis our view was that it should proceed.

With respect to the Fort Garry proposal, we indicated that generally we were of the view that because MHRC owned a great deal of land in the vicinity, which was intended for residential purposes, that there was not as much need in Fort Garry for retaining the land for residential purposes, and that would in fact have to be a decision of the City, as to whether they wish to use the land for residential or industrial. But, in view of that position, that we would be agreeable to abandoning that particular land expropriation if there was agreement by the owners that there would be no action for damages against the city or the province, if the original moneys plus interest were returned. City Council has recently, after considering that letter, taken a decision that in their view, both the

Thursday, July 13, 1978

expropriation in St. Vital and Fort Garry should be abandoned. We are presently reviewing the St. Vital aspect in order to reply to the city, but we have not yet completed our deliberations in that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questions having expired, proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of the following bills for third reading: Bills Nos. 15, 26, 64 and 70.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILLS NOS. 15 and 26 were read page by page and passed.

BILL NO. 64 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: Page 1 —pass; Page 2—pass — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise only with respect to two points with respect to this entire Bill. The first is to enquire of the Government House Leader, whether he has been made aware of suggested further amendment or wording which would improve upon the General Exception Section 19(2). I believe the Legislative Council was at work helping an honourable member on either side to make some minor change which involved, I think, the change of only one conjunction, but I don't know if that, in fact, has been cleared with the Minister and if it is acceptable, and if so, what about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the matter was raised by the honourable member, but we feel that the bill as it's presently structured is designed to cover situations in the future, and we would like to leave it just as it is. I don't think that any harm can come as a result of the bill remaining just as it is.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the substance of this section of Bill 64 was discussed as between the Government House Leader and I guess my colleague, the Member for Inkster, certainly it was as between the First Minister and myself; it relates to members on both sides of the House, I think two or three in number. I'd like to be clear here, that the Government House Leader, having received advice, is indicating that it's the considered opinion that the section, as worded in this bill, is adequate to deal with the two or three cases in question.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, that's the impression I get, and I think, in order to cover adequately the situations in the future, it would be preferable to leave the section just as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just don't wish there to be any misunderstanding. I'm not really aware of the subject matter. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he thought it was discussed between the First Minister and myself. It wasn't, but he indicated that it was discussed between himself and the First Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2—pass; Page 3—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

BILL NO. 70 was read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 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 Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

BILL NOS. 15, 26 (On division), 64 and 70 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be agreeable to proceed with the Supply Bills at this time, as far as my honourable friends would like them to go.

MR. GEN: No difficulty, Mr. Speaker. With the Supply Bills? Well, we will adjourn it on second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSON: That is what I was asking my honourable friend, we will go with as many stages as my honourable friends wish to go.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Government House Leader . . . Order please — the Honourable Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I erred in thinking that we are at the place where the Supply Bill would have second reading. If we were going into Supplementary Supply to pass those items of Supply, then I would have to give notice to several of my colleagues that we are going to be in Committee of Supply, which I guess is what the Honourable Minister wants to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be the intention to go into Committee stage on Supp. 1 and Supp. 2, so there would be some detail there that you want to . . .

MR. GREEN: Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that we would adjourn the Supply Bill on Second Reading, but we are not to the bill yet, and I suggest that we go ahead, go into Committee, and we will tell those colleagues of ours who wish to speak on this motion that we are now in Committee.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Abe Kovnats: The matter before the House is the first Supplementary Supply Bill.

Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$2 million for Education: Private Sector Youth Employment Program — \$2 million — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have a statement entitled "Detailed Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure," and I enquired of the Clerk and I understand that this was the document

Thursday, July 13, 1978

that we were referring to and the first item is shown as the Executive Council, Appropriation No. 6 — Electoral Division Boundaries Commission, \$30,000.00.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can get straightened out. We are on the Supplementary Supply No. 1 and then we do Supplementary Supply No. 2, and you are on the first item of Supplementary No. 2. The Member for Brandon East is referring to the first item of Bill No. 2, but No. 1 deals only with the Private Sector Youth Employment Program.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, some of our members don't have — I think maybe I should say all of our members don't have No. 1, but it might not be anybody's fault.

Is the only item on No. 1 the one that you are calling now? Then we don't need the sheet. The only item is the Private Sector Youth Employment Program.

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Fine. Okay, that's fine. Proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I hope, Mr. Chairman, I won't be long. It's the Private Sector Youth Employment Program now Item No. 1 in the amount of how much?

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$2 million.

MR. GREEN: All right, Mr. Chairman, this is \$2 million which is to put youth into the private sector for a period of a certain number of months and I would imagine that it would be for a period of four months or so. And how many people do you expect to put into employment with this Program over the summer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it started on the Budget Day, I think it was Budget Day or the day after or very close, it ends October 20th. It is for that period of time until then. The applications were received until July 7th, which was the end of last week, Friday noon of last week. The count at that time was 4,600 applications had been processed and approved through the Program. We had originally thought probably there would be somewhere in the order of 2,000 applications. It went to 4,600. As the time progressed along the financial commitment is less and if you add up the amount that is provided for in Supplementary Supply No. 2, you will find that the total comes somewhere approximately three and one-half, if you add it all together. Partly, the periods are reduced as time goes by and it is anticipated at this point that there will be some lapsing as well, so the provision here is anticipated to be adequate to cover the entire program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to believe the Honourable Minister. I'm not going to debate the entire philosophy of whether it would have been wiser to employ these people in the public sector either in hospitals, or municipalities, or environmental protection, or litter control, in all of the areas in which good and worthwhile things are being done in the public sector. It may be the first time I resisted the temptation to do so, nevertheless I am going to do it.

What I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, is that if we're talking about 2,000 jobs here, then, in relation to the kind of statistics that we were dealing with yesterday and today, the same dollar money exactly might be involved, but it will take 2,000 people off the statistic of those people who we hire directly in the Public Service for the same program that would have been hired under the Youth Program last year, 2,000 people would be on that statistic which are not on this year's statistic, with the money still being spent. Mr. Chairman, we could argue for months, and will be arguing for years, decades, about whether it should be one way or the other. I don't think we should be arguing that the money is being spent, and the statistic ends up somewhere, and all that happens here, is the statistic is taken out of the Public Service and put into the private service. I am sure I would not have the tolerance of the House if I once again argued how it could be just as valuable or more valuable in the Public Service, than in the private service. But the statistic is still there.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, in part, the member's comments would have to refer to the summer

period to have any validity, and from the point of view of the program itself, I'm not going to either get into a debate over how much of this shows up or would show up as government employment if we hadn't gone into the program, but the purpose of the program was — and this isn't done at the exclusion of government programs. There are other government programs carrying on that are employing people directly, and there are municipal programs that are doing the same thing. The city has a very active program of employing young people during the summer as well, and other public bodies do as well. But the aim of this program was, and I think it wasn't a singular aim, but one of the main aims of it was to introduce young people to jobs in the private sector, and one of the conditions on the application form was that it must be a new job, it must not be the filling of a job that was an existing ongoing job. It had to be a new job. Now whether or not they all are, the statistics will remain to be seen because the people who were supervising the project to July 7th to some extent have directed their attention now to providing the analysis of the jobs data that is available, through the forms, through the jobs, so that we'll have a better indicator next year as to how many in fact, new jobs were created, whether ongoing jobs are likely to be created.

Anyway, one of the principal aims was to get young people introduced into the job market and get them introduced into the sector where there is a possibility of an ongoing job. Once the association is made between the person and the employer, then there is a better chance that in another year it will carry on under its own steam. So, Mr. Chairman, that's the basis of it.

I don't have to repeat again, it was much more successful than we anticipated in starting it. I must say, just as a matter of interest, that the thought for this program arose from a farmer who lives up in the Roblin area, who dreamt it up and brought it forward to us, and this is part of the democratic process in action, I suppose. We took a look at it, we looked at it further, we also found that Ontario had done a similar program last year, and has strong similarity, and also was repeated again this year in Ontario with success. But I mention this simply because it was an idea that stemmed from a recognition of an opportunity, in both the rural area and in the urban area for creating job opportunities for young people, and I think it's worked extremely well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cast any negative aspersions on the program, because it is I think obviously needed, but certainly a number of questions and observations arise.

The first is that this program is all the more necessary this year for two reasons. One is because the level of unemployment, particularly among the young is running higher than many, many years, and second is that there has been a turning down of the extent to which there is additional employment created for young people during the summer months within the public sector. But let the record be clear that this is not a new concept.

The Private Sector Youth Employment Program, we have the benefit of at least a working year's experience with it. The difference between this program and the one that was put into effect a year ago is a difference of degree only. I believe that we too had the criteria when we initiated the Private Sector Youth Employment Program, that no firm would be eligible except to the extent that they were hiring someone additional or beyond their payroll size, the previous year. So that certainly is identical with one of the criteria that the Honourable Minister of Finance has just mentioned.

The second point I'd make, and here there is a difference, not a similarity, but it's a difference of degree, and that is that a firm that employed to be eligible, had to be a firm in the category of 50 employees or less. I believe that we did not extend the benefits of this program to include firms that had payroll size in the order of 100, 200, or several hundred, or more. Then too, the number of young people that benefited from the predecessor version of this program a year ago, I think would be in the order of 1,000, perhaps 1,200, whereas this year my honourable friend is saying that they were looking at 4,000 applications.

But if the appropriation being requested is \$2 million, then for the \$2 million, and if it's 4,000 involved, that averages out to \$500; 4,600 for \$2 million, it's merely a case of simple . . . \$3.5 million, so my honourable friends then, you see, Mr. Chairman, there is a greater emphasis admittedly being put into this particular program, because last year's youth job creation program had about eight or ten components to it. The private sector was one, and there was a local government component, where municipalities were eligible for this kind of similar funding, except instead of it being a private company, that it could be a municipal corporation.

In addition to that, local groups, institutions such as hospitals and schools, were eligible as well for some support in turn for hiring of young people. I believe that in the order of 5,500 jobs were created for young people at mid-July a year ago. Now of the 5,500, I venture to say that something in the order of 1,500 to 2,000 was in the public sector, provincial public sector, and I have already mentioned about 1,000 in the private sector Youth Employment Program, and the balance would

then be as between the hospital and school institutional hiring and local government. All in all the program fleshed out to about 5,500 jobs so created.

The Member for Inkster makes a point which now can be elaborated with some specific figures, that the Minister of Labour this morning, in tabling some statistics with respect to the size of the public service at different quarters of the year, neglects to show in that document, although once one has the information it is easy to perceive in that document, that in the order of 1,500 jobs would show up additional in the public service employment for those months of the year in which the Youth Employment Program was operational. I might add that we had, in addition to the regular annual type of hiring by the various departments of government which has been going on for, I suppose, decades to the extent of a few hundreds and then two or three thousand, in addition to that there was additional hiring by virtue of these special Youth Employment Programs and STEP and so on.

Well, I quite agree that now is not the time nor place to argue the relative merits of depending on the private sector or the public sector for youth employment creation. Indeed, one would think that since most people agree nowadays that our economy is necessarily and desirably so a mixed economy, that any effort in terms of extra effort for youth employment creation would be one which had a judicious balance as between private and public sector. The public sector extra effort has been dropped by the wayside and that conveniently relates to the government being able to show a somewhat smaller public service this summer than last year. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if that somewhat smaller public service this summer is smaller by much more than something in the order of 1,500 to 2,000, July to July. If that be so, if those numbers be even approximately correct, then that 1,500 to 2,000 will relate to the number of young people who would ordinarily last summer have been employed within the public sector. Okay.

So we are being asked here to vote an appropriation for the private sector Youth Employment. There is no basis, philosophically and pragmatically, for opposing the request since it is really the only significant youth employment extra effort that is before us. So that much at least we have to support and want to support. But, I wonder whether anyone can say with conviction that there is no scope for a similar type of program to provide employment opportunities and, at the same time, carry out useful work for the public service at the local municipal level, at the hospital and school board level and at the local community groups level as well. \$

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact figures on the direct employment programs. I think that there are approximately 1,200 students directly employed by the government for the summer. There is about another 800 on STEP programs and there are other programs that are funded by government, supported by government, ICEP programs. I don't have the figures on it but the 4,600 figure, if you add even the ones I've mentioned, would be up around 6,600 and there are more than that in total. So the eggs aren't all in the one basket of the private sector employment program. As I mention, the figure that I recall is roughly 1,200 on direct employment in government service for the summer and that's not included in the 4,600. The figure would be somewhere in the order I would think probably of 6,600 or in that order at least of the numbers that I do recall at this time and it probably is higher if you include the programs such as ICEP and so on that I haven't included in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just add one or two words to what my leader, the Leader of the Opposition, has stated, and that is that the program which the previous administration, the New Democratic Party administration, had in place last year was very comprehensive, all-embracing in a sense that it included various elements of the public sector as well as the private sector. Given the fact that the program was in the order of around \$20 million, that is the summer portion of the program, it does follow — in fact the exact amount is \$20.59 million — it followed that we put many many more people to work.

What amuses me is the critical comments made by the members of the government side with regard to employment creation programs. It seems to me that they have gone into this whole matter very reluctantly. The particular program that we're looking at now, the particular expenditure we're looking at now, is really a copy of our Jobs in Small Business that was introduced last year, that program that was introduced last year, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred and which was, I believe, successful the first time it was undertaken. We had to be very careful that we were bringing new jobs on stream, that we weren't simply replacing people who could have been working working anyway or employers who could have had people filling jobs and we wanted to make sure that they weren't laying them off in order to tap the new program, so we had to be very careful,

as I'm sure the government today has to be very careful that there is true net additionality to the program. Because if all you're doing is displacing others who may be laid off because the employer wants to take advantage of the program, then of course I think it should be agreed that we're not any further ahead.

I would suggest that the government has a large number of applications because it doesn't have two things; it doesn't have these other elements going for it, it doesn't have these other job creating programs in operation that the previous administration had, and secondly, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the employment picture this summer is far worse than it was last summer. The latest labour force statistics show that of all those people employed in Manitoba over 14,000, over 14,000 persons are in the category of under 25 years of age and that, Mr. Chairman, is a very serious condemnation of our provincial economy and the situation that exists today. The unfortunate part is that these are young people, a great portion of whom have never been able to get a job. They have come out of school or whatever educational institution they've been in and have not been able to find employment within the Province of Manitoba. It would be interesting to see to what degree there has been an exodus from the province although I admit there are unemployment problems elsewhere in the country and it may not be as attractive for some of our young people to go to Ontario, for example, but certainly there is an attraction for them to go to Saskatchewan and to Alberta.

I find it rather ironical that the government is in this program, to me at least, it seems to me with a great deal of reluctance it has gone into this program. I find that very ironical, because by going into the program it has accepted in effect the principle that government can create useful jobs, that the government can play a very positive role in creating jobs in our economy at the provincial level. The fact that we've got this item before us, the fact that the government is in this program, albeit in a very modest, a very minor way, given the degree and the nature of the problem, I say that it's recognition on the part of the government that this is the type of program that at least can help us counterbalance the cyclical situation that we find ourselves in where we are in the depth of a recession, where we find that our economy is indeed very soft and something has to be done.

I think when we discuss this type of measure of course we very quickly get onto the very fundamental issue as to how we create more economic growth in the province, how do we create more jobs for our people, and this of course leads to a very fundamental difference of view. The present government, of course, taking the view that reduced taxes, reduced government activity, is the panacea for economic development, for economic growth. I think as some of my colleagues have tried to point out over the past few months, during this Session, that this is a panacea that is simply not going to work and that there is some other very fundamental factors at work such as lack of markets, lack of certain resources and the pervasive nature of a North American recession or indeed a Canadian-wide, nation-wide recession that we're in.

So I say that the panacea that the present government looks to as the months roll by, and as the years go by we will see, during this administration, that that panacea, that this solution is one that will not work. I recommend to the government, therefore, that they take a look at some of the programs that the Schreyer administration introduced whereby we created jobs, useful jobs, jobs that added something to the quality of life in the community, jobs in the health institutions, whether they be hospitals or personal care homes, jobs at the municipal level, jobs indeed involving community groups whereby many many innovative programs were undertaken and whereby, I think, there was a net addition to the wealth of Manitoba created.

I don't know how often we have to say it, but it's fundamental enough that it bears repeating, that the greatest waste of all surely has to be people, whether they be young or old, being forced into idleness, not being able to work, not being able to create goods and services. That surely is the greatest waste of all in our economy, not to mention the social or the psychological factors, the psychological and sociological waste that occurs, or detrimental effects that occur. Purely from an economical and material point of view we are the poorer in this province because of these thousands of people being out of work. It seems to me that what we should have placed before us is a comprehensive program whereby we involve municipalities, whereby we involve various non-profit institutions, whereby we involve co-operatives, school divisions, and indeed as well as the private sector — which was involved last summer and which is involved this summer — involve both public and private sectors and take a comprehensive and aggressive and a positive attack, make a positive and aggressive attack on unemployment.

There are day by day, week by week, reports in the newspapers of a worsening situation for this country in the coming winter and I say the government would be well advised to look at other areas of employment creation. I don't suggest for one moment that we have people engaged in useless work and I'm convinced from looking at all the programs that we've had in the past involving the municipalities and local community groups, and co-operatives, and hospitals, and the school divisions, and all the groups and people that were involved, that these people that were put to work

were doing something of true value to the community and to the province. We were getting wealth put into place, yes, at a price, but my question is, can we afford not to do it? I think the unfortunate part in our history at this time, in this province, with 14,000-plus unemployed young people, is that we have a great deal of bitterness in our society, a great deal of frustration, a great deal of cynicism on the part of our young people. I think that government of all levels, including the Provincial Government, has a very serious responsibility to do more in this area than this government is doing today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add two or three comments. I hadn't intended to speak on this particular matter, but the comments of the Member for Brandon East prompted me to rise. I thought we were discussing the matter of the Estimates before us, but he has gone beyond that.

Let me assure the Member for Brandon East that when we have totalled up at the end of the season, the number of jobs that have been created or initiated by the government for youth in this province, that the figure for this year will be greater than that that it was for last summer, due in part of course to the success of the private sector youth employment program. And my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has mentioned some of the very pleasant aspects of that program, and the spinoffs that we are very delighted with. What he did not mention, Mr. Chairman, I think is worth noting, that we have received considerable indication that in the area of non-student youth, in this particular area, many of the summer jobs within the private sector youth employment plan would appear to be turning into regular jobs, that they will be ongoing and that these young people who entered into the program at the beginning of the summer, will be retained by their employer. I think that is a most useful aspect and of course it is too early to measure the extent of that particular aspect, but I suggest that it's a most positive one.

There is a second positive aspect of that particular program, Mr. Chairman, and that is the fact that there is a training aspect to the whole program, in that many employers are taking the time to train young people who are employed with them, and this particular training makes that particular youth much more employable, whether they remain with the employer for the rest of the year or whether they terminate and seek employment elsewhere. I would say that those two aspects have not been mentioned here are and very positive.

The Member for Brandon East suggests in some way the youth employment program in this province is not comprehensive. I suggest to him that it is more comprehensive than it was last year. As my colleague, the Minister of Finance has said, we have youth working in government, in different types of government programs as well as the private sector. I would suggest we have the best of both worlds, Mr. Chairman. We have the Regional Disparity Program, a Youth Employment Program in the north, as well as various other programs where we have young people working with the physically handicapped in that particular type of program.

The Member for Brandon East, in deploring the situation, and of course I think all members of this House deplore the situation if young people cannot find gainful employment. The Member for Brandon East somehow never takes into consideration that we do have some young people, for some very good reasons, that do not want to work, and perhaps we have some young people for some very bad reasons, that do not want to work. And when he's talking about his 14,000, I wish that he would take that particular factor into consideration. And when I talk about good reasons, we have many who are attending camps, educational institutions and so on in the summer months and are not available for employment. I also have had several reports, Mr. Chairman, from employers in the province who are trying to hire young people and find none available. I suppose this may be a matter of geography, but it is the situation and it is only a report that I have been receiving. I have had no report, Mr. Chairman, from numbers of young people who say that they can't find a job. Now you can't argue with the statistics; apparently there are so many thousand who are not employed, but I suggest to the honourable member that there are various reasons for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest to the comments of the Minister of Education, and really what I heard, if I close my eyes, was I could have been listening to a speech made last year, because the programs he mentions are really programs that have been here for some time. The Student Employment Program has been in existence for about five years as I recall. Last year there was well in excess of 2,000 students involved; this year something like 800. —(Interjection)— Over 3,000, all right.

Last year we launched the Job Creation Program, and the target was not students, the target was people who were not going on to post secondary, because those who were looking for seasonal

work during the summer months, were getting jobs through the STEP program, and through government service itself, parks, the highways, and so on. The Minister talks about northern Manitoba; I can tell him that there were programs, as he well knows, in northern Manitoba, to look after the regional problems in northern Manitoba.

The entire Job Creation Program, which I think one of the members across said came to them via some farmer who gave him an idea, I don't know why they had to talk to the farmer, because the fact is the program was in existence. The program that Manitoba developed, I can tell you, was so good that it was then taken up by the Federal Government with some modification, and they have a very similar program now. They do it through an Income Tax Credit, when the company files their income tax. But it was based on the Manitoba concept of jobs in the private sector.

Basically what we see here, Mr. Chairman, is this government's total dedication to the idea that the private sector is a vehicle, and they prefer to put more dollars into the private sector than into the public. They prefer to believe that somebody working in some ice cream parlor on Portage Avenue is doing more useful work than somebody who is working in a hospital. Well, that's their decision, and I can't argue with them, they have a majority, and they are at this time the government. I don't agree with them but that's a matter of opinion. But insofar as the totality of students being employed, whether it's through the private sector, the public sector, and public including all the agencies: the hospitals, the school boards, the municipalities. I would venture to say that this year they will not have more students involved in work, but less students, and even though there is still a STEP program only employing about 800 students, it's a far cry from what it was last year.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise only, because if one were to listen to the Minister of Education, one would get the idea that somehow the government came up with these tremendous ideas, and all that has happened is they are carrying through, pretty well, what was started by the former government, but they're changing their emphasis. Rather than working through the public sector into meaningful work for the young people, they've chosen the route of the private sector, and it's a form of subsidy to the private sector. They say to the individual, or to the company, you hire a student, pay him \$3.00 an hour, we'll give you \$1.50. You know, they might just as well have given the company a grant to hire students; it's almost the same thing. So it's a form of subsidy to the private sector, and in certain circumstances it can work, if in fact they are very careful that what they're doing is making these jobs available, and the funds available, for the creation of new jobs and not simply the kind of jobs that are required seasonally at this time of year by firms that do always require extra manpower in the summertime, by virtue of the nature of their business. And that they would be hiring their 50 or 10, or 5 employees anyways, but now with this program, they of course get 50 percent of the salaries paid for by the government, so they would be crazy not to take advantage of it.

So the key really is, to what extent is the government assuring that in fact the criteria, or the guideline, or the requirement, that these are new jobs over and above, not what the firm may have needed in March or February when perhaps their business is at its lowest ebb, but rather a comparable period in the preceding year. Because as I say, many of these businesses do hire and do most of their hiring in the summer months when their needs are greatest, when their activities are greatest. So it is that question which I hope, all I can do is express a hope that the government is very careful, that in approving these applications they are not simply approving payment for employees, student employees, who the company would normally have had to hire in any case over the summer months because their business requires those students to be hired.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 — pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to raise with the Minister on this question of Supplementary Estimates, the scope of the program and why we seem to be concentrating exclusively upon providing assistance to firms, and not to organizations engaged in some aspect of community work which also provide legitimate occupations, provide work for people skilled who have received skill training in our universities and in our community colleges, but don't happen to be going into factory type or farming type operation. And because so many of the other support programs for community related organizations, I think in this particular case of the child care programs, have utilized things like the Inner City Employment Program and others' that kind of funding has either been frozen or, and I think the ICEP program is probably going to be eliminated.

It seems to me equally as important, if the philosophy and objective of the government is to give work to young people so they can utilize their skills and begin to find useful work track records and acquire that kind of experience, that to exclude many of the community organizations, particularly the private ones, which are undertaking a lot of useful work in the community, and only put the application of this money to private firms per se, really is a form of discrimination and one that really doesn't serve, I would think, the proper purposes of the program. So I would ask the Minister at this stage, if he would be prepared to offer an explanation, why that exclusion is in place and

whether the government is prepared to reconsider it so that in certain key areas, educational fields, health fields, child care fields, where there is requirement for skilled workers coming out of our institutions and where there is also very useful and beneficial services being provided, why they are being excluded from this kind of ad hoc or temporary assistance under the Youth Employment Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, this item of course is only intended to cover this one type of job creation program, which is the Private Sector Program, and as the Minister of Education has indicated there are a number of other programs in government or supported by government or through government that are providing job opportunities for young people. I don't have the exact figures or totals, but I did give a couple of figures. My recollection is that the direct government jobs for the summer period for youth, was in the order of 1,200, and I think there are separately about 800 STEP and there are other programs. Now I presume he is referring to more permanent jobs rather than just the ones I referred to, but I wouldn't know where to start to try and outline to him the many programs that are supported by government on a more permanent basis, and I think as we've gone through the Estimates, you've seen a number of them. I think principally through the Department of Health, you'll find large numbers, but again I can't put an exact figure on them at this point in time.

But this program, this particular program, filled one part of the total and it's not a case of putting all the emphasis on the private sector youth employment program, but it was done for that reason that I gave, which was to attempt to introduce, provide an incentive for introduction of young people to jobs in the private sector and I think it's been very successful, but it's not the only one that is being done.

There is, in the second Supplementary Supply bill here, an additional amount that we'll come to that covers the balance. You'll also find \$300,000 in the additional to provide additional jobs in the northern parts, quite apart from the programs that are being undertaken through NORTHLANDS and other programs. There is another \$300,000 in there for that. Again, when we come to it, I may have some numbers here on the number of jobs created by it. But it isn't a case of the government putting all its emphasis in this one place. I think even the Member for Fort Rouge might be prepared to agree that, looking at it in isolation, it's been a successful program. It's been exceedingly well administered and I think the Department of Education has done an exceptionally good job. The turn around time on the applications averages about three days on the programs — there's not a hold-up.

There's been some question raised that it was like the other program that was carried out by the government last year, the Jobs in Small Business Program. Well, there are some similarities, but there are some distinctions, very marked distinctions as well. We weren't so concerned about whether the business had 50 people in it or not, that looks after itself; the only restriction we put on it was that no one business could hire more than 10 students or young people under this program, and it tended to be self-controlling, so we didn't have to go into a lot of red tape in order to get the jobs placed, and they were placed very rapidly. They have signed the agreement, the agreements are being examined now after the fact, to see how successful. All told it has been a good program, and it has provided about twice as many jobs as we thought it would provide when we first started it, and for that we don't begrudge a nickel of it. All the evidence we have, is that it has been an exceedingly good investment.

But it is not the only program that the government is supporting and I think the members opposite realize that. There are a number of other programs which are not subject to the Supplementary Supply, but are in the regular Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Meer for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little perplexed at the Minister's answers. He talks about all these programs — I don't know of any, and I attended the Estimates faithfully on Health and Social Development and on Education. The only additional program that is available is a STEP program which provides employment for students working directly in the government service. There is absolutely no other program available for private sector employment of a non-profit kind, or even public sector. —(Interjection)— He talks about all these programs, then, if there are all these programs, I would desperately like to know where they are, because I have a number of people in my own constituency who would love to make use of them. So it's the best kept secret in Manitoba, as to where all these other programs are.

Now, I didn't rise in any way to be critical of this particular aspect of the program. I think that this one technique that the Minister has is a useful one, and a good one, and I compliment him

on it, and I'm glad it is a success, and I hope that they will continue offering this kind of work program. But, what I am saying is that this program is restricted solely to, I guess what you would call, profit making enterprises, and there is nothing wrong with that per se, but it does mean that a lot of the other organizations in the private sector who do provide other kinds of services do not have any opportunity, other than the Canada Works Program — the Federal Program — to employ students either for a summer period, or for other periods to work with them. I would give a specific example, the Child Care Institutions. Many of the Child Care Institutions, both Day Care and Lunch and After School, in the past, have relied upon supplement student programs, to maintain their programs over the summer months when their grants are not covered. Lunch and After School, for example, is not covered during the summer months, they have basically an eight-month grant. Previous to this they worked under the ICEP Program. The ICEP Program has basically been frozen, they've been told by the bureaucrats running it, no point in applying again, it's not coming. They really are sort of up against it.

There are many other kinds of community associations, who provide work activities in these areas, where they provide maintenance work; where they provide work in hospitals and in other sort of private — if you want to call them private sector — but they are non-profit. I know of no other provincial program that is made available for that kind of assistance, and yet, as I understood the philosophy behind a Youth Employment Program, it's in part to give a chance for students who have certain skills, and want to develop them, or to get some work experience. Now what it means is that the only work experience that were considered to be legitimate or worthy of support, is that in a private sort of profit making enterprise, as opposed to those students who may see themselves going into a service type occupation — they are not being given any kind of incentive to this program.

So, the Minister might be right, there may be all kinds of programs, but I must confess that it is information that only he and a few others in the province have, because most people are not aware of what all these programs are, other than the STEP Program, which really is confined solely to hiring students to work in government, and that's it. Other than that, I know of no other summer employment or temporary employment programs that are presently available or being funded by the provincial government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAUNT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise also not to criticize this program at all, but I am a bit confused, and I think that maybe the Minister is confused, or he doesn't understand the concern that we have on this side of the House.

Now this program, first of all I didn't know where I was for awhile, when the Minister said it was a great idea and it was somebody from the farm that had thought of it. I remember fighting for this program last year when I was a member of the Cabinet —(Interjection)— I'm not saying it's exactly the same, and I don't care who gets the credit, but it is something that we had. Now there might be more money spent this year, so there is no way that anybody — I haven't heard anybody on this side of the House criticize this — it's a good program; it's helping employment; and it's helping small businesses. That was one of the reasons why we brought it in. But what I want to know, and what I think the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wants to know, besides that, we are not talking about the amount of money in the Estimates of the Department of Education for employment of students, we are not talking about that program — that was there — but in the supplement, last year — well, I don't want to start a discussion at this time in the session, who started the program and so on, but I thought it was odd that the Minister should give all the credit to somebody else when this program is just an expansion of the program that we had.

But what I want to know now is that, besides this program that we talk about for the private sector, the programs for the students, there was a program that we brought in in the Supplement Estimate last year, and that was a companion program, you might say, to this one that we are discussing now, and that was that money was made available for the people, for instance, who were financed by the government. For instance, the hospitals' program — the hospitals were asked to find out where they could employ certain people; the same thing at personal care homes; in day care; and helping with the retarded; and so on — those are the kind of programs I think that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is referring to, and this is what we want to know. And the Minister said, "Well, yes, those programs still exist.", and we want to know where. We are not criticizing, we want to know where, where we'll discuss that, because if it was in the Estimates, it went over our heads, it went over the head of the Liberal Party and also our party, because we didn't see anything in there at all, and this is what we want to know.

And then there were programs with municipalities, but I think that the Minister said that that also exists now. I don't want to put words in his mouth, but it seems to me that he said that. We just want to know where, we are not criticizing this program, this is a good program and we are

pleased that you've expanded it, and we hope that you are going to do it again because it helped to create employment, it helps create new jobs — I hope — and also, it helps small businesses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.tfm

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I think the best thing to do would be to provide some more detailed information on the job programs other than this. The nuers I have here, other than for this program, are probably not accurate, but I know they exist, I just don't know what the numbers are. He refers to Day Care Programs, I know that Day Care Programs, Lunch and After School Programs are being financed and supported by the government, and I don't know what numbers are attached to it, but I know they're there. —(Interjection)— Well, I know that they are being financed through government, and I don't know what department it is but I can get the information. What I'll attempt to do is to get a run down on the direct jobs of government, the STEP Program, the ICEP Program, the SNEP Program, there's another \$300,000 in here for Northern Native Programs, that is, Youth Programs, and we'll try and get some nuers for the entire list for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is being a little bit unfair to himself and perhaps my learned friend who didn't want to criticize him, and the Member for Fort Rouge who also was looking for other programs, that perhaps they didn't look hard enough. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, this is \$2 million in public funds payable to the private sector, because the system we are operating under doesn't create jobs. Mr. Chairman, it's not the only \$2 million. If you want other programs, I will identify —(Interjection)— Is it \$3 million? That's right, there's \$3.5 million altogether, \$3.5 million that the people of this province are asking to chip in so that somebody will have a job, and the amount is \$3.5 million. Mr. Chairman, at the moment, I repeat, I'm not going to say that there could be better deployment of the money to the greater productivity of wealth in the Province of Manitoba.

But there are other programs, Mr. Chairman. There is \$2.8 million, or roughly \$3 million, to CCIL, to create jobs which the public of this province are dipping into their pockets — cite —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has got the nerve to say that a guarantee is not moneys advanced by the Province of Manitoba. We may get it back, we may not have to realize on it, but it is exactly the same as a loan, Mr. Chairman. If instead of giving the money directly from the Manitoba Development Corporation to these firms, we had gone to the bank and said, "You give the money and we will guarantee the bank," would the honourable meer say that that's different, that's good, that's elegant, that's nice, that's not costing the people any money? I don't know about the honourable member, but when I go to my bank to borrow money, they ask me a statement of assets and liabilities and guarantees, because a guarantee, and your auditor will tell you the same thing, is the advancement of money. —(Interjection)— Well, yes, I put up my shares and they then take into account my guarantees, and my guarantees are not that many, but I know what they are, and I know that I had to pay to realize one of them — I won't even mention which one it was, some of the honourable members may know, it had to do with a magazine.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that on that basis, on the basis that we guarantee performance of \$28 million, which we did and I've never denied it, Canadian Indemnity guaranteed 21, we guaranteed 7, and we improved Flyer's performance then, not by \$16 million in one year, but by \$54 million in one year, because we never had to pay out a cent on that guarantee. —(Interjection)— It's not a defeat. I recognize that guarantee, and the government included that guarantee in its liabilities. Ask the auditor if that \$7 million was not included. —(Interjection)— It was included then, we had to take it out and put it in. We had to put in that guarantee, and Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member something else, that when Canadian Indemnity was causing us trouble and running around the province doing what no other guarantor would do, and running down the industry, Flyer, I told them we are not going to give them any more money. Yes, I'll have to go to the people of Manitoba and tell them we lost \$7 million, that wouldn't have been bad in view of what we ultimately lost, they would have lost \$21 million.

All of a sudden, Mr. Chairman, Canadian Indemnity started to say nice things about Flyer — they became socialists, Mr. Chairman. They said, "Flyer Industry is a great place, they can produce, they are doing a fine job," but the guarantee is money. So there is \$3 million for CCIL, there is \$3.5 million in this program, there is another \$3 million to \$4 million under the agreement signed between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Federal Government, which is going to give \$4 million a year to private industry in order to create jobs.

So the Minister shouldn't belittle himself. When the Meer for Fort Rouge and the Member for St. Boniface say, "What else?" What we know is that there is three and one-half plus three is six

and one-half plus four is ten and one-half million dollars of the people of this province's money being given to private sector industries to create jobs — \$10.5 million in the first year after this government when they came into power says it's going to get the government out of business. Mr. Chairman, it's getting the government out of business but it's not getting the people's money out of subsidizing business — \$10.5 million the first year, and, Mr. Chairman, we haven't gone half the year yet. —(Interjection)— Oh, we're over six months now, I'm sorry, we've gone over half the year, Mr. Chairman. And there may be much more but there is at least \$10.5 million which the public is spending — and let there be no mistake about it — for the purpose of subsidizing private sector business in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never said that this kind of thing is not necessary. What I have said is that there is no great beauty about giving it to the private sector instead of giving it to the public sector, in the hope that you will produce something. And there has been things produced; there have been many things produced in the Province of Manitoba, some of which are so embarrassing to the Conservative administration that they got rid of them.

But, Mr. Chairman, it's not this private enterprise government that started it, every private enterprise government had to do this kind of thing because their philosophy didn't work, it has never worked. Mr. Chairman, what did we do during the depression when jobs could not be created? When was this province so rich that it could build the Salter Bridge and the Winnipeg Auditorium and the sewage treatment plant in North Winnipeg? When did we have the money that we could put it into the budget to do it? Do you know when? During the depression. We had no money and we were so poor, Mr. Chairman, and there was so little money available that the public had to create wealth and nobody else could do it. The private sector couldn't do it, so the public went and created wealth. It created the overpass which we have never been able to create in the rich days when we had all that money and the private sector is paying taxes. We haven't been able to build a McGregor-Sherbrook overpass, but we were able to build the Salter Bridge when we were so poor that we could afford to do it. We were able to build the treatment plant in North Winnipeg when we were so poor that we were able to do it and we were able to build the Winnipeg Auditorium when we were so poor that we had to create wealth to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister went on television yesterday and he was completely against this type of thing. He said, Mr. Chairman, that you can't spend your way into prosperity. That's nonsense, and we have no intention of spending our way into prosperity. Mr. Chairman, what private enterprise has had to do every time they got into trouble is to spend their way into prosperity and I give my answer to this government. You cannot starve yourself into prosperity, Mr. Chairman. You cannot bring about prosperity by imposing starvation. What the government pretends to do is to say we are not going to do anything, we are not going to engage in public spending and as a result of the public not doing things for the purpose of creating prosperity we are going to get wealthy.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that is more nonsensical an attitude than the suggestion that you cannot spend your way into prosperity. The Minister has proved it and they've proved it very quickly, all of those great protestations, Mr. Chairman, all of those pious statements about the government getting out of business have been defeated and been undone to the extent, at this period of time, Mr. Chairman, of \$10.5 million up until this time, for one year. Mr. Chairman, that's more than we would have been spending under the Development Corporation. The Development Corporation earned \$4.8 million last year. We had some very bad years, yes, most of them, and the greatest percentage of them, attributable to one project which was entered into by the Conservative administration because they felt that you had to finance private enterprise the same way as they're doing with this program in order that the province could become rich, but nothing like what is now being spent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that's not entirely fair. In addition to the Development Corporation we had programs of this kind and I, Mr. Chairman, do not fault them. The reason that I do not fault them is that they are based in no respects on any particular political philosophy. They are based on the fact that the model system which the Conservatives like to believe will create wealth in this province doesn't work, Mr. Chairman. To quote a Thatcherism: "Capitalism is a wonderful system except it doesn't work." That's its only problem, and that you can put it down on paper and show how the invisible hand of the marketplace will create plenty for everybody and will increase the pie and as a result everybody will make more, and you can write a thesis on it and you can write a book on it.

I won't quote *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith because it has no relation to what these people are saying. Adam Smith was at least smart enough to say that where an industry is such that it no longer is subject to normal competition and is administered and has no effective composition it should not be left in the private sector, it should be in the public sector. At least he had the brains to say that and those people who quote Smith should understand that that is what he said. —(Interjection)— Absolutely. Adam Smith would never permit Bell Telephone— I mean,

he would say that that is horrendous. There is no competition; it is one unit, it is providing a utility service; it should be in the public sector. But he would go further, Mr. Chairman. He wouldn't permit Lockheed. Lockheed's major customer, only customer, or major customer in any event, is the public and therefore it is not subject to the normal competitive processes. And if you're going to have your major competitor, your major market, as the public sector, and there is no effective competition, he would not put that industry into the so-called invisible hand of the market.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to come to the defense of the Minister who has been wrongfully attacked by the Member for Fort Rouge and my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, on the basis that there are no other programs. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Fort Rouge, I am now being facetious. —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm now being facetious and I will admit to it. I won't even argue with you if you say it.

A MEMBER: What are you when you're attacking unions?

MR. GREEN: Oh, just the same way, facetious. Yes, that's right.

The Minister is doing much more than is indicated on this page. The Minister is forced to do more. The system which he thinks is going to improve the economy hasn't worked, isn't working, won't work, has never worked, and therefore the public becomes his loadstone. The public will become the saviour. The public will be asked to finance the private sector and that is exactly the way this government is proceeding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to prolong the topic that's being addressed right now too extensively on this philosophical debate, but I must say that I'm always envious of people who can see only black and white because they're thinking pattern becomes extremely uncomplicated. I look at those extreme right-wingers and those extreme left-wingers and I, quite frankly, envy them. I think, boy, it must be nice to go home at night because their life is very uncomplicated. They either like something specifically for one reason or they hate it with the same passion, the other side with the same passion.

And the Member for Inkster can, whether he's doing it by instinct or whether he's doing it by design, I don't know, but I must say that these sort of quaint arguments about Adam Smith, of course, are fine, but just between he and I, things have changed. They're not just quite as left and as right as they were in the days of Adam Smith and I think even people like the Member for St. Boniface might even agree with that from time to time. If you look at his speeches from the days when you and I first entered this House in 1966, and you listen to his speeches now, there is some difference, they are not quite the same speeches. Things change periodically.

Some days I listen to the Member for Inkster and I remember the Member for Inkster trying to convince the former Member for Lakeside, D. L. Campbell, in a debate in this House ten years ago about how these sides of the political argument go around, they form a big circle and then the two points come together. But, Mr. Campbell didn't quite go along with that. I think he had a rebuttal on that and I think you'll probably find in Hansard that (Interjection)— Oh, he agreed. Well, it wasn't his point anyway. So I've listened to many of these thrusts by the Member for Inkster and this is one more of them. I just repeat that it's very nice to be able to think in these nice little containers, right, left. It's great. It doesn't always work out that way though.

The Member for Brandon East gave me a lot of difficulty. I thought I heard him refer to a word called "methodicality." I was going to say that we were going to try that too except we thought it would defy the Human Rights Act so we dropped the idea and then I realized that he was talking that it was net additionality. The Member for St. James went and got the dictionary just to make sure we hadn't missed out on something during our 3Rs days and I must advise the Member for Brandon East that we can't find the work "additionality" in Webster's dictionary, however, I've no doubt it's one of those economist terms that has evolved over a period of time and that net additionality, I'm afraid, is something that is too complicated for you to ever convince the Member for Inkster that Adam Smith would ever buy. But that's where we're at. We're providing net additionality, I guess, to the labour force and it's in the numbers of 4,600 people. It's cost the taxpayer who is recirculating the taxpayers' money, part of it, those people that are getting it, I suppose, and the amount amounts to \$3.1 million on this program, another \$300,000 you'll find on the Northern Program, and it's all there.

MR. GREEN: That's additionality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think I share with the Minister some desire to try and proceed on with the document. There are questions with respect to items 8 on Page 1 and 6 on Page 2, which will have to wait until we can get to them. But I cannot resist making observation on the supreme irony of the Minister of Finance talking about the world being a little more complicated than those few, I think he said three or so on the right and on the left, would make it out. I sort of share that view myself but I wouldn't have thought, by so much that's been said by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance and others, that they admit of the fact that our modern day economy is indeed necessarily and desirably mixed economy, because we have in the item right before us rather an exclusive, or nigh onto being exclusive, preoccupation with generating employment through the use of government — a bad word — the use of government to generate additional employment activity through the private sector. So that's great, in fact last year I have documentation right before me to show that that was in the mix, since it's a mixed economy, but there was also — to relate now to something that's been said by the Member for Fort Rouge — there was also provision with respect to private non-profit organizations under the heading of local community organization job creation. Local community organization oftentimes can be private non-profit, as often as being of a community association nature.

In addition to that, that I'm repeating now so I'll keep it brief, we found it necessary and according to our judgment to provide some appropriations with respect to the public sector job creation. Now the Minister says there is that present in their regular Estimates and I admit there is some of it but there has not been any adjustment made even though the facts now tell us that the level of unemployment among the young people is floating quite high. Whether my honourable friend wants to accept the term "additionality" or "incrementality" — if he can't find additionality in Webster's International I think he'll find incrementality and it's tantamount to the same thing. The point being, Mr. Chairman, that surely a government that recognizes doctrinaire approaches, as the Minister would have us believe, must therefore be non-doctrinaire enough itself to be able to adjust in the face of unemployment levels such as they are today and this summer. Well that's not to be, therefore we don't intend, I should say I don't intend, to speak at any further length on this particular item. I serve notice to the Minister though so that he can have some perhaps somewhat more detailed information with respect to No. 8, on the Energy Council and also the item under Northern Flood Agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of words. I want to remind my honourable colleagues across that the English language is like a river. It flows on and it changes as it proceeds, it changes certainly through time, and if we can do our bit to add to the English language, if this is indeed a new word, well so be it. But I am not so sure that I am that original.

A MEMBER: You were original when you said a couple of words.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think the point has been well made, that the program that is before us for approval is really a reflection of the Jobs in Small Business Program that we established last year. I don't know what farmer the Honourable Minister of Education was talking to, but I can assure him that whoever it was hadn't heard of our Jobs in Small Business, and I would also remind the Minister of Education that the jobs there were permanent-type jobs. As a matter of fact one of the criteria for hiring the person was that you had to create a new permanent job. I am reading from the description of the program, "a new permanent job." And I won't go into all the details. I can simply say however that it was handled very efficiently, very expeditiously, there was little or no red tape. And who knows, maybe it is the same people that are handling it this year and, if it is the same people, they did a very good job last year and hopefully they are doing a very good job this year.

The main point I want to make though, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister of Finance was very defensive about this program. He said, you know it is not the only program that the government is supporting and then he referred to direct government employment programs employing 1,200 people. He talked about STEP employing 800. Incidentally, I might remind him that last year we employed over 3,000 people under STEP, over 3,000 people under STEP.

Okay, the point I want to make though and this is the critical point, is that really the Minister of Finance has stated in so many words that he has accepted, his government has accepted in principle this program, this approach of creating jobs through the government sector, this is what he is saying to us in effect. He has accepted it in principle regardless of all his accusations, regardless of all the speeches made on the hustings, regardless of all the comments made by the Minister of Finance himself that were very critical of past job creation efforts of this government. What we have before us, Mr. Chairman, without question is a pale reflection of what we attempted last year.

Very very pale reflection indeed, a very watered-down version, a watered-down version of what we were attempting to do last year.

But the important point is that the government of today has really accepted the fact that, given the unemployment situation, government must do something, and I say again they are not doing enough. But the fact is, in spite of their protestations, they have accepted in principle that government must become involved; that government must intervene in the private sector; that government must intervene to create jobs. And let that be on the record and let there be no mistake about it that the Conservative Government of today has accepted that principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1—pass.

Resolution 1, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$2 million for Education, Private Sector Youth Employment Program: \$2 million—pass.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like to address with your indulgence, Sir, the two very specific questions to the Minister, even though it is in advance, so that he can have some forenotice of it. The one is to ask very specifically whether the Manitoba Energy Council Item here relates to the Engineering Study Costs of the Western Inter-Provincial Grid, and also whether this has to do with the possible identification of the actual cost of remedying the very technical engineering problem of the Saskatchewan-Alberta systems being out of phase one to the other. Can the Minister indicate when he deals with this, whether that is a multi-million or a multi-tens.-of-million dollar problem to overcome?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Executive Council — Electoral Division Boundaries Commission, \$30,000—pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.tf\$

MR. EVANS: Well, I wonder if the Minister of Finance, or whoever, could indicate to the House when will the Commission be activated and in what respect are these moneys to be spent? Are they going to be touring the province with their recommendations and receiving briefs and so on? Could the Minister provide us with some information as to how the Commission will function, very briefly how the Commission will function and what is the timetable? When does the government expect to receive a report from the Commission recommending certain boundary changes, presumably in the light of population changes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question, of course, it is statutory, every ten years and the Commission has already had two meetings of the Committee itself, of three. The Public Hearings portion of it comes after the boundaries are recommended and that is the stage at which the Public Hearings are held. But they have had two meetings already and are proceeding with their work.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabour the question and I appreciate the information. Could the Minister advise us, given that information, what the timetabling is? He may not have heard that part of my question. In other words, when would the Commission expect to initiate public hearings, I presume for the purpose of getting views on proposed boundary changes that might be recommended by the Commission, or will be recommended by the Commission? When I said might be, I assumed in some areas there may not be any population change, but where there is population change dictating a change or an adjustment of the boundary, I would presume that the Commission would want to receive some public input. So my question is: When, approximately when, might this take place?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the Chief Electoral Officer that the meetings' public meetings, are likely to be about October, which coincides with the timing, roughly, of the former meetings or the last ten-year ago setting of the boundaries, that sort of timetable roughly brought the hearings to the October date and the Chief Electoral Officer feels that it will be about the same this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: —pass.

Resolution No. 1, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$30,000 for Executive Council, Electoral Division Boundaries Commission — \$30,000— pass.

Education, Private Sector Youth Employment Program, — \$1,100,000—pass.

Resolution 2, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding

for Education, Private Sector Youth Employment Program — \$1,100,000—pass.
Finance, 1(e) Special Studies, \$300,000 — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Anything under the general title of Special Studies simply demands elaboration.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, it is entirely for the Tritschler Inquiry Commission and its work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: —pass.

Resolution 3, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I realize that the Minister may not be able to be definitive, but is he assuming that this \$300,000 will be sufficient or is he assuming that this is merely an installment along the way, requiring additional funding at some point in the course of the next six to twelve months.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the printed Estimates contained an amount of \$150,000 and the additional \$300,000 in Supplementary would bring the total to \$450,000, which is anticipated to be about the total cost for the Commission's work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, that requires, I think, some elaboration. Could the Minister indicate to us what necessitates the additional \$300,000 expenditure? Has the Tritschler Inquiry commissioned specific engineering studies or financial statements, has it added staff? Perhaps he could be more specific as to exactly what the additional expenditure will be for, and could he indicate then how that might affect the timing of the report of the Tritschler Commission. In previous statements, I think the Minister indicated it would be reporting this fall. Does the additional money indicate that this announcement or report of the inquiry will now be extended for a further period of time, and if so, can he estimate how long?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the only information I can relay on the timing is the information that was put out by the Commission, which is probably now a month ago, that they intended to have public hearings by late summer and that it looked as though they would probably finish their work by the end of this calendar year. That is as close information as I can give you and it is not recent, although the Estimates here are recent and they would indicate that there has been no change over that period of time. The \$150,000 was originally to cover mostly the work of the Commission itself. The \$300,000 is mostly for consultant's fees, engineering and economic studies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize there is no point pursuing this at length just yet, because when it comes to Royal Commissions or commissions of investigation, whether it be here or anywhere else in Canada, experience has shown in the other province that has had some recent experience with commissions of inquiry into Hydro, namely, Ontario and Ontario Hydro, that neither of the two major Royal Commissions or commissions of inquiry in the past five years that have been held in that province, be it the Border Commission or the other one, has been able to conduct its work at anything less than \$1 million for Commission of Inquiry each time. Now are we to conclude that because Manitoba Hydro is a smaller system that it would cost proportionately less to carry out a fully sophisticated inquiry. I believe that economy of scale does not apply to Royal Commissions, and that if there is a utility that is under investigation or inquiry, that it will not make that much difference costwise if it is to be equally sophisticated, whether the utility has generating capacity in the order of 3,000 megawatts or in the order of 20,000 megawatts.

Since the Commission of Inquiry will have to delve into the structure, the decision-making process, the basis of engineering data and accumulation of engineering studies that went into this decision and that, that has nothing to do with scale. Therefore, I venture to say at this stage that if this is to be a sophisticated study worthy of the name Royal Commission or formal Commission, that we are probably looking at a \$1 million price tag.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, these are the requirements indicated to me by the Commission's office

and to the best of my knowledge they tended to be adequate to meet their total needs. If there is some further additions to be made, I will undoubtedly be notified of it but I've no information that would indicate that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the possibility of unseemly costs arising as a result of this particular Commission, particularly after hearing the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with respect to the experience of other Royal Commissions in other provinces. I am wondering, in view of the fact that there is in these circumstances a tendency for the work to make itself, I'm wondering whether or not we could be apprised at this particular time by the Minister responsible of the names of the individuals who have been appointed to act as agents or consultants to the Inquiry, what sort of fee and rate structures they would be charging, whether or not there have been any contracts actually executed or that will be executed as between the government or the Commission and these consulting firms or people. I would be interested in having that information tabled in order that we would know what we are facing, what the future might bring. Could the Minister advise the members of the committee as to how this matter will proceed? I understand that the \$300,000 is a comprehensive figure but given that we started off with a somewhat lesser sum and now by increment we're advancing ever steadily upward and onward, close to possibly even half a million dollars invested to date. It wouldn't seem inappropriate in these times of concern about fiscal restraint for this committee to delve further into this subject matter in order to assure ourselves that all the expenditures are in fact of a necessary nature. I'm sure that the constraints that we might wish to impose on public spending would be somewhat different than those that might be imposed by a person who hasn't had that sort of experience with the public purse.

So given the fact that it is we and we alone, who have the mandate to spend the public's money, I would ask the Minister whether he would be willing to indicate to us what restrictions he is willing, if any, to impose on the Tritschler Inquiry with respect to expenditure of public funds and whether or not he is willing to impose any guidelines, any guidelines that might express the fiscal latitude which is considered proper for the Commission to work within.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is of course some difference when dealing with a Commission of Inquiry than dealing with a normal government operation in that it does tend to operate at arms-length and if the government, the Minister, wants to get into the specifics of their *modus operandi* then you are of course open to the suspicion that you are trying to steer their direction in terms of the people they get and the quality of the people they hire. The only guideline that I can suggest to you that might be useful is that the Commissioner himself is receiving nothing in the way of income. He's a retired judge. He asks and demands that he receive nothing except his travelling expenses. One of the principal people working for him has been seconded from one of the government departments and is acting as the secretary of the operation from the Water Resources Branch and there has been counsel hired and there have been consultants hired. I don't know the names of the consultants that are being used in total. I know that the one group on engineering is an Ottawa firm by the name of Walker. I don't know the names of any of the other parties that are involved in the consulting operation.

A MEMBER: Cass-Beggs.

MR. CRAIK: No. So, Mr. Chairman, that's all the information I can impart. I deliberately remain at arms-length from the operation of the Commission of Inquiry and I can assure the Member for Wellington that I suspect that this Commission is probably operating more frugally than most just by the determination of the Commissioner himself to operate his own shop as frugally as possible. I suspect that the amount contained here is adequate to do the job he intends to do.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the Minister, I think, fail to illuminate the situation. I certainly respect the need and the requirement that the Minister remain at arms-length with the Commission. I think that's a fundamental principle which must be abided by in these circumstances in such a situation. But I am concerned that he is unwilling to impose any limitation at all, for instance, on the hiring of consultants. I, for one, would have thought that it wouldn't have been unreasonable given the severe depression in the field of engineering, in the engineering profession in this province. It might not have been unreasonable to impose a restriction on the Commission that would have required them to seek out and attempt to employ a local engineering consulting firm as opposed

to an Ottawa firm. I'm sure that the firm that has been retained is one that has imminent qualification but I would question whether or not it wouldn't have been possible or wasn't possible to retain a firm with similar qualifications in the Manitoba region. It seems to me that we should be doing everything possible to support our local professional people in these very difficult times. I know for a fact, for instance, that the Commission has, when seeking legal counsel, has retained members of, well at least one Winnipeg firm, I'm not certain about another, but they have retained members of one Winnipeg firm and obviously they are satisfied, the Commissioner is satisfied that these individuals will be able to serve the Commission as competently as, for instance, a firm of outside solicitors from, for instance, Ottawa.

So I would wonder why the Commission saw the need to retain the employment of an extraprovincial engineering firm and I would ask the Minister whether he wouldn't review this matter with the Commission in order to consider the possibility of imposing such a requirement that would in effect necessitate the employment wherever possible of local professional and other support people.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I can't tell the Member that the Commissioner doesn't have local consultants involved because I just don't know. He asked me for names; I only recognized one name as it went by. It happened to be a firm from Ottawa as I mentioned. But as far as admonishing him to hire local consultants, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I'd be tempted to touch that with a barge pole. I don't see how you can retain arms-length from this and advise the Commissioner to follow that pattern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass. Resolution 3: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$300,000 for Finance, General Administration, (e) Special Studies—\$300,000—pass.

Treasury Division, (d) Refunds — \$1,300,000—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Could the Minister throw some light on this amount because there was \$450,000 voted in the Main Estimates. This is in addition to the \$450,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to answer that one because that's one of those cases where we're going to vote money this year to pay for last year's problems. This is principally the Air Canada court case we are going to have to refund some further moneys and the totals are principally for that purpose, the refund of revenues that were collected previously and we have to make provision for repayment unless the Supreme Court reverses the decision.

MR. MILLER: I gather from the last few words the Minister mentions that this is under appeal, the government is appealing this. Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) Refunds—pass. Resolution 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1,300,000 for Finance, Treasury Division, (d) Refunds — \$1,300,000—pass.

Manitoba Energy Council — (b) Other Expenditures— — \$120,000—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, asked about this one and of the \$120,000, \$100,000 is for the Western Power Grid Study and \$20,000 is for the preparation of the Polar Gas work for the gas hearings.

With regard to the Western Power Grid Study, its operational study group is mostly formed at this point and is operational. There will be an announcement coming out from the four Ministers involved, including myself, I think very shortly, giving the details on it and it is expected that the study will be completed by December of 1978.

With regard to the technical problem, DC versus AC at the Saskatchewan-Alberta boundary, this of course is one of the things that is being looked at. DC may provide the opportunity to overcome the traditional barrier at the Saskatchewan-Alberta boundary because of the different synchronization of the AC circuit, so that's part and parcel of the study to see what technical problems would have to be overcome in order to get into the Alberta market with Manitoba power eventually and probably simultaneously be able to draw into Manitoba power at times of need from that part of the world as well.

So that's the substance of it. The \$100,000 is the obligation of the Manitoba Government in

Thursday, July 13, 1978

the study and Alberta is paying \$100,000 and it's a total study, the indicated budget is \$287,000.00. There is a provision of \$300,000 in total. British Columbia and Saskatchewan are splitting the remaining \$100,000.00. Alberta and Manitoba initiated the study to begin with. It then moved on to the other provinces and B.C. came in latterly as the result of the discussions at the Yorkton conference of the First Ministers. That's how the study operates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be critical of this particular endeavour nor of the appropriation requested. I believe that it can be justified simply on the basis that it's just as well that the full policy implications of what's involved be directly faced up to by the two or three governments and provinces involved.

However, there is one thing here that is a bit confusing to say the least, and that is that it is not as though the practical feasibility of an interprovincial prairie province electrical grid has not been looked at time and again over the years but, until two things change, the matter remained and remains academic. The one change that has to come about — studies will not alter it very much — is a policy decision on the part of those of that province or provinces that are fossil fuel rich, particularly not only oil and natural gas but also coal. As long as the Government of Alberta and Saskatchewan both follow an energy policy of exploiting coal deposits for the generation of electricity as being preferable, in their policy view, to inter-provincial grid that would pull electrical energy longer distances from a renewable source using fossil fuels only for spinning reserve and in the drier part of the cycle. Unless they make such a conscious policy decision, this study will be merely repeating previous analyses made by the respective utilities. One need not think for a moment that there hasn't been analysis given to this in the past.

The second point that has to be made is that the study will also serve the useful purpose of perhaps identifying more clearly for public consumption that there is a technical problem which will cost in the order of tens of millions to overcome because of the synchronization problem at the Alberta-Saskatchewan border. It can be solved. Obviously, there are technical alternatives, but either of them do involve expenditures of substantial amounts. Whether the amounts involved in overcoming the technical problem can be justified in turn comes back, it becomes rather circular, comes back to the problem of whether or not the other provincial governments are willing to make a substantial enough change in policy to be willing to move away, at least by significant degree, from reliance on coal generation. And if they are, then it will justify the spending of tens of millions on dealing with the problem of synchronization on the border between those two utilities, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I suppose one should not call this a redundancy, this particular study, but it really will accomplish nothing in the absence of policy decisions within those two provincial governments, particularly Alberta, given that its system-generating capacity is quite large and is growing at a faster rate. The various utilities operating in Alberta are growing at a faster rate than in either of the other two Prairie Provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, just two points. First of all, if we waited on the utilities to suggest that there were no technical problems and that the systems could be rationalized and integrated, it would never happen. If it is going to happen at all it has to happen this way. It is a four-government undertaking. There is liaison with the utilities. There is more than one utility in the Province of Alberta. There are special committees working in Alberta with the different utilities there to bring them together within the province, and if its study proves that it is technically and economically viable to do this, of course, the arrangement amongst the utilities has to follow. But the pattern we are following is the logical course, to see first of all whether it is technically economically feasible, if it is we move on to the next step. We should know that by the end of 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with the first part of the Minister's comments. Clearly if it is left up to the utilities themselves it is likely that it will never happen, the Minister said. Certainly I will agree that it is likely that it wouldn't happen for a long long time. But, Sir, as of, I believe it is July or August of 1976, the government of Alberta undertook to hold discussions and liaise with the electrical utilities in Alberta to explore the costs and the feasibility of putting the system, Saskatchewan-Alberta interconnection, into phase, or into synchronization, so that the larger question of regional western prairie grid could become a reality. So I believe that on close analysis anyone who cares to pursue this subject will find that in Alberta this has been under some analysis, since

that is where the technical problem lies, and the policy issue I might add. They have undertaken as of two years ago, it will be two years this month, to begin to look at the question.

But the point I make and I have no hesitation in repeating it is that I can just imagine this study dealing with some pretty subjective value judgments. If it is to be put in the context of hard cold economic feasibility, then that is all very well' but in order to do that it has to be possible to attribute a value to coal. And I am saying in advance that if the value that is attributed to coal is current prices, then there is no prospect of being able to justify a western inter-provincial grid of any significant size as a replacement for building power plants right on top of the coal beds, whether it be at Estevan or whether it be anywhere in central Alberta, anywhere near the Alberta coal fields.

So there is no avoiding policy judgments here and the economic feasibility has to wait on those policy judgments. The study is not going to solve that for them.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister. I have a few comments to make, but first I would like to ask the Honourable Minister with regard to the \$20,000 of expenditure for Polar Gas Studies, I believe he said. I am not sure whether it is studies with regard to intervention before the National Energy Board or exactly what. If that is the case, could the Honourable Minister tell us who is being retained and why is it necessary to go beyond his own staff to obtain research assistance? Why cannot it be done in-House? Now it may be a very technical engineering study, I don't know, but I would like to obtain more information on this.

MR. CRAIK: The \$20,000, Mr. Chairman, is legal counsel costs and the person that has been retained is Bill Norrie, who is on contract with the government for the preparation of this. We had a press announcement or it was announced some months ago and it was done after the original Estimates were brought into the House and there wasn't provision for the \$20,000 for that purpose. The rest of the group is entirely government personnel and there are four or five of a committee from the involved departments — Environment, Northern Affairs, Renewable Resources, Energy and one other, Education. I have missed one, but there are a total of five staff people on an ad hoc basis that have been assigned to it to now bring the available information into the intervention preparation.

MR. EVANS: Well, could the Minister advise when the interventions will take place? When will the hearings take place, presumably in Ottawa, but regardless, and does he expect them to go on for a period of time?

MR. CRAIK: The general gas hearings are this fall in roughly October by the National Energy Board. It looks like the Polar Gas hearings would be early 1979. In the meantime if that gas deposit in Alberta proves to be realistic we can cancel everything.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would say that the Honourable Minister hit the nail on the head with his last comment, and that is the fluidity of the situation, the find or presumed find of considerable new resources of natural gas, reserves of natural gas in Alberta. It really brings into question the whole effort with respect to Polar Gas Hearings and this \$20,000 expenditure. Indeed there are many in the industry who are very sceptical about the possibility of Polar Gas becoming a reality in the foreseeable future regardless, because of technical difficulties in bringing the gas through large channels of water in the high Arctic, off of the various Arctic islands to the mainland, and this is a very great technological challenge and I am not sure that the company has really overcome these technical barriers.

So I really question the wisdom of spending this money at this time. One would like to see the activity occur. One would like to see the Polar Gas route through the spine of Manitoba, the Interlake Region of Manitoba. One would like to see the economic activity, the spin-off and so on, but I really believe that the possibility of the Polar Gas project becoming a reality in this century is becoming more and more remote. I think it is more of a project for the 21st Century not the 20th Century.

With regard to the \$100,000 being spent on a western grid study, the Leader of the Opposition indicated some very good points. I think perhaps you are batting your head against a brick wall. It is rather idealistic. You have looked at it before or it's been looked at before and I really ask myself, and I ask the government, really whether this expenditure is necessary, really will anything come of it? And if you want to be careful with your money, if you want to be prudent, I would say prudence would dictate that you don't spend the money, you don't spend this \$120,000 that has been asked for under this appropriation. If you want to

Thursday, July 13, 1978

be careful, if you want to save the taxpayers' money, I say here is the place, don't spend this \$120,000, because I don't think we are going to get anything for it. I wish we would, but I think the odds are, given the information that we have, the knowledge that we have, that we are going to get very little, if anything, I suspect nothing for this money. I think it is a sheer waste of money.

On the other hand, I do regret the Minister's rather critical attitude with respect to previous solar energy projects, particularly in view that the Federal Government has many millions of dollars, apparently, to invest in this area. And I think that it is incumbent upon the Minister. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30, 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a change on Statutory Law and Regulations Committee. The Honourable Member for Wellington to replace the Member for Burrows.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have heard the changes in the Committee, is it agreed?
(Agreed)

A MEMBER: Can you give us some indication?

MR. JORGENSON: As Mr. Speaker, has indicated the intention of the House, is to meet tomorrow morning. Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will be meeting tonight. Tomorrow morning it will be in the House. It will depend on the kind of progress that is made. I would like to be able to tell my honourable friends I suspect it will be in the House in the afternoon and in Committees in the evening, but it will depend on the kind of progress made in either place.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.
(Friday)