

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's Gallery where we have 60 students from Northern Collegiate Band from Sarnia, Ontario. These students are under the direction of Mr. Scott Milligan and Miss E. Bull. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS and TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1978 Annual Report of the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have some reports to distribute on behalf of the Minister of Labour.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the latest unemployment totals issued this morning, showing that Manitoba's unemployment rate continues to edge upward, while the rate for Canada as a whole is edging downward, is the First Minister at this time prepared to review his present economic policies, sterile in nature, which have provided the area for this type of trend and pattern to take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, I hope, will now have the advantage of reading the figures that have just been passed out by the Acting Minister of Labour, with respect to the Stats Can Report that issued this morning. These figures show of course that the unemployment figures for Manitoba which last month stood at 6.9 percent, this month are at 7.0 percent, which is a full point below what they were last year at this time when they were 8.0 percent, a full 1 percent lower than they were a year ago, and that on a seasonally-adjusted basis, they are 5.6 this month, February of 1979, as opposed to 6.6 one year ago, a full point better than they were a year ago.

My honourable friend also, Mr. Speaker, apparently has that kind of a curiously selective memory when it comes to unemployment statistics. For the past three months, or is it the past four months, the statistics in Manitoba have been going downward, not upward, and this month shows the first slight increase that we have had. Now, we have said, I think quite rationally, that you can't judge on a month-to-month basis but that you must look at the trends over a quarter or over a half. We think that on the basis of the last quarter, indeed the last half, the statistics for Manitoba are indeed more encouraging than they were a year ago. So I say to my honourable friend that in his zeal to spread doom and gloom and false fear among the people of Manitoba and in his reference

to the allegedly sterile programs of this government, which are contributing to the phony figures that he is trying to place upon the people of Manitoba, I merely say to my honourable friend that he had better learn to stick to the facts, because we have the facts; we will give the facts, as Stats Canada does, to the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, also to the First Minister, when we talk about trends, is the First Minister prepared to examine the trend during the past year in which the out-migration of jobs from this province has increased by between 4,000 and 5,000 in the space of one year?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are quite concerned to examine those trends and if my honourable friend will turn over to Page 2 of the document that has just been placed on his desk — and may I say that we consider it advisable to circulate these documents so that my honourable friends can't selectively pick out phony statistics and try to fool the people of Manitoba — he will see that Stats Canada indicate — this is actual data with seasonally-adjusted data in the brackets — that the labour force in Manitoba, February of 1979, is 470,000 as opposed to 457,000 a year ago in February of 1978; that the employed numbers in 1979 in February were 437,000 as opposed to 421,000 a year ago.

Now, if my honourable friend wants to regurgitate the equally phony statistics that were being used by his colleague from Brandon East on in and out-migration, we'll deal with those too. If he would like to have another go at that, we'll deal with those too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to hear that all of a sudden the Premier of this province has some faith in Statistics Canada again, which he was ready to cast aside. Only a month ago, he was prepared to cast aside Statistics Canada figures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if it is not true, in this last year, that the number of people leaving Manitoba has increased to an all-time high; the number of people leaving has increased and the number of people coming into Manitoba is even less than before?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is trying to revive a fruitless debate that he got himself into the other day in which he was whipped by the facts. The very facts are that if you subtract in-migration from out-migration, you will find that the figure for the past year in Manitoba was higher than it has been, but if you look at those figures in other than a socialistic, selective way, which the only way my honourable friends can look at them, you will find that eight out of ten provinces in Canada were experiencing the same phenomenon with respect to lower in-migration. And if you have lower in-migration and a relatively constant out-migration, you are going to have a greater difference between the two. That is something that I would imagine even a Grade 2 student could understand, but my honourable friend opposite obviously hasn't found that comprehensible as yet.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable First Minister if he has not observed that there has been a fantastic increase in the number of people going out of the province, which he wants to continually forget? It's not a matter of using socialist, capitalist or any other kind of arithmetic; it is a matter of looking at the numbers. And the numbers are undisputable. I would like the Honourable Premier to refute the fact that there has been an increase in outward migration from this province as well as fewer people coming into the province, and is it not true that Manitoba is the only other province along with the Province of Quebec that is losing this number of people?

My question is, Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that it is Manitoba that shares the dubious distinction with the Province of Quebec in losing the fantastic numbers of people, percentage-wise, that we have been losing the past year?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it is quite true, my honourable friend now doesn't wish to talk about unemployment, he wants to regurgitate some other phony statistics he was throwing around the House a week ago.

I regret that I don't have on my desk the statement of Stats Canada figures on migration. I'll

get them for the edification of my honourable friend and for all Members of the House, so that he can't continue to try to buffalo the people of Manitoba with his phony statistics.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the official statistics that the Honourable Premier. . . Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the Premier's statement of the true figures, presumably. The so-called good figures from Stats Canada are the same source that the phony figures are that the Honourable First Minister refers to.

My question is, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable First Minister not concerned that the unemployment rate in Manitoba is now becoming precariously close to that in Ontario, instead of being close to Alberta and Saskatchewan, and instead of sometimes being the lowest, or the second lowest in this country, as it used to be a few years ago, sometimes the lowest, sometimes the second? Now we are always the third and getting pretty close to Ontario. Is the First Minister not concerned about this trend of increasing structural unemployment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that he is in danger of being repetitive at times. Orders of the Day.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we'd like an answer from the First Minister of this province as to whether or not he agrees that the unemployment rate in Manitoba is now becoming closer to the Ontario situation than to our cousin provinces, Saskatchewan or Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions of agreement are hardly proper questions for the Question Period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, is the First Minister now indicating to the House that his government's policy is basically to export jobs, export unemployment from this province to other provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite, as we all know, are not very good at figures, particularly figures having to do with the finances of the province, because we know the unholy state in which everyone on that side of the House left this province. So, recognizing their inability to deal with figures, I merely repeat for my honourable friends' benefit that this month, February of 1979, there are 13,000 more in the labour force than there were a year ago this month. This month, February 1979, there are 437,000 people employed, as opposed to 421,000 people. That, to me, is an increase of 16,000 people. If that is exporting jobs, then I think I'd better go to a new school of mathematics or perhaps join the one that my honourable friend joined in his early years; I think the school master's name was Marx.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm that, using his figures that he has just presented to both sides of the House, that the actual number of employed persons in Manitoba stood still from January of this year to February of this year, whereas the actual number of unemployed increased by 1,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Stats Can figures are presented to the whole House and to the members of the press so that my honourable friends can manipulate, selectively choose or do whatever they want, but they can't. . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I hear from the opposite side of the House utterances that I thought civilized man had given up 50,000 years ago, but if my honourable friends wish to select. . . —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends can worry and oil their way around the statistics all they want; the facts that we have mentioned this afternoon stand out as being the facts of the case. The unemployment rate in Manitoba today, in February of 1979, according to Stats Can is one percent lower than it was a year ago.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, as their usual tactic is, the First Minister is looking far back into the past once again. I would like to talk about the changes from January of 1979 to February

of 1979, the most recent changes, and according to the statistics that were presented to us by the government side, can the First Minister confirm that while the labour force increased by 1,000 the number of employed stayed the same and the number of unemployed increased by 1,000, thereby causing statistically this phenomena to occur that for every person that entered the labour force there was no job available for them — every single person? Can the Minister confirm that change that occurred for the most recent months, January to February?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to my honourable friend echoing what one of my colleagues has said that we have a phenomenon in Canada called winter. My honourable friend has not been subjected to too many of them, I'm told. But during the winter, the number of jobs tends to decrease and actually these statistics, based as they are upon the facts that Stats Canada give them to us indicate that the record for the past year has not been bad at all. Now let me say this. I am the first to say, and this government is the first to say, that we're still not happy with an unemployment rate as set forward in these statistics. We would like to see, as a province and as a country doing much better and I think as the country begins to adopt policies of fiscal responsibility, we will do much better. But I say to my honourable friend that, at present time, the trends are in the right direction. The trends are for a decrease; they're in the right direction. Let's only hope, without getting into partisan argument, that they continue in this direction.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to all honourable members that if we try and avoid argumentative-type questions, the whole House might benefit. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will avoid argumentative-type questions as long as I am not presented with argumentative-type answers which I think we've seen a classic example of. The First Minister in his attempt to lecture this side has talked about a phenomena called winter which is taken. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Has the Honourable Member for Churchill got a question?

MR. COWAN: Can the First Minister confirm that on a seasonally adjusted basis which takes into account the phenomena called winter in the country of Canada, can he confirm that the employed labour force for the Province of Manitoba, went down by 1,000 people on a seasonally adjusted basis which takes care of the phenomena that he was talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member that that is already a question he has already asked. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister concerning the diagnosis of trends which I think he should treat with some seriousness. By his own figures, could he indicate if the government has any plans in mind to deal with the fact that, according to these figures, the unemployment rate for young people between the ages of 15 and 24 has in fact increased a full percentage point over last month. Do we have any plans to deal with the problem where the unemployment problem for young people is particularly severe according to these figures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend is aware that in the Throne Speech, it was announced that there would be a repetition of the very successful Youth Employment Program which was carried out by this government last year. We hope that, along with the other trends that are developing in the economy, some of which are indicated in the statistics, will be helpful with respect to that particular group which is not a unique group for Manitoba. It is the group in Canada who are finding it most difficult to find employment. So we certainly agree that extra attention must be paid, and will be paid, as was enunciated in the Throne Speech.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for that answer. The question I would have to ask him is in relation to that special program. Is there any intention to expand the job creation program, not simply to work with business agencies, but to provide the same option of credit for different kinds of community organizations that also need help during the summer time and would also provide employment for young people working in those fields.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the main emphasis on the program that has been mentioned in the Throne Speech will be with the private sector where the real and the meaningful jobs are as it was last year. That does not mean however, Sir, that there will not be other positions in other government programs operating on a continuing basis that will be of the nature as my honourable friend describes.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In light of these figures, and I think of the concern that's being expressed, could the Minister detail more specifically what he means by other government programs? Does he intend to provide for a special Youth Employment Program in the Provincial Government Agencies and Departments and to increase the number of job openings available to young people both for a summertime and seasonal basis and also for a longer term commitment?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, those are specifics that will be dealt with, I'm sure, when Estimates of the appropriate departments are before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: On a Point of Order I would like your advice as to whether the last question by the Member for Churchill was ruled out of order by you or was it not answered simply because the First Minister chose not to answer? Did you rule that last question out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I had suggested to the honourable member that his question was repetitive.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like you to review Hansard and to ascertain whether or not that question is actually repetitive or not, and if you would do that, Mr. Speaker, we'd appreciate receiving your advice tomorrow as to whether in fact the question was repetitive.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd be very pleased to review the Question Period tomorrow. The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, if I might answer a few questions that I took as notice. The Member for The Pas asked if I would refer to a dispute between the LGD of Consol at The Pas and the owner of the Valley View Trailer Court, the position of the tenants and who they should pay their rent to. I'm advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Local Government District of Consol on the advice of their Municipal Solicitor is collecting the rent from the tenants of the Valley View Trailer Court in accordance with Section 783 of The Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker, in response to a question I took as notice from the Member for Winnipeg Centre with regard to a suggestion as to the number of garnishing orders which have been issued last year over the year previously, I want to indicate that in the Court of Queen's Bench in 1976 there were 1,343 garnishing orders issued; in 1977, 772 and this was further reduced in 1978 to 699. In the County Court and Small Claims Court in 1976, 2,496 garnishing orders; in 1977, 2,450; and that increased in 1978 to 3,649. But I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 1977 there were 6,431 Statements of Claim in those Courts and this was reduced in 1978 to 3,649 and I would suspect that the increase in the number of orders issued a last year in those Courts was as a result of the large increase in the number of Claims in 1977.

In response to a question, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for Fort Rouge who suggested that the concourse under Portage and Main only has one entrance for those who are physically handicapped and disadvantaged, and whether or not there could be an investigation or whether or not there was a contravention of the Human Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the city architect who designed the plans for the concourse had numerous meetings with the Canadian Paraplegic Association in preparing the plans and the plans were, according to my information, agreed to by the Canadian Paraplegic Association to provide for access by handicapped persons at the northeast corner, at the southwest corner, when the construction of the Bank of Nova Scotia takes place, and that there would be provision at the northwest corner in the redevelopment of that property, which is expected to take place fairly shortly, and there were accommodations in the concourse with the provision of ramps, and that these matters were agreed to by the Canadian Paraplegic Association.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Human Rights Commission are prepared to, if a complaint is lodged

with respect to this matter, they are prepared to accept it as a jurisdictional matter and investigate it in the usual way.

With respect to one further question from the Member for Fort Rouge, Mr. Speaker, referring to complaints and objections from females on the grounds that they have been fired because they refused to exchange certain favours with their employers. This issue has been before the Human Rights Commission for a number of months, Mr. Speaker, and the Commission will be dealing with this matter at their meeting later in the month and will be making a decision as to whether or not they will be accepting and dealing with complaints on this matter. They have been canvassing other Human Rights Commissions in the various approaches that have been taking place with respect to this issue and will be dealing with it at the end of this month, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can undertake to advise the Member for Fort Rouge of the decision that is taken by the Human Rights Commission later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is the Minister monitoring or studying his department's revolving door policy of temporary absences whereby some prisoners are applying for a release at Headingley almost as soon as the doors are shut behind them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): The answer is "yes", Mr. Speaker. I would also remind my honourable friend that we recently reorganized the corrections component in this province.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Attorney-General whether he could comment on Judge Garson's remark that the temporary absence program is designed to clear out inmates, may be designed, to clear out inmates to make room for new ones, and if I can quote what he said in a letter, that, "it is reprehensible and publicly fraudulent to release prisoners under the guise of rehabilitation". I ask the Minister whether it is because of a shortage of correctional space in Manitoba that this type of policy is being implemented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of concern not only for me but for the Minister of Health, and our respective departments and ourselves are in the process of reviewing this very serious matter.

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

MR. DOERN: I would also ask the Attorney-General whether he could comment on provincial Judge Minuk's remark that he may hand out stiffer sentences simply because the TAP Program is shortening them so much.

MR. MERCIER: I would welcome that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: I would like to get just a clarification from the First Minister. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether or not he is concerned that Manitoba's unemployment rate is increasing at the same time the national average is decreasing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had indicated to the House not only on this occasion but on all other occasions when I have had the opportunity to speak about unemployment, I don't think that any government, of whatever political stripe, is happy with the amount of unemployment that Canada and this province has at the present time. What is encouraging, however, notwithstanding my honourable friend's attempts to paint the picture otherwise, is that the trend is downward. So I say to my honourable friend that we are concerned about the figures. However, I did not hear any comments of approbation or non-concern from my honourable friends when, for the past three or was it four months, the figures in Manitoba were consistently down. I only wish my honourable

friends could be consistent in their selective concern.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister could give me a selective, dogmatic, oily and insulting answer to the following question: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is concerned that seven provinces have their unemployment rate going down and Manitoba is one of those that has their unemployment rate going up, and whether the Minister intends — whether the First Minister and this government intends — to reinstitute some of the employment and economic development programs that they have eliminated in northern Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: I have to tell the honourable member that his question is out of order. Would the Honourable Member for The Pas care to rephrase it?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of which part is out of order, so it's very difficult to rephrase it.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for The Pas care to rephrase his question?

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, since I'm not aware of which part is out of order, I'll have to repeat the whole question. I wonder if the First Minister is concerned about the fact that Manitoba is one of the few provinces whose unemployment rate is increasing, and whether his expressed concern will cause him and his government to re-establish the northern employment programs and the northern economic development programs that have been systematically eliminated by this government with their lack of concern for the people in northern Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can say that we are concerned about employment in all parts of Manitoba, including the north. That was a concern that was not manifested by my honourable friends opposite because, of course, they would have felt . . . According to their former leader, they felt embarrassed if they had any members sitting from south of the Assiniboine River. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that is concerned about unemployment in every part of Manitoba. On the second branch of my honourable friend's question, if he is asking would we reinstate, as a government, if we would reinstate some of the disastrous policies over which he and his colleagues presided in northern Manitoba, which were make-work, patchwork and losers, the answer to that question is "no".

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed, may I point out to all members that it is the intention in the Question Period to allow members an opportunity to ask for information and I hope that in giving that information those members of the Bench that are providing the information would stick to the question that has been asked of them, without extending it into a long detailed answer. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, now that you have instructed the First Minister how to behave appropriately in this House, I would like to place another question to him and see if he understands your direction, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Does this First Minister and this government intend to reinstate a program of economic development in the north called the "Special Northern Employment Program"; will they be reinstating that program in light of the increasing unemployment in this province under the leadership of this government?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the Minister of Northern Affairs is restored to full health and his Estimates are before the House, he will be able to discuss in minute detail that and any other program my honourable friend wishes to discuss out of northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, in view of the fact that traditionally unemployment figures from the labour force survey have been released by way of a statement by the appropriate Minister to the House, a formal statement, in view of the fact that I believe this to be the first occasion that that has not been the case. Can the First Minister indicate whether or not we are now witnessing a departure from past practice, of a formal statement being issued to the House as to the most recent statistics of unemployment? Is it because of embarrassment on the part of this government that they haven't proceeded in the traditional manner, or is it that we are now marking a new road insofar as dealing with the monthly unemployment figures issued from Ottawa?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I can't make my honourable friend feel better in his obvious real or imagined agony about the form in which these statistics reached him this afternoon. The fact of life, as he must be aware, is that the Minister of Labour is presently in hospital, or I hope just about to be released from hospital. —(Interjections)— If my honourable friends don't wish an answer to the question, that is fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister taken any action on the Milk Control Board recommendation of May, 1978, for a program of milk supply to mothers and pre-school children in remote areas and in low-income families?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I discussed it with my department and there was no action taken.

MR. CORRIN: Is the Minister aware that there are at present applications before the Milk Control Board for increases up to 11 cents per litre in southern Manitoba and 15 cents per litre in northern Manitoba?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not totally aware of what is being presented to the Milk Control Board, but the hearings are in place and I feel that it is no place for the Minister to become involved when the hearings are taking place.

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

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in light of the substantial price increases which may result, will the Minister reconsider his passive approach concerning the health and development of children in low-income families in this province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated, it is a hypothetical question and certainly it does not require an answer to a hypothetical question.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Resources. I have had some representation in regard to the Fairford Dam. I would ask the Minister if he could advise the House, what is the status at the present time insofar as the Fairford Dam is concerned? Is it open; is it closed; or is it partially open? I wonder if he could give us that information at this time.

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

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we just have completed a discussion in my Estimates of the operation of the dam and I would have to take as notice the honourable member's question as to the precise setting on the dam at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Last week the Minister of Consumer Affairs accepted my colleague's request to look into possible gas price fixing in Flin Flon. Over two months ago, I asked the Minister if he would look into the whole matter of bread pricing. Is he now in a position to report as to whether the bread price increases of over 13 percent are justified or unjustified?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Without accepting my honourable friend's quotation as to the degree of the increase, Mr. Speaker, I can tell my honourable friend that I have just recently received the final figures that I have been attempting to accumulate and have not as yet been able

able to assess them.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will he have his staff look into the whole matter of tariff reductions being a possible influence in lowering food prices in Manitoba, and would he please monitor to ensure that the lower tariffs for imported food actually do result in lower food prices for Manitobans?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I asked that that information be provided to me some time ago and that is now being re-evaluated in the light of the changes that have recently been announced in Ottawa. But I can tell my honourable friend, in case honourable gentlemen opposite were not aware of it, that the tariffs as well as the exchange rate on the dollar, do play a significant impact on the prices of food being imported into this country, particularly fresh vegetables and fruits.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister if he will table the reports on the impact of lower tariffs on food prices and if he will also table the report he has received from his department regarding bread price increases. Will he table that material with the House?

MR. JORGENSON: No, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend should know better than that, that those are departmental documents that I have requested from my staff. I feel no need to have to table them. I will provide my honourable friend with answers to as many questions as he chooses to ask, providing I have the answers, and I hope and trust that he will be satisfied with the answers that he gets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that the statistics which he presented to the Legislature, giving the unemployment statistics for Manitoba, represent or show a much lower proportion of unemployed people in this province since these statistics do not include many of the people who live in remote and northern communities in this province who are not in the statistics of Statistics Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I think on all sides of the House, there have been questions as to the manner in which Stats Canada derives its statistics and so on. We have no control over that. My honourable friend should better direct his question to the Minister in Ottawa who is responsible for the figures, not to this government.

Now, if you want to go back and use the old system, you can do it that way but it really doesn't make much difference in terms of the percentages.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, something that is contained in his figures, and I ask him if he can confirm, that of the 1,000 people who are on the rolls of the unemployed, 1,000 increased over last month, that many of these people are the young people of Manitoba who are not able to find work, largely as a result of the disastrous economic policies of his government?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, using that kind of convoluted reasoning, my honourable friend would then have to say that because of the — and I use his words — “disastrous policies of this government,” would he kindly explain why the unemployment rate is one point lower this year than it was at this time last year?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out that the Question Period in the time for members not on the Treasury Bench. It is their opportunity to ask questions, not members of the Treasury Bench.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary to the First Minister, can the Minister confirm that if this present trend continues, that is, there are 1,000 people coming off the market looking for jobs each month and they are not able to find jobs in this province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that his question might be hypothetical. Would he care to rephrase it?

MR. BOSTROM: Yes. Mr. Speaker, since it is very likely that this trend will continue, is it also not likely . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that the question might still be hypothetical. Would he care to rephrase it?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the trend shows that there is an increase of 1,000 people in the work force this month over last month, and Mr. Speaker, if this group of people who are on the employment rolls of the province in this month, if they are not able to find jobs in this province, their likely only recourse is to leave the province to look for work. Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister if he is not concerned about this trend and is not doing something with his government policies to try to arrest this trend which will likely result in even more people leaving this province in this year than last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is for the third time in this question period and I don't know, Sir, whether I have exhausted your patience and that of the press gallery and the others who have been listening, but the trends to which my honourable friends make reference, or the trend to which he just made reference, in terms of the labour force is that it has increased by 13,000 since last year, that the number of employed has increased by 16,000 since last year and that's the kind of trend that I would imagine that any sound thinking Manitoban would like to see increased. All of that has gone on at a time when this government has been in office.

But may I be the first to say, Mr. Speaker, that the jobs and the increases that are taking place in the labour force and in employment are not make-work, pancake types of jobs that my honourable friends were so good at trying to take credit for. These are jobs in the private sector and that's where the real jobs are created, where we want to see them created, and where they represent the best hope for our young people in this province rather than the kind of make-work nonsense that my honourable friends paraded before this province for eight years to the prejudice of young people who left by many thousands at that time, continuing a trend that is in evidence still today, but my honourable friend conveniently chooses to disregard that fact. So, I say to my honourable friend, as long as the work force is increasing, as long as the number of jobs is increasing in Manitoba, we should take some pride in that fact. As long as the unemployment figures are reduced on a year by year basis, I think we should take some pride in that fact. I only wish, Sir, that he and his colleagues would, the rest of Manitoba does.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a point of order, please. Whilst you were lecturing the First Minister and his colleagues on the manner in which questions should be answered, I turned to the pages that were distributed on the Question Period and the citation of Beausnes, Citation 181 came to my mind and I want to draw to your attention that subsection 1 reads (—Interjection—).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that I also have a copy of that.

MR. CHERNIACK: I am sure that you have a copy and therefore I will refer you to Citation 181 (2) which reads, "In answer to a question placed by a member on the order paper cannot contain gratuitous references and if it does, it must be expunged from Hansard." Mr. Speaker, my point is that this Question Period was not really different from any others that we've had and in the light of what I've just read and reflecting on what I heard the Honourable, the First Minister say on this occasion today and on previous occasions, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to review Hansard on today's comments and answers made by, especially the First Minister, and advise us those references, which were gratuitous, and which must be expunged from Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, while you were examining Beausnes for answers to questions that my honourable friend alleges are not in accordance with the rules, I wonder if you will also take the trouble of reviewing Beausnes with respect to the questions that are out of order. I will name but a few of them, Sir, and if we are going to start applying — and I would be waiting

a long time for my honourable friends to agree — to the application of the rules with respect to Question Period as outlined in Beauchesne. Let me read just but a few of them, Sir. (—Interjection—). "A question oral or written, must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive . . ." (—Interjection—)

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I am nothing more than a servant of the legislature and if the legislature so desires thtt we follow the rules, I will be more than happy to do so. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a question to me as to whether or not you will be expunging from Hansard gratuitous references made in answers to questions. That is the point I'm raising. I want to know then, is the House Leader suggesting that you are not following. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. May I point out to all members that we follow the rules as laid down by our own Rules Committee and our own House. (—Interjection—). We are supposed to. This is your little blue book. Beauchesne is nothing more than a reference. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to be examining the Beauchesne to determine whether or not an answer is in order, then I think that it's in keeping with the spirit of the rules that you examine all of the Question Period including the questions and expunge from the record all of those questions from the other side of the House that have been satirical, ironical, rhetorical, offensive, contain epithet innuendo , be trivial, vague and meaningless, multiply with slight variations, similar questions on the same point, repeat in substance questions already answered, etc., etc., etc. If my honourable friends want the rules applied in that way . . .

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. We're now under Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into Committees of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Finance.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — FINANCE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): For the consideration of the Committee, the Estimates of the Department of Finance; \$216,761,000.00. First Item, General Administration 1(a) Minister's Salary; \$15,600 — the Honourable Minister.

MR. CHERNIACK: That I believe is set aside until the last Item to be dealt with. However, I think it is the custom for the Minister to, if he wishes, to make a statement under 1(b)(1) which is the first Item we deal with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the correction. 1(b) Administration — the Honourable Minister.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take the opportunity to make a few brief comments in introducing the Estimates and I want to first of all acknowledge the help I've had from the Department of Finance, the staff people who are involved, Mr. Curtis and all his able assistants. We've gone through a fairly important year with a number of significant changes taking place in the Department of Finance and in the reorganization of the government and it's been a heavy burden on a large number of staff people in making adjustments.

I also want to acknowledge the work that's been done by those that are involved in another

area which is dealing with a number of the Provincial and Federal relationships that aren't necessarily so involved in the dollars and cents part of the operation of the department but in the first 12 months, I think, of being in government we were involved one way or another in seven Federal-Provincial Conferences. I think it must have probably set somewhat of a record even at that, but with the round of various sector conferences that were called by the Federal Government primarily, we had an ongoing endless number of meetings that have now just come to an end. There have been more than seven, of course, that we've had an involvement in over that period but I think it was seven in the first 12 months.

First of all, I'd like to point out that the Estimates of the department will reflect some elements of the recent reorganization which has affected most government departments. The Administrative Policy Branch which has government wide responsibilities has been transferred from the Management Committee of Cabinet and has been added to the department's Administration Division. One of the prime responsibilities of this Branch is maintenance of the General Manual of Administration which is applicable to all departments and agencies of government.

The former Program Audit Division of Management Committee has also been transferred into Finance and has been established as a separate Program Analysis and Review Division.

On the other hand the Insurance Branch has been transferred out to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Except for these changes the 1979-80 Finance Estimates to be voted are essentially in the same format as last year.

Members have already been advised of the department's intention to table a White Paper dealing with the Tax Credit Program. I would suggest that the serious part of the discussion on this topic should be deferred until such time as the White Paper is tabled so that all of the relevant information and background data is available for detailed consideration.

I would point out, in addition, Mr. Chairman, that the Finance Estimates usually do come after the tabling of the Budget, I gather, historically, and there may be some cases where it is going to be somewhat awkward to get into some detail on forward projections because of the Estimates being examined before the Budget.

Members should also be aware that the amount of \$140 million included in the Main Estimates for Tax Credit payments, is calculated on the basis of the existing program. There is a possibility that this could be changed somewhat through Supplementary Supply, if in fact the White Paper recommends that approach and if the government makes a decision which would alter what is shown in the Estimates here.

Included in my comments when tabling the Main Estimates of Expenditure on February 27, 1979, was a reference to the establishment of Appropriation 26, the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. I indicated then that this was to ensure flexibility in the implementation of various cost-shared agreements with the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion. For existing agreements, 15 percent of approved projects' amounts have been transferred for implementing departments to the Enabling Vote and for new agreements and programs, estimated 1979-80 requirements have been included in the Enabling Vote in total. The Enabling Authority will be administered through the Financial Analysis Branch of the Comptroller's Division of Finance and allocated to implementing departments on the basis of the cash flow requirements.

Mr. Chairman, to perhaps summarize that, what that means — again just to repeat — is that 15 percent of the DREE Programs, the amount totally in the budget for the DREE Programs, is taken out and put into an Enabling Vote here that allows the flexibility of moving it within those programs with more flexibility than would be if they were contained in the specific votes. This is not new. Of course, the Enabling Vote has been there for some time; it just is being applied to more programs because there are more DREE programs now under way with the Federal Government.

In terms of staffing, the Finance Estimates for 1979-80 include a total of 353.48 SMY made up of 335 continuing and 18.48 term. This compares with 367.14 SMY for 1978-79, which was made up of 345.4 continuing and 21.26 term. This represents a decrease of 13.18, or 4 percent from one year to the next. Decreases have occurred in Administrative Services, the Comptroller's Division, Mining and Use Taxes, and Succession Duty and Gift Tax Branch. This reflects the winding down of some programs and projects and a general tightening up of staff requirements where possible.

Notwithstanding that the Estimates for Public Debt Expenditures are statutory and do not require to be voted by the House, they are nevertheless significant in these Estimates. The increase from 78.9 to 79.80 requires some explanation. Of the \$20.2 million increase, 4.6 covers interest on new general purpose borrowings, 6.9 is caused by foreign exchange rate fluctuations, 1.1 is caused by higher interest rates to be paid on monies held in trust, and a 6.9 reduction in the amount expected to be earned on the province's short term investments. Now, Mr. Chairman, that's a very brief summary of the introduction to the Estimates and if you want to go on, we can deal with the

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the introduction by the honourable minister. I want to take some form of pleasure from the compliments that he paid to his staff all of whom I recognize and I think, all of whom I've worked with and acquired a great deal of confidence in. I don't really know if it's to their credit or discredited that they're still intact and have not been slaughtered in the general firing that has taken place by the government, but I'm pleased to know that they are still with us, and I hope they will continue to be. I think by now they should feel reassured that their value is great and I recognize it as such. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but hear the Honourable Member from Rhineland say it's not nice and I would agree with him the way people have been fired by this government is not only not nice, it's abhorrent and is something to be remembered, especially by those who are the victims. But, Mr. Chairman, the reason I personally have joined in recognizing the value of the staff whose item we are now dealing with and I do it also because of the fact that on previous occasions, the minister has said, "You are suggesting that there is something improper in the figures presented by the same staff which served you, and which were accountable to you, and therefore you are casting a slight on that staff." I want to make it absolutely clear, Mr. Chairman, that at no time did we attack the integrity of the staff of the Department of Finance. What we have attacked and are continuing to question are certain policy decisions which were made, I have to say, by the Minister because only he could make policy decisions along with his Cabinet and it was not the calculations that the staff prepared, but rather the policy.

I want to dell with several of these; the first one is the presentation of last year's Estimate, that is the year about to expire, with the omission of any indication of some \$30 million of carryover capital authority which was considered by this government as becoming part of current revenues. The reason I mention that is that with a change in presentation to the public that the government stated that they would combine both Capital and Current into one, there was an implied percentage increase that was stated which did not take into account the fact that there was \$30 million in Capital Carry-over that was planned to be spent in that year.

On the other hand, in the presentation of these Estimates we have before us, the \$30 million was included as having been allocated for last year and there was an increase of percentage calculation for this year in the Minister's statement. The result is that, having left out the \$30 million last year and having included it this year, the percentage increase was not affected by that \$30 million and should have been, either last year or this year, or divided between the two years, but not ignored. There is some 2 percent involved in that \$30 million and I point out that if one takes the increase from March 31, 1978, to March 31, 1980, one will find that the increase is 2 percent higher than the total accumulative total presented by the Minister.

Having pointed that out, and I think it is rather clear where our difference is — I don't think there is any argument about numbers — I would like to have the Minister, in due course and I don't think it should be a big job to do, to undertake to let us know of that \$30 million, the following: Firstly, how much was spent in each of the appropriations over which the \$30 million was spread; how much was not spent and therefore presumably the amount not spent will lapse and I would like to know how it will lapse. What positive act will be taken to make them lapse, because unless something is done then they wouldn't lapse automatically. I might say that the Minister of Mines has today given us the breakdown within his department. Since it is an overall structure of Estimates, it would be helpful if the Minister gave us that as soon as he is able to do it.

I would like to go on to other matters. Would the Minister like to respond one at a time or accumulative?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps I could. The carry-forward will lapse at the end of this year by Section 59, by Order-in-Council under Section 59 of The Financial Administration Act. So the procedure is there.

MR. CHERNIACK: Will it lapse by a specific amount or in some general way?

MR. CRAIK: Well, it will be a specific amount, but that goes back to your second-last question as to providing you with information on the amount of used carry-forward Capital. We won't have final figures on that, as you know, because the books don't close until the end of April, but the quarterly statement that we last brought out will tell you where we expect to be at the year-end, and that includes the lapse, and that includes the Capital Carry-Forward. It includes everything.

That gives you the year-end position.

Now, if you want to go back and use the old system, you can do it that way but it really doesn't make much difference in terms of the percentages. We can break out Capital or we can leave Capital combined with Current. We can show it any way you like or we can carry forward Capital, but as long as you do the same thing in every year so that when you are comparing with the former year, that is the basic rule to follow. There was a considerable fuss made over last year about somehow there wasn't \$30 million Capital carry-forward shown, and of course it was true because it never has been shown in the last 20 years. Capital carry-forward has never been shown.

So if we had shown Capital carry-forward last year, we would, in order to compare it with the year before, had to have shown it the year before as well. And of course we didn't. And if we had shown it the year before, it would have added \$43 million to the year before's Budget, which would have made our percentage increase last year look even lower than it was.

Now, you can look at it any way you like. I don't mind looking at it the way you suggest, but the part I take objection to is you try to suggest that we are doing it in a particular way to make it look a particular direction and that's not the case. As a matter of fact, I think it may be advantageous for us to do it for you by the two different methods so that you can see how it would compare had we done it consistently on the old method. All we have done is say that from here on, according to the initial recommendations of the Provincial Auditor over the years that Current and Capital should be combined and it should be done on a combined basis, we made the shift.

Now, this year, all the Capital lapses at the end of this year by that Section 59 of the Act, it will be done by Order-in-Council but it can't be done until we know exactly what it is. But we have gone out on a limb already and told you in the Third Quarter Report that at the end of the year, having included Capital carry-forward and lapse and all other factors, that at the end of the year, we expect to have the Budget come in as stated and the net difference between revenue and expenditures we have estimated now will be in the order of \$129 million of difference. So I don't know how else we can tell it to you. We can draw the picture any way you like, as long as you compare one year with the other year on an equitable basis and we have attempted to do that. There was no intention, by not showing Capital carry-forward last year, to imply anything because that's the way it had been done for probably twenty years or more previous, including the period of your administration. We simply compared it with the year before because that's the way it had always been done.

There is the slight difference this year in that what would traditionally have been carried forward is included in the Estimates. Now, if you are going to try to look at a comparison of this year with last year, the comparison is probably on the conservative side, and I would say that in small "c" conservative side, because it means that if we do have lapsing in this next year, we may in fact come in lower, but then on the other hand, you won't really know that until we get through Supp. Supply, as to whether we bring in any extra in the Supp. Supply. But the normal lapsing is around \$30 million so that that is a pretty good average for a year, about \$30 million.

Maybe for members to understand what this lapsing is, it is when we vote in the Estimates, a line in here of a certain amount in Treasury division, \$1,292,000, if Treasury Division does not spend that, but on the other hand if the Comptroller's Division goes over, we can't shift a vote of money from one division to the other division because it is not provided for, and never has been, in the Att. So you have to let one lapse and the other one you have to increase. Your increase is by Special Warrant. But the usual average over the years, if you look at it, is that your lapse factor can vary by somewhere up to 2 percent or maybe more, sometimes 3 percent, of your budget. The average right now is around \$30 million. So that's why we said last year, when you accused us of hiding \$30 million in Carry-Forward, that it would probably be covered over by the lapse because that has been the historical fact.

So the figures that we are giving you this year, of percentage increase of 5.6 percent, are in our estimation pretty good figures, remembering that these are Estimates. If the usual pattern is followed, there will be Supp. Supply and if the usual pattern is followed, there will be lapsing and the chances are, based on historical fact, is that they will end up about even and we'll end up back at the stated increase of 5.6 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have never quarrelled with the government's decision to have national accounting on this basis, to have the Capital and the Current combined. But I did quarrel with — and it is already history — what I quarrelled with was the fact that it was not indicated clearly that the government intended to spend \$30 million more than was shown in the Estimates. Now, the reason he couldn't compare it and show \$40-odd million in the previous year is that he knows very well that it was not intended that that should lapse and therefore that was for a long-range Capital Authority. And you can't say that the government at that time had planned to spend it all

in the one year. What we knew is that last year, this government intended to spend \$30 million, because it said so. Only it took a while to get them to say so and the Minister gave us a breakdown of that \$30 million in various departments of government as being intended to be spent. It is now confirmed on the left-hand side of the current Estimates where that \$30 million has been distributed amongst the various departments.

So that it is still there; there is still the differential. What the Minister is now saying is that when he estimated 5.7 or whatever it was, that figure, it was not done strictly on the arithmetic basis of these Estimates, but rather on the basis of the arithmetic figure with certain puts and takes, that is, with an estimation that there would be a \$30 million lapsing and a \$30 million extra spent. On that basis, it is speculative and therefore I wouldn't want to go into that any further.

MR. CRAIK: Well perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if the member doesn't mind, really, your left-hand side, even on Current, is really an estimate —(Interjection)— That's right, and so is your Capital an Authority; they are both Authorities. So the left-hand side always shows an Authority. So there is nothing peculiar about it. Whether it is Capital or whether it is Current, they are both Authority. Whether or not they are both completely spent, we won't know until the books are closed, not on March 31, but the normal date is about the end of April and questions that for instance the Member for St. Johns is asking these specific Ministers, they are not going to be able to answer specifically because we won't know exactly what is spent until that time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines has given us that information.

MR. CRAIK: That's right, you can get in the ballpark and we've done that in the Quarterly Statement.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I pass the quarterly statement to the Honourable Minister and ask him to indicate where it's shown.

MR. CRAIK: The quarterly statement net result has to be the same thing that's reflected in the Auditor's report and the Public Accounts when the year-end closes, and there is no way that we would be stating in the quarterly statement something that we didn't think was going to be there when the books closed. And the books, when they close, will show Capital carry forward and they will show everything. It will be what you did during the year. And then if you really want to get the final measurement of year over year, you can do it as your Public Accounts are issued, of course.

MR. CHERNIACK: On Page 9 on the nine month quarterly report — that is the last quarterly report we received — on Page 9, it says, "The Capital carry-over expenditures were not broken down into a quarterly budget plan. There is" — or maybe one should say "there are approximately \$30 million of Authority available for expenditures over the 1978-79 fiscal year." So they're not shown. And then when one gets to the projected statement, all it says there is that the government is expecting to spend exactly what the Estimates — well exactly, almost exactly — what the Estimates were for this current year which is about to expire, and it relates to the old printed Estimates, not the new printed Estimates.

So is the Minister now saying that the projected expenditure — we're only two weeks and a fraction away from the end of the year — is he saying that he expects the expenditures to be in the neighbourhood of \$1.656 billion and does he then include or exclude the \$30 million of Capital carry-forward, which is not included in that figure as of last year?

MR. CRAIK: Well, the year-end statement, what you have read or the projection, the third quarter statement, although it doesn't break the Capital carry-forward out into specific departments, it does gross it as to what is expected in there. So the Capital carry-forward is included in that year-end projection.

MR. CHERNIACK: On Page 10.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I don't know what page it's on, but it's in the year-end projection. The spending that takes place out of Capital carry-forward that you're concerned about is included in the year-end projection.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Minister is now saying he is including this \$30 million — that portion which will be spent — is included in the figure \$1.656 billion and that is the Minister's expectation of

what will be spent in this year, including Capital. All right. Now, I come back to my earlier request. Will the Minister attempt to give us the information such as the Minister of Mines has already given us, showing Carry-over of Capital Authority, estimate expended for this current year, estimated unexpended, so that we will know that when we get this sheet that will approximate the lapsing that we will see in an Order-in-Council, plus whatever was left unexpired last year — which I think was some \$17 million, I don't remember. I assume that will all be included in the one O/C. Is that correct, and will the Minister try to give us that information?

MR. CRAIK: The amount of Capital carry-forward in this year's spending was pretty thoroughly examined in the Estimates last year when you were given the Estimates in each department. I don't think there would be much point in us now trying to reaffirm that in terms of the specific departments when the actual will be known about the end of April. All we would be doing is undertaking an exercise now that we would be duplicating again the end of April. And I don't know to what avail, because in gross terms you are really asking for information that in your day we never got until 12 months after the year-end, and now we're not even at the year-end. We'll probably have that in his hands by July but, you know, you're asking for what you never provided until 12 months after the year-end sometimes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I am going to try to avoid entering into the kind of discussion that this leads into. You're asking for what you never gave us; maybe you never asked for it. —(Interjection)— No, no, no, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman; I don't think I should be interrupted all the time, occasionally okay, at least let me finish my sentence. I said, "I don't want to be drawn into that kind of discussion." I will try to avoid it. All I'm saying is that the Minister of Mines was able to say that out of \$6,725,600 in the Capital carry-over in his department, he expects to spend \$4,789,000 and he expects to have unexpended \$1,936,600.00. No one would hold him to that figure, at all, because this is an anticipated figure, but it's one which must approximate what he expects. Now, if he has that, I am sure that that's available information. If the Minister says, "We don't have it readily available. It will take us a day's work", I'm not sure that I would want him to spend that time. But he will have to say that for me to just shrug my shoulders and say, "Well, he didn't get it four years, therefore he doesn't have to give it now."

MR. CRAIK: Well, yes, it does take a lot of work, and I think the Member for St. Johns knows it takes a lot of work. Perhaps it would suffice if I told him that we will have the unaudited year-end statements in his hands before this session is finished.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, but I do know that many years in the past Ministers have been asked in any one of the resolutions, "What do you expect will be your expenditure last year for this program?", and they answer that question. Now, I say that this should not be difficult and not be a lot of work for the department to run through all the various departments for the Capital Authority, which is really the item — I believe it's called Physical Acquisitions — and that is the Current voted last year, plus the \$30 million Capital carry-forward, and they have a pretty good idea — I'm sure they have a pretty good idea now — as to what is authorized to be spent within this year — that's this month; by the end of this month — and what is not. That's all I'm asking for, without any attempt to insist that it be accurate to the penny.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I'm going to have to repeat that it is a lot of work, and I think the Member for St. Johns knows that it is a fair-sized job and I think he also recognizes that at this time of year the staff is already well up their ears in preparing for year-end. If I thought that we were going to be 12 months away from getting the figures into the member's hands I would feel that there may be some value to it. I can repeat that we will have the preliminary year-end statement available, I would think, probably by no later than June. I think last year it was the end of June; I think this year we will probably have it ready sooner. But I really don't see the advantage in plowing through all that work because it's no different, really, than the Current account. You're going to have some lapsing of Capital; you're going to have some lapsing of the Current, and the best fix on that is that at the end of April when the books close and your bills are in, you will be able to tell exactly where you are. These are construction projects on Capital, and in some cases even if we gave it to you at this point it would probably be a certain amount of give and take. I might give you a figure in a particular department and it may not work out and then we'd have another fight come May because the figure I gave you didn't jibe with the year-end figure, but just because it was out \$1 million which wouldn't be a significant amount in the total. I think that if I could see any real advantage to the Legislature in trying to accelerate which we have already accelerated by many months, by accelerating that by another month, then actually really pre-empting the year end, I'd

do it but I don't see the logic to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now that we have the Minister's refusal to give the information now or in the near future — well, it is a refusal — that's an absolute refusal. The Minister said if he saw that it would be of advantage to the Legislature he might consider doing it but he's not going to, so it's a refusal. And there's nothing wrong with it. A Minister has the right. Pardon?

MR. CRAIK: How many more SMYs do you want me to have?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, for whatever reason the Minister has said he won't do it. Now, I had no trouble whatsoever. I asked the Minister of Mines, who has some \$14 million in that Item, of which \$6.7 million was Capital, I asked him last night at about 10 to 10 if he could provide the information. He said he didn't have it but would get it, and today at 2:30 I went up to him and I said, "Do you have that information available?" He said, "Here it is," and he handed me a sheet of paper. Now, if the Minister of Finance can't do it then I will be forced, as we did last year, to ask every Minister, "Could you give us a projection?" I think they can, and I think they will because I don't see any reason why they shouldn't. So I just leave it that way.

If you will recall last year, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister, we started by asking each Minister how much Capital Authority do you have that you plan to spend this year over and above your Estimates, and the Minister of Agriculture gave us that information first, and then another Minister gave it, then another Minister, and then several Ministers said, "Well, we can't give it to you. We don't even know." And finally it was this Minister of Finance who gave it to us. So that may happen this year, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: But just to underline, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I'm mistaken but you're asking for how much of the Capital last year, really trying to determine how much of the Capital is going to lapse.

MR. CHERNIACK: Of the \$30 million.

MR. CRAIK: Of the \$30 million.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, in effect that's right . . . That would be the last . . .

MR. CRAIK: But the amount of 30 that was in the Budget last year was laid out by myself last year, and by some Ministers, and it seems to me I'd just be duplicating it. What you're saying is that one month before the Year End you want to know how much of that lapsed Capital that was included in last year's Carry-forward actually got spent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Approximately. Yes.

MR. CRAIK: Well, you're going to have all that by the end of May, the first of June, anyway. So, you know, if you can give me some logic as to what value it is, or how important it is to the Legislature, we can have a look at it but you're not really asking about information about the 1979-80 Estimates; you're asking about last year's.

MR. CHERNIACK: The reason that — since time immemorial — that is since the time before I can remember, you have last year's figures and next year's figures so that you can draw some comparison between the two and usually we ask questions as did the Honourable the Minister when he was in Opposition. You were allotted a certain amount of money for a certain program last year. How much did you spend, because you're asking a certain up or down for this coming year? Rather than what you were authorized, what did you spend last year? And you got answers, and you insisted on getting answers. I am projecting the question that may be asked and I'm just asking can we get that information, and I assure the Minister again that I believe it's available. I really believe it's available without too much difficulty, but if he finds it difficult, if he feels he cannot provide it for whatever reason, I have to accept that and try and get it some other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: I just have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that very likely this whole business, and perhaps the member really doesn't want to resolve it clearly, I just have a feeling that, you know, five minutes of quietly sitting down we can go through the permutations that are involved and how you show a comparison of one year to the next and he'll see very quickly that there's nothing unusual about the Capital Carry-forward, and I think that once he saw that, that he wouldn't be trying to obtain information at this point in time that is automatically going to come out and be accurate and a darn sight more accurate than it would be now. Because what he's dealing with is Estimates; the information he got last year was an Estimate, and at the Year End as of April 1, he will not get an Estimate, he'll get an actual. And anything that a Minister gives him today, and anything that I would give him, would still have an element of estimate in it, and I really don't see why we should provide two sets of Estimates for 1978-79 when we're really supposed to be looking at 1979-80 Estimates. We're really duplicating, doing the second time around, something that was done for last year and we're supposed to be looking at 1979-80.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, Capital Authority is still what is being used by this government in spending some of its money and will be until the end of this month; that is, the end of this fiscal year. It is not Current. We argued last year when we said the \$30 million should be shown that the government to be consistent should have lapsed all Capital Authority as of the beginning of this current year; that is, as of March 31, 1978, and in its Estimates included all of the money it wanted to spend as being Estimates of Expenditure. I won't call it Current or Capital; it would be combined. And in that way we would know automatically that there is a lapsing as of March 31 of all moneys that were in the Estimates, but they chose not to do it, and by not doing it they did say, well, we're going to raise for Current so many millions of dollars, and we then found that there was another \$30 million to be spent. Now there is a distinction which will disappear once the lapsing takes place, and until that distinction does disappear, we can't help but want to follow it through and that's careful and prudent efforts to watch the management, to monitor the management of the moneys of the government. That's not only our prerogative, it's our responsibility.

Therefore, until the government wipes out this Capital — the use of Capital Authority — we've got to monitor it and I don't even have to explain what use we'll put to the information, and frankly, I don't know that we would put any use to it. But we're entitled to have it because the Minister is accountable. He says, "You're going to get it anyway." Well, that's fine. I recognize that, but I still contend that it is readily available. I am sure that it is in the . . . I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, and I'm hearkening back maybe five years ago when I was in his position, I don't believe that any Capital Authority can be committed without it being recorded somewhere in the records of the Department of Finance as being an Authority against which there will be a charge, and I don't believe that in the Department of Finance or in the former Management Committee or in the Auditor's own figures, because he does a pre-audit on authority, that they don't know that Capital Authority number so-and-so has so much in it, that so much has been committed and there is a difference. . . And I believe it is there. Now, you know, I have to be told that it isn't there or that it means extra hiring of SMYs in order to get that done. Maybe if it needs that, maybe it should do it, because, Mr. Chairman, that's not good management either. To think that there is a Capital Authority on the books and the government does not know readily whether or not the moneys are available to be spent and charged to that, would indicate to me a sloppiness which I know does not exist. Let me make it clear, I do not say that it doesn't exist; I would say that if that information did not exist, I would have to wonder how come. But I believe it is there; I really believe it is there and it is just a question of getting it.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps it would be easier, Mr. Chairman, if we went back and did it the way you want to do it. We had cancelled everything last year. We could do that.

MR. CHERNIACK: What could you do?

MR. CRAIK: It's a hypothetical thing, but if it makes you happy, you know, let's go back and do it.

MR. CHERNIACK: No way. We're dealing with audits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, order please. For the sake of the recorder, if we could have one at a time, and then if I can recognize them, then we have no problems getting it on the machine. The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, there is a law that was passed by this Legislature — several laws — which added up to Authority to the government, to the Queen through her Ministers, to spend money on a Capital Authority which was non-lapsing and continuing. Last year, we were informed by the government that they had something in excess of \$38 million of uncommitted Authority as at March 31, 1978, and they informed us that of that amount, they intended to carry over some \$30 million-plus. That's a law. Now, the Minister can't say, we'll go back and we'll do it as if it were lapsed last year; it wasn't. What of that \$38 million, as at March 31, 1979, is expected to have been committed and how much of that is expected to be lapsed? Now, I believe the Minister, that he intends to lapse the uncommitted Authority as of March 31. I believe he does it, but I have every responsibility to ensure that we have the information so that we could monitor it.

MR. CRAIK: We'll have a look at the quarterly and see if it is broken out as to the amount of the 30, the proportion of the 30 that is projected, to the end of the year. But to go back to your question or statement that we ought to have lapsed all the Capital Authority last year, if that had been done, and in order to compare it with the year before, we would have had to lapse the Capital of the year before as well. That's where you get into the difficulty of it. Whatever you do for one year, you have to do for the other.

But in the final analysis, what it really boils down to is that the year-end projection for this current year contains the Capital Carry-forward, the proportion in total of the Carry-forward that is expected to be spent and it also included the amount of both Capital and current that is expected to lapse. So that the third quarter projection to the end of this current year is an actual total picture, net, of what we expect to do for the year. That, surely, is far more important in the final analysis to presenting the true picture, than trying to evaluate and go through the Estimates again for this past year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I really must admit that I am surprised. I thought that the question I asked quite a while ago would be accepted by the Minister and I expected him to say, well, I'll see what I can do about it and let you know. The fact that I am now getting not only a refusal but a convoluted explanation of why it should not be necessary, surprises me. You know, I really don't have to explain to the Minister why I am asking for this information, although I did. I don't have to; I have a right to ask the question; he has the right to say, no, I won't give it to you.

I would then like to ask the Minister a specific question. There is in this list we were given last year . . .

MR. CRAIK: Can I answer your earlier one first?

MR. CHERNIACK: Sure.

MR. CRAIK: In Schedule 3 of the Quarterly Statement, there is a breakout of the Carry-forward, Pages 8 and 9, and at the end of the third quarter of this current fiscal year, out of the \$30 million carried forward, there was expended \$11 million, and it is broken out in detail. It is there and we'll have the same thing for you as soon as we can after the end of this month. But you are asking me to go down now and really update that to this week or today and I say it is unrealistic because you are going to have that same thing after the end of this month and it will be much more factual than anything I can give you right now. But there it is. At the end of the third quarter, \$11 million out of the \$30 million had been spent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether there is a Capital Authority for any one item that bears a number against which commitments are recorded. Is that in the books of the government?

MR. CRAIK: I gather we would have to go, and do go when we compile these, we have to go through and determine the expenditure numbers that go with the amounts.

MR. CHERNIACK: But that information is available?

MR. CRAIK: In the compilation, my understanding is — I have a new word since yesterday — my understanding is that that is right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is it correct that there is some way, some means, by which a department is told, you cannot commit this money against this Capital Authority because it has been

is that not correct?

MR. CRAIK: Again, I will have to ask the officials on the actual technique. ' In determining this far, then we would have to repeat it again. There would be a designation of X amount for each project in before it's committed, then we'd have to go back and say "How much have you now spent out of that project?" to determine whether or not the full amount that had been designated for it had been spent. I presume that was what was done in compiling this that the appropriations of the Capital, what we did was go back and determine in each case how much had been spent in each appropriation. —(Interjection)— Yes, but we basically have to go back to the Departments to gain the information.

MR. CHERNIACK: Either the Minister would do that through his department or we would have to do it through the Estimates process, one or the other.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, that's right. But you see the member got that last year because the estimate of your expenditure are one thing; the actual that you expend are another thing. What you're still asking for really is "What are Estimates?" Really, you're asking for an updated Estimate, which you've already got. You've already got the third-quarter statement that tells you what it was at the end of December. And now you're really asking for us to, at March 15th, 15 days away from the year end, to tell you what it is at March 15th. We're going to do it anyway when the year end closes which is a matter of weeks away and we'll have it in your hands, to repeat, before the Session's over and I fail to see the actual advantage of going back and dealing with it again because, I have to repeat, we're dealing with 1979-80 at these Estimates, not 1978-79.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to take up more time of the Committee. I want to point out to the Minister that in the case of Mines, out of the \$30 million there was 6.7 million allocated to Mines. Now we find that they did not spend and do not expect to spend almost 2 million of that figure. That means then, that just as in other Estimates, the increase from this current year into next year will be greater to the extent of this 2 million dollars in that comparison figure, and that is why the minister of Mines in the very first place said "I am increasing my expenditures although the Estimates showed a decrease." He said, "Oh no, ignore the capital authority because I am just going by the Estimates as they were shown last year — as they were shown last year — and as I'm showing them for this coming year." And he threw this confusion in my mind which resulted in my asking a question at 10 o'clock last night and getting an answer this afternoon. And that confusion is that Capital is different than Current. However, I'm satisfied now that the Minister . . .

MR. CRAIK: Your Capital could be less too though.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's my exact point. I'm sure that Capital is less.

MR. CRAIK: I mean your Current could be less too.

MR. CHERNIACK: That may be, but that Current I know will lapse. I just know it'll lapse. And the Capital, I don't know yet just how the government is going to handle it. I'm told by the Minister how it's going to be done, but I want to be able to monitor it, that's a word I picked up the other day from Mr. Sherman so it's a good term. I'm not able to monitor this because I'm not getting the information so I know that. I'd like to go on to some other questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I'm interrupting the proceedings of this Committee for Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — MINES, NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 63 in the main Estimates. We are on Resolution No. 81, Mines, Natural Resources and Environment. Administration (1) Minister's Compensation—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yesterday I asked the Honourable Minister if he could give a breakdown of the moneys in the Carry Forward Authority from last year, how they were spent and what was

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's already given me that information. I thank him very much for it. I appreciate whatever trouble he gave to provide the information and I just want to put on record that I appreciate having it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if I might just respond to a few questions that had been asked previously and which I had not yet been able to supply answers for.

One question was from the Honourable Member for Churchill that had to do with the negotiations on Entitlement with various Bands as to which ones were under active consideration, and there were five I think we could classify as under active consideration. They are Churchill, Fox Lake, Mathias Colomb, Northlands and York Factory, and three of those, having to do with Churchill Band, Northlands, and York Factory have been given approval in principle by Cabinet and now are undergoing various surveys.

The honourable member also asked a question concerning War Lake Band and where the negotiations were at in that situation. I'm advised that that is a situation where some Treaty Indians living at Ilford are members of the Split Lake Band and have requested a Reserve of 3,000 acres at War Lake. Those discussions are continuing, but again we do have the difficult situation of the matter of not being able to expropriate for public purposes and that one is stalled on that particular point, Mr. Chairman.

I also had a question from the Honourable Member for Inkster having to do with fishing licences, angling licences, and some concern about the period of the licence and the opening of the season, some concern about the possible damage to spawning fish populations. I'm assured that there really is no change in the system, Mr. Chairman, as far as the licencing goes. The individual situations are taken care of by zoning in terms of the closures. The licence may be valid but if the season isn't open then of course the fishing cannot take place.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that largely deals with the outstanding questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to raise with the Minister an issue which I think really only belongs under this Item because it is a fairly broad-based policy question but one that hasn't been addressed really any time during his Estimates, and that has to do with the basic question of the jurisdiction over resources. We've heard a great deal of sound and fury in this House during his Estimates about the relationship between the private and public sector control over resource allocation within the province. What we haven't really received from this government at any time is the position they take in relation to the control over resources between Federal and Provincial jurisdictions. It is probably an issue which is paramount in the total debate of this country at the present moment, that certain individuals, including the Premier of Alberta and the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party at the national level, have advanced the position that the entire control over Natural Resources reside under Provincial jurisdiction, both over pricing, distribution, and marketing, and it is of some interest and some importance as to where does this province stand on that very fundamental and vital question. I think it is important from the point of view of the relationship of Manitoba within the total federation of Canada and whether we are prepared to contradict or oppose the positions taken by those two worthy gentlemen, considering the impact it would have upon such things as gasoline prices and fuel oil prices and energy prices within Manitoba. It also has a great deal to do with our own internal financing and the way in which we plan the development of our resources within the province itself. So it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, as being somewhat unusual that, in fact, the most important question, dealing with the allocation of resources that has been of serious consideration within this country is one that has been not addressed at all at any time or shape during this whole calculation and assessment of the resource position of the province.

During Question Period a few weeks back I asked the First Minister when we might receive some indication of what the provincial stand is. He indicated that we would receive it during Estimates. The Minister didn't volunteer that information and I thought it appropriate to wait until this time to ask him specifically these kinds of questions or perhaps to make it a point, that at the last Federal-Provincial Conference, did the Province of Manitoba advance a position which would assert the right of the Federal Government to maintain primary control over resources in terms of the allocation and distribution of Inter-Provincial exchange of resources and International exchange of resources and yet also maintain the preservation of the right to set pricing and distribution of those resources? Or did the Province of Manitoba support the position taken by Alberta that the resource question, the distribution and pricing of resources should be completely allocated to the Provincial

jurisdiction? Did we present a position on that? If so, what was the position, and to what extent is that position being communicated to other provinces? In other words, where do we stand on that side of the issue dealing with the problem of how do we go about distributing resources within this country at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Well, if he's prepared to answer, fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, perhaps Mr. Speaker, while the Honourable Minister is preparing his reply to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I would like to direct two or three questions to him.

My questions, two of them arise out of the consideration of the Estimates of the Highways Department. One question which I had asked on a couple of occasions and to which I did not receive a response is related to the Parks Branch of this Minister's department, Mr. Chairman, and my question is: Has the Minister some particular plans regarding the development of the west side of Turtle Mountain Provincial Park? And the reason that I ask that question, Mr. Chairman, is it was brought to our attention that Provincial Road No. 450 is being upgraded, I think, this year — well, eventually it will be a hard-topped road, and the hard-topping ends, oh, just at the northwest corner of Turtle Mountain Provincial Park.

Now, I'm just wondering whether the hard-topping of that road is in some way connected or related to some possible plans that the Minister may have for the development of that side of the urged and pressed for the upgrading of Provincial Road 446 to Max Lake, which isn't really in the best of shape, rather than agreeing in Cabinet to the paving of Route 450, which leads to a dead end down to the 49th Parallel and does not extend beyond it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of questions I would like to bring up to the Minister. The first would be in regard to the Big Grass Marsh. We find that up until the Thanksgiving weekend, there is morning only hunting for geese. It is an area that is very conducive to a heavy hunting pressure and as of Thanksgiving weekend the season is opened both morning and night. We find that the birds are chased so that they have no opportunity to rest or feed and I would ask the Minister to consider a morning only season for the complete length of the season.

Another request would be to do with the hunting of moose and elk, possibly a party licence there, even if it was limited to two. Many times it is very inconvenient as an individual to go out alone, and I think even with two in the party, it would kind of rectify this situation. I brought this up in previous years. There still seems to be quite a request for it, so it would possibly deserve some consideration.

The third would be the deer hunting parties. Previous to the discontinuance of the season, it was four, then it was cut back to two. I would suggest to the Minister that possibly this could be raised to three, the reason being that in some cases a person may bag a deer; his partner may become ill or for some reason or another can't continue hunting. The person may have taken his three days or his week off and he finds that he is no longer able to go hunting.

Those would be the only questions that I have. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have several issues that I wanted to raise, but one in particular that I wish to raise again with the Minister of Mines is the area dealing with the Clean Environment Commission and a stand taken by him last Session. This relates to correspondence that I had with him, I believe, and his predecessor, the Minister of Mines, of the former government, dealing with the underground pollution by leaking gasoline storage tanks in the community of Fisher Branch. The Minister will recall that a leak was detected in the summer of 1977, I believe, the spring of 1977. The area was declared a Disaster Area under The Clean Environment Act and certain measures were undertaken by the department in order to test all the storage tanks in the community and to make certain that they were safe in terms of not polluting the ground water or subsoil anywhere else in the community.

Subsequent to this work being undertaken by the department, the Minister of the day — and I would like to read into the record of a letter that he wrote me on July 19, 1977 concerning a particular party in the community of Fisher Branch who did suffer and had to leave their residence for a period of time on the recommendations of the local fire department and his department because of the dangerous situation that the gasoline presented in their home, which was situated very close to the source, or at least the believed source of pollution. The Minister indicated to me, and I quote from the third paragraph of the letter: "When the restoration work in the vicinity of the Sanduliak residence is complete, a report with complete financial statement will be forwarded to the Clean Environment Commission. The Commission will then schedule a hearing as soon as practicable to determine the person responsible for the contamination and the costs involved. The Commission will determine the schedule of the public hearing."

Mr. Chairman, subsequent to this note in July of 1977, I wrote to the Minister of Mines and subsequent to that, I raised questions in the Legislature on Wednesday, March 29 of 1978, Page 243 in Hansard, where I asked the Minister of Mines: "I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment. Could he indicate or possibly check out whether a hearing will be held by the Clean Environment Commission in the Fisher Branch area dealing with the underground pollution by leaking gasoline tanks in that community earlier in 1977, whether a hearing will be carried out in that community?"

Mr. Chairman, the Minister took the question as notice and subsequently on March 30 replied, and I quote from his answer: "With regard to the question from the Honourable Member for St. George, there is no intention at the moment to refer the situation with the gasoline leak at Fisher Branch to the Clean Environment Commission."

I would like to ask the Minister, in light of the apparent reversal of position taken by himself versus the position taken by his predecessor, I have yet to receive an answer from him as to the reason for not conducting the hearing in that community to determine and assess the responsible party with the costs. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in the last Session, we passed a bill, I believe it was a bill, and the only bill that was presented by the Minister of the Environment, which gave him the power to close temporarily all or part of an operation or the premises on which it is located if it doesn't conform to the Clean Environment Act. And the bill as well provides that the continued contravention or violation would cause serious injury to any person or property and would cause serious or lasting damage to the environment. If the Minister is satisfied that it does not, he can then re-open it.

In light of these actions undertaken by him and his department, I would ascertain from the Minister as to why a hearing was not held, or is there still an intention to hold a hearing and, if so, whether the people can expect a hearing to be held in that community dealing with the contamination of the underground water and soil pollution as a result of the gasoline spill; whether there is an intent by the department to live up to the terms of the Clean Environment Act to determine who the responsible party is and to assess whatever costs the province may have undertaken, because I believe there are costs that have been borne out by the province in terms of the expenses of the environmental engineers and the time and effort that they have spent in that community; as well as to be able to tell the people who were adversely affected what recourse they have with respect to the pollution that affected their residents for some period of several weeks, in which they had to leave their homes. I believe that there is a reversal of position by this Minister, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that he will indicate whether or not he intends to direct the Clean Environment Commission to hold a hearing in the community of Fisher Branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. During the course of the Estimates the Minister took a number of questions as notice and he informed us at that time that he would get back to us during the course of his Estimates with the answers. I'm wondering if the Minister has a list of those questions available and, if so, if he has the answers available for us at this time.

MR. RANSOM: I responded to some of those questions at the opening of this afternoon's procedure, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will have to peruse the Hansard for those. I would ask the Minister if there have been any changes . . . During the course of the Estimates we inquired as to testing that was being done at the environmental lab in regards to the lead poisoning crisis that currently exists in the province and the Minister indicated that workers in lead-using industries, who were having their blood tested, were having that done at the lab that is run by the Environmental Division. I'm wondering if the Minister can confirm that circumstances have changed since he gave

us that information and that that testing is no longer being done at the environmental lab.

MR. RANSOM: I can't confirm that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister then can confirm that, at the present time, there doesn't seem to be any testing being done on workers' blood for the purpose of determining whether or not they have high lead in blood levels.

MR. RANSOM: The sampling is not carried out by our department, as the honourable member knows from previous discussion. It was the actual analysis of the sample that was being done by our department and if there are no samples being supplied then naturally they are not analysing any.

MR. COWAN: If my understanding of the situation is correct, Mr. Chairperson, the saling, while it is being commissioned — and I think those are the Minister's words — it is being commissioned by the Workplace Safety and Health Division. It is indeed being done at the lab under his responsibility as Minister responsible for Environmental Management, and during the course of the Estimates he had indicated to us that the testing is being done at the lab under his responsibility. He even indicated specifics that they could do anywhere from 60 to 100 tests per week. It is my understanding now, from information that has come to me from the various unions that are representing workers at the lead-using industries in the Province of Manitoba or in the City of Winnipeg, to be specific, it is my information that there is no testing being done at the moment and that the responsibility for the testing is being taken out of the realm of the Department of the Environment and put into the realm of the Division for Workplace Safety and Health.

I'm asking the Minister if he can confirm that and if he can indicate that because of the changeover that no testing is currently being done, leaving the workers that are working in the lead-using industries in a rather precarious position, the way the system works now — which is not the proper way — but the way that the system is working now and the way this government is allowing and encouraging it to work, is that we use the workers as sort of a decimetre to test what kind of conditions are currently existing at the workplace. In other words, if they have high lead levels in their blood, , then we can determine from that that we have a dirty workplace. Now, that is a wrong method. I will categorically state that it's a wrong method but it is a method that this government chooses to use and, when they choose to use that, then they have a responsibility to ensure that that testing is ongoing and continuing. And I would ask the Minister if he can confirm now that the testing indeed is ongoing and continuing and that testing now is being done at the lab, under his responsibility — the Environmental Management lab; can he confirm that the testing is now being done at that particular lab for the purpose of determining levels of lead in workers' blood?

MR. RANSOM: The honourable member seems to have a bit of difficulty understanding, Mr. Chairman. This was fully discussed previously in the Estimaes. The information that was given in response to a question . . . The question was: How many samples could we do? It didn't say how many are we doing; he said how many could we do. I responded that we could do 60 without difficulty and that we had agreed to increase that to 100 a week if requested to do so. We do not carry out the sampling. When the sampling is done and the samples are forwarded to our lab for testing then we are in a position to test them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I'd just like to find out what's happening here. Are we repeating the long extended debate on lead poisoning or is the Minister intending to answer other questions that have been asked, or is he simply ignoring those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I was about to raise that same point. I think that the line of questioning that is now being pursued by the Member for Churchill has been pursued already, and one of the reasons why the rules are structured in the manner that they are is to prevent that very kind of repetition. If that line of questioning has been pursued during the course of the consideration of Estimates, then I don't think it should be repeated here. If there were questions that were asked during the course of that examination that the Minister did not have answers for at that time, I think it's perfectly all right to ask those questions now in order to get the information

now. But to repeat a debate that has already taken place is clearly outside the rules of our procedure and not the manner in which the rules have expected us to proceed. There is no point in repetition of a debate that has already taken place, and in every instance we attempt to avoid that kind of repetition by the manner in which the rules are constructed.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, on this same point of order. I think my honourable friend is correct if he's talking about direct repetition, exactly the same thing, but if it is bringing the same debate back, if you want to follow through I think this is certainly permissible. This was done before because many times you try to get the information on this item line by line and then you save the Minister's, that's why the staff is here at this time. You can give them the courtesy of trying to ask these questions while the staff is here but then you proceed if you want to make a point or pursue a discussion. For instance, during my Estimates, when I was the Minister of Health, there were a lot of questions asked and during the Minister's Salary, I remember the health critic at the time coming back again for the umpteenth time about not enough personal care beds and this was done. I agree with my friend if my honourable friend is talking about repetition of the same question again and over and over again but if it's coming back on the same topic, everything should be covered before you come to the Minister's Salary, then there wouldn't be anything to discuss if we're not going to revive some of the topics that we want to emphasize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I don't think that the Member for St. Boniface and myself are that far apart on our understanding of the rules. The examination of the Estimates during the course of examination is intended to elicit the kind of information and the answers to questions that are being asked. When we go back to the first item, the purpose in leaving the first item open is to enable an honourable member to recap if he wants to launch another attack on the Minister, fine, he's perfectly able to do that. But I think that the questioning and answer that is now being carried on is not the way in which the rules were structured and the manner in which, I think, that we should be proceeding. If my honourable friend has some speeches to make with respect to the whole gammit of Mines and Resources, fine, then that's acceptable. But the line of questioning that he's pursuing now, in my opinion' is a repetition of a debate that's already taken place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will make speeches on this subject. The Honourable Minister can rest assured on that. There is time and there are places for those sorts of speeches and they will continue because the problem is very serious, and the problem needs attention and it needs the attention of this government until that government on that side decides to give its attention to the problem, then we will continue to pursue it through the Estimates Procedure, through the Question Period and through speeches and any other means available to us inside and outside this House. But I think if the Minister had been listening carefully to what I had said in the beginning or perhaps the Minister was not here present in the Chamber during the initial line of questioning revolving around the environmental management lab, the Minister would know then that what I said at the beginning was that there seems to have been new information that has come my way since we had last discussed this during the Estimates Procedure, that there have been some changes made and that the information that the Minister gave me, the Minister of Mines, gave me at that time is now either outdated or perhaps had been outdated even at that time and he was not aware of it. And that is the line of questioning that I am attempting and fully expecting to pursue and I would ask for a decision from the Chairperson if I can pursue this line of questioning to determine changes that may have occurred since we discussed this matter last during the appropriate section in the Estimates. So, I would seek your direction, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: On the point of order, I have no objection to the member following a line of questioning but other members also want to follow lines of questioning. The Minister seemed to be waiting to take a list of questions before he followed it. I would think that in order to establish some degree of allocation of time and responsibilities, we find out how the Minister intends to

Does he want to follow specific lines of questioning or is he going to accumulate all these questions and answer them at once? I think that really the Minister has got to indicate how he wants us to proceed at this committee because others in this committee also have lines of questioning they intended to follow before we got back to lead poisoning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I think read the situation correctly. It was my intention to listen to the various points raised by the honourable members and then to provide responses to them no doubt with the expectation that there would be further response from those members. I responded to the Honourable Member for Churchill because I felt that we already had dealt with that situation and I attempted to point that out to the honourable member. If in fact we are to pursue that manner of questioning, Mr. Chairman, then I would go back and respond to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I'd be quite happy to defer to the discussion that was going on previous to my entering the Estimates Procedures at this point. But, I would just like your decision on whether or not when we get back to this item if I can continue this line of questioning in response to new situations that have come up since we last questioned the Minister. I'd like a ruling on that one particular aspect of this debate, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I realize the nature of the debate as to whether it's in order or out of order, but perhaps I can help you out by saying there is no new information. The situation remains as it was when I discussed it previously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I enter this discussion at a late date and at an appropriate time. The subject came up in the Throne Speech debate on Crown lands and Crown lands were discussed during the various Estimates of the department. Crown lands as we all know are a subject that are very dear and near to members opposite and any tampering with the status quo in terms of Crown lands often brings howls of discontent, etc., etc.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to mention at this stage of the game that I have no Crown lands in my constituency and I have no vested interest in pursuing a Crown land policy per se. I don't have any constituents who are interested in any changes of Crown land but I, as a member of the agricultural community, welcome the change in direction under this Minister in terms of Crown lands in that where Crown lands are not deemed essential for the public use in that they are deemed to be more suitably used and better utilized in the hands of private ownership via farming operations and more particularly I would presume, ranching operations.

I very much feel good that the Minister and this government has chosen to examine Crown lands and to see if there is a better place for the ownership of Crown lands, provincial Crown lands in the hands of private individuals, private farmers, private ranchers in this province. I think the record has shown over the past years, since indeed this province was pioneered and settled, that private ownership of land has always led to the greatest utilization of that resource and I believe that if we pursue a policy of allowing Crown lands to be sold to private individuals, to private farmers, private ranchers, they will be better utilized, improvements will be made to them to make them more effective, more productive to the agricultural community, and I wholly endorse such a policy of making Crown lands available to private ownership for the purposes of agriculture in particular.

I don't think there's any argument, Mr. Chairman, that agriculture still is the number one industry in Manitoba and if we wanted to put agriculture into the perspective that it enjoys on a national scene, agriculture today is one of the very few industries which contribute consistently and generously to our gross national product and to our balance of payments through exports of grain, exports of meat products. So that, I welcome a move by this government into private ownership of Crown lands for the purposes of agricultural production because I am confident, I am very confident, Mr. Chairman, that under private ownership those lands will become ever more productive to the agricultural community and as a result very much more beneficial to the provincial economy through increased production in grains and in meat products.

I hope that, Mr. Chairman, although I am not aware of Crown land policies in other provinces, but I would think that the move that this Minister and this government has made dealing with Crown lands in this province will probably set a very good example for Crown land policies in other jurisdictions across Canada. And, this I can foresee to be a tremendous boost and a tremendous input to the agricultural economy throughout western Canada and indeed Canada. And that is something which all members including members in the opposition have to welcome at this time. Any increase in the productivity of our agricultural community means direct dollars to urban consumers, to workers in all fields of agricultural supply, whether it be machinery manufacturer, fertilizer supply and manufacture, transportation and all the service industries which are so directly associated with agricultural production and so important to this province.

We have heard over the past number of weeks, Mr. Chairman, where members in the opposition I believe have raised questions as to the serious layoffs which we are currently experiencing in the meat packing industry in Winnipeg. There has even been rumours of one of the major packing houses closing their doors and throwing many, many workers, dedicated workers out of employment. This would be, no doubt, Mr. Chairman, a drastic and serious thing to happen to the provincial economy at this time. I think in the overall approach that this Minister and this government has taken towards long term solutions to the many problems within the province, that this policy of expanding private ownership of Crown lands particularly, Mr. Chairman, where it refers specifically to lands with cattle production capabilities, the ranch lands that are presently under ownership of the Crown. I think the policy at this time is very, very timely because our livestock industry does need some long run reassurances and if that comes in part from individual ranchers being able to assure that they are going to have range land available in the long run for the care and for the feeding of their livestock herds, then I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is a step in the right direction to assure the continuity of beef supplies that this province and this country needs and more particularly as many of the members opposite will I'm certain agree, if this increase in beef supplies, this long term stability of the beef producing community is added to by sale of suitable Crown lands to ranchers, then I'm certain that members opposite will agree that that in the short run and indeed, in the long run will assure that our packing industry in Winnipeg will remain viable and a very healthy industry to the betterment of the many employees in that particular industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, I very much welcome the opportunity to enter the debate at this appropriate time of the Minister's Salary. I think he has grappled with some of the gnawing questions and problems that he inherited when he resumed his duties as Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and in a very short time has come up with some very clear and very positive policy directions, something which members opposite as short a time ago as a few nights past, were saying did not exist but yet they failed to recognize this very positive and very definite change in policy that he's undertaking with regards to Crown lands. So, Mr. Chairman, I applaud that particular move. Again, I have no hesitation in saying that in the long run it's going to strengthen the agricultural community through private ownership.

Private ownership of farmlands is the only method which will guarantee that our agricultural community will remain strong and efficient and productive over the many, many years. There is no other set of incentives that can make agriculture as productive as the private ownership and the pride of ownership in the productive capacity of land. People, farmers, ranchers, have to own their land if they're going to derive, for the betterment of all people in Canada, the maximum benefit from that land.

We have seen many jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, which have tried various systems of land tenure and I think they are, without doubt, dismal failures and the most dramatic example of that has to be that great nation, the USSR. Private ownership of land in that country is non-existent, except for very, very small plots, and with the tremendous agricultural capability they have in terms of climate and land resource, they find that they have to import food commodities on a very, very regular basis and despite the importation of sizeable quantities of foodstuffs, their level of diet is no where near the level of diet, Mr. Chairman, that we in North America enjoy. I'm not saying that necessarily that's good for us in North America, because we have quite a few rotund figures in the North American continent, which I'm sure members opposite will agree is not the best for long-term health but nevertheless it proves without a doubt, Mr. Chairman, that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan on a point of order.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: I raise a point of order. Are we in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources or are we in the Department of Agriculture? I feel we're discussing the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, not the Department of Agriculture, which I think comes up at a later date. And I think that the honourable member, while he has been speaking about Crown lands, is now discussing a philosophical discourse on the joys of agriculture. So I think that he should

come back to what is before this House at this time, at this Committee. I don't disagree that Crown lands are not part of it, but when he starts talking about somewhere else in the world, whether it's private ownership in Russia, — which we have nothing in this Chamber that we can do about private land ownership in Russia — that is a decision that the government of that country makes. And so I would suggest to you, sir, with all deference, that the honourable member is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would advise the honourable member that we are under discussion in Mines, Natural Resources and Environment and I think that just by mentioning that if you could get back to Mines, Environment and Natural Resources, you would be in order.

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, thank you. My reference to the tenure of land holding is very relevant to the exercise that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has embarked upon in his policy towards Crown land sales, and I think that nothing can be more relevant in pointing out very dramatically to members opposite that with the system of private tenure of agricultural land, which is being proposed by the Minister of Mines and Resources in his Crown land policy, we can show time and time again throughout the world that that is the most successful method of land tenure, which leads to the greatest productivity. And this is what we're after in this country, whether members opposite like to admit it or not; we want to have the greatest productivity that we can get from the available resources, whether they be land, machinery or human resources. We must have that kind of increase in production and I maintain that by sale of Crown lands to private individuals we're going to better assure in the long run that we have that kind of maximization of production, which is not available to other political systems who do not believe in the private ownership of land resources.

I think it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, at this time, since the members opposite have concerned themselves as to whether my debate is relevant or not, I think it is only appropriate at this time to point out that obviously this policy of sale of Crown lands, a land resource owned by the province, to private individuals must cut deep against the political grain of members opposite because they not only would not embark upon a program of selling agriculturally suitable Crown lands to private individuals, they went one step further, Mr. Chairman, in their State Farm Program, where they went out and bought from private individuals viable agricultural land to put it in the name of the state. That program doesn't work in North America, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I think it's appropriate that the records show very clearly that the efforts and the directions that this government and this Minister are taking in making Crown lands, which are suitable for agriculture, available for sale to private individuals is a policy that has to be applauded and has to be, in the long run, in the best interests of not only the province but of the country.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the topic of discussion but I think it goes without saying that this policy will, in the long run, and in the immediate short run, better the agricultural production of this community, which is going to mean jobs for the Honourable Member for Logan. It's going to mean jobs in the rail industry that he, I think, is so greatly interested in, if these Crown lands will produce exportable quantities of grains which are in demand on the world market, that will employ members of the Brotherhood of Railway Workers.

If the sale of Crown lands to individual ranchers will mean an increase in the continuity of supply in the beef herd, then that's going to mean that residents of various constituencies of members opposite are going to enjoy full and guaranteed employment at the various packinghouses and within the meat industry in Winnipeg. So I think that although the Member for Logan, I believe, took exception to some of my comments that I was straying into agriculture, he possibly shows some of his short-sightedness in the fact that he would bite the very hand that feeds him — and I say that literally and I mean it sincerely, Mr. Chairman — because not only does agriculture feed him, Mr. Chairman, but it also feeds a lot of his . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague stood up on a point of order and you allowed him to speak, and then my honourable friend got up and we thought it was on a point of order. We were waiting and waiting and he went back in agriculture, and I'm asking you now, Sir, is he out of order or will this be allowed? I'm asking the House Leader also. I'm seeking his guidance because this could be pretty dangerous, if this is allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I was listening to the discussion from the Honourable Member for Pembina and the discussion was on Crown lands. There was some reference to agriculture but just outside reference and . . . The Honourable Member for Logan on

a point of order.

MR. JENKINS: I would like a ruling from you where my biting of the hand of the Honourable Member for Pembina is dealing with the . . . —(Interjection)— Literally, he said tat I was biting his hand that fed me. What has that to do with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources? —(Interjection)— Wildlife?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, thank you. To continue on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface, on the same point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman . . . I feel that you should make a ruling and, Mr. Chairman, if this is allowed I will take it that this is your ruling and we will act accordingly for the rest of the Estimates, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ruling has been, I was listening to the discussion very, very closely. It was upon Crown lands. There was some outside reference to agriculture, but the main part of the discussion was on Crown lands and that's why I didn't rule it out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine, Mr. Chairman, I would like to let you know now that we will be stretching things quite a bit also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To wrap up, in the brief, since the Member for St. Boniface is quite anxious, the Member for Logan, when I mentioned that he bites the hand that feeds him, I meant also that many, many people in his constituency — and possibly some of them even voted for him — depend on agriculture for their livelihood and their jobs, and any effort by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources through the sale of Crown lands to private producers to increase the agricultural production in this province and to increase the employment of many people in the City of Winnipeg is to the betterment of all people in this Chamber and, indeed, all people in the province. And those kind of changes are the policy directions, Mr. Chairman, which should be welcomed by all people in the province. Thank you.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm hoping that — the Minister has quite a number of questions that he has taken under advisement — that he will answer all the questions posed.

I wanted to make some comment to the Minister but I thought I should make some short comment of the Member for Pembina, in terms of his understanding and relationship to the Crown land issue that is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Mines. I think the Honourable Member for Pembina should recall ; that historically these Crown lands have been under private ownership, that are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Mines, that most of these lands were under title hold and they were being farmed, but they were given up, either under tax sale or just through total abandonment. And the honourable member's contention that the only way that there will be adequate production is if land is in private hands, Mr. Chairman, I think he misunderstands the total concept that it is only through good husbandry and good management that the resource will be put to good use and that the returns from the resource will be as such as can be harvested or managed by the individual who is managing it, not whether it is either in private or public hands, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted the Minister of Mines to comment, if he could, if there is an intention to sell off the Crown lands that were taken over from the municipalities and local government districts — primarily from the local government districts — if there is an intent to sell that land, what guarantees there are going to be for the hunters of this province in terms of the right of access during the hunting season, as has been enjoyed by the hunters of this province in terms of Crown lands? While I do realize that from time to time there have been damages created to fences and other parts of the Crown lands in question, but basically there has been a fairly decent rapport between the hunters of this province and the farmers who leased and managed the Crown lands in question.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a specific that I raised with the Minister during the Question Period some time ago with respect to correspondence that I received from a farmer from the Broad

Valley area, dealing with damages to his Timothy crop by elk. The contention put forward by the farmer is to the effect that the province, through its management policies of restocking the wildlife management areas within the Interlake in the middle and late Sixties, brought in a number of elk into the region. The elk population has increased substantially now to the point where, I think there's probably even consideration that there may be some time in the future, a limited hunt. What is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that the elk — just like cattle if you allow them, they love to browse in the haystacks and on fields like horses and cattle — are doing tremendous damage to tame Timothy and grass seed crops by ripping up the snow and allowing the frost into the ground, taking off the snow cover, eating off the fall growth, thus freezing out the planned crops.

The farmer in question advises that the compensation in terms of the wildlife damage compensation is certainly not adequate, in terms of the losses and the value of the crop that is being damaged, and the proposition that I had attempted to put to you in the Question Period, is whether there is consideration to looking at this area where the Crown itself has purposefully or intentionally restocked the area with wildlife whether or not actual damages will be covered by the Wildlife Compensation Program rather than a portion of the damages as has been carried on up until now. That is the specific in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I also, because of the Highways' Estimates and the storm last week, I was not able to be here for the discussion on the program and the department dealing with the Water Resources Division. I wanted to ask the Minister as to what priority is the department placing with respect to the serious situation in the Moosehorn area, which we have corresponded about for quite some time with respect to the water backup on the Dog Hung Creek Drain and the drainage system west of the Moosehorn area into Lake Manitoba, there have been serious flooding problems in the Moosehorn area perennially as a result of the inadequate drainage system and the backup of water flooding the community and adjacent farmlands in that area, whether there is any intent to do some remedial work under their maintenance program in order to begin the clean out process from Lake Manitoba back inland towards the community of Moosehorn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I was simply rising, perhaps on a point of order, to ask the Minister, I thought that the Minister was going to respond to the whole host of questions that were put to him during the course of the afternoon, so we'd be quite prepared to give him the opportunity to do so, or at least to commence his response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Just two small things, Mr. Chairman. I would like to remind the Minister on that jurisdiction problem in the Flin Flon area. I think the Minister understands it very, very well. In fact he showed some sympathy towards this problem and I'd like the Minister to assure me that he will try and settle this longstanding problem as soon as possible.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, I've spoke on it several times. I won't go into detail but one problem we have there are on enquiries into fatal accidents. What concerns me, Mr. Minister, is the time lapse between the time of the accident and the time of the enquiry. I think the Minister understands in time people forget, they move, they become more sympathetic and the enquiries sometimes leave a lot to be desired. I wonder if the Minister could in some way shorten the time between the accident and the enquiry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of questions put to the Honourable Minister during the course of the afternoon which I do believe deserve an answer or a comment, some response from the Minister. There were questions raised by my colleagues from my caucus and also the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. We have been waiting for the Honourable Minister to answer. Now, perhaps the Honourable Minister does not wish to respond to the questions put to him. If he chooses not to respond, then I suppose that is his privilege. It is a rule of the House that a Minister is not compelled to reply to all questions put to him. But, Mr. Chairman, I think that you will agree with me, that the questions that were put to him by members on this side were questions of valid concern to us' questions related to the operations of his department, and questions to which the people of Manitoba, I feel, are entitled to some response.

You'll recall, Mr. Chairman, that I asked the Honourable Minister whether — and Parks falls within his jurisdiction as per the recent reorganization of the department — and I had asked the

Honourable Minister whether he has any plans because this was not on checking — Hansard I could not find any reference to any plans for any development of the west side of Turtle Mountain Provincial Park. And, well, because there was no reference at that time, it didn't really concern me all that much, but then, as I had indicated to you, when I noticed that Provincial Road 450 is being hardtopped to the northwest corner of Turtle Mountain Park. Therefore Mr. Chairman, that brings to mind the question which I had put to the Honourable Minister whether he has any plans for the development of the Park because it's a deadend road, it leads past the park, ends at the 49th parallel and continues no further. Is there some other reason for wanting to build that road which I don't expect the Minister to answer because if the Minister has no plans for developing that corner of the park then all he has to say is that he has no plans and then we will find whatever other available opportunities that there may be available to us in the House to pursue the matter further with the Honourable Minister of Highways and we'll have to attempt to get a response from him. But, it does lead to the perfectly valid question which I asked about plans, if any, for the west side of Turtle Mountain Provincial Park.

And then of course, now that the Honourable Minister for Highways is back and this is a matter which hereto I thought that perhaps the Honourable Minister of Mines has some plan under raps for the development the Enns Paradise, of which the Honourable Minister spoke in glowing terms in his estimates last night, in the Interlake area and perhaps the Honourable Minister has some plans for park development about 7.8 miles north of Woodlands on Provincial Road 518. Now, if the Honourable Minister has, we'd appreciate having the opportunity to share that information with him. The Honourable Minister says there are mineral deposits there, there's oil there and there may well be. Perhaps their reasons for developing those roads, other than parks, that there might be mineral, gas deposits, oil, etc.

So, that was the reason, Mr. Chairman, why I raised that question and then of course I expressed my concern about Rock Lake and the Honourable Minister, I'm sure is well aware of the concern of the local community in the vicinity of Rock Lake. Really there are two matters that they're concerned about. One, the pollution of the water, and secondly, the freezing of the lake in the wintertime and hence killing the fish. And, it's been a matter of some concern and I would like to know whether this Minister has some solution to offer the people of the Rock Lake area about which, I'm sure that the Minister would agree, the people are very much concerned over there. It's been a matter of concern to them for sometime as similar problems are of concern to people in other parts of Manitoba and south of the 49th parallel where some solutions have been utilized to cope with the problem. This is an environmental matter, it's an environmental matter in an agricultural and a recreational area and hence, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the Honourable Minister what his department's plans are to deal with this particular matter and this afternoon we have not had a response. But I do hope, I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that before we pass the Honourable Minister's Salary that he will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19(2), I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under Private Members' Hour the first item of business is Private Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 0. The Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stand.)

The second item of business is Public Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. Bill No. 19. The Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stand.)

The next item of business is proposed resolutions.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK

MR. SPEAKER: The Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. Resolution No. 1. The Honourable Member for Logan has ten minutes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I was speaking on this bill the other day, I promised the Honourable Member for Rhineland that I would bring him up -to-date on just how much industry right to work legislation has brought to states that have had right to work legislation, or so called right to work legislation. In the State of Arkansas which has had right to work legislation since

just after World War II and in ranking Arkansas with its sister states in the United States a scale of 1 to 50 is used in the following table. One being the best and 50 being the worst and this is just a short list and should be by no means considered as a complete list of the indicators. But the average school year as completed in the State of Arkansas ranks 48. The availability of higher learning institutes, it ranks 44. The per pupil expenditure, the amount spent by government on education on a per pupil basis, it ranks 41st. On the availability of doctors, the number of doctors per capita, it ranks 48. On the average hourly wage, it ranks 49. On the per capital income, it ranks 48.

This is what right to work legislation has been advocated by the Winnipeg Builders Exchange and has been presented to this government by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities for this government to take under consideration. It is true as the first Minister has said that they are studying this process and the Minister of Labour has also said that they are not introducing any legislation dealing with the so-called right to work concept that is being put forward by the Winnipeg Builders Exchange. And speaking of the Winnipeg Builders Exchange, if I might quote one, Chris Johnson, a one-time member of the Winnipeg Builders Exchange Wage Negotiating Committee and he had this to say of the so-called right to work legislation. "Having worked for more than 20 years on the management side of the construction industry, and being fully conversant with how the industry operates, I give fair warning, whenever management starts to prate about protecting the work force, even under the most seductive philosophical precept of the right to work, such prating invariably implies an increase in profits for the management at the cost of the lowering of the standard of living for the work force, and therefore be warned."

That was quoted out of the Communicator, I believe the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 500. I believe it also appeared in the daily presses, both the Winnipeg and Tribune. —(Interjection)— Well, the honourable member wants to know what date. I imagine that if he wishes to go to the library, the library has a complete record of the press and if he wants to be more specific, then I suggest he phone the morgue of either one of the two newspapers and they will be delighted to give him the date and when it was printed.

You know, the right to work, the term in itself is very very deceptive, not the resolution that is before us today, but the concept that the business community, the Builders' Exchange, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities wish to put forward to the people, because it implies the right of every worker to a job. No, it doesn't. The right to work has nothing to do with guaranteeing such. Instead, it promises the employer workers at a lower wage and I think that has been proven by the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and other states that have this so-called right to work legislation.

Before I complete my discourse on this matter, I think it might be of interest to some of the backbenchers of the Conservative Government, because this very concept was proposed in a Private Member's Bill by a Progressive Conservative member of the House of Commons, I believe by one Progressive Conservative, Frank Oberle, the MP for Prince George-Peace River Constituency, on June 10, 1977, placed before the House of Commons, as a Private Member's Bill, and it is right to work legislation.

I would like to quote just what the labour critic of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ottawa said about that so-called piece of right to work legislation when he spoke about it. I am now quoting the Honourable Member for Vancouver South, John Fraser, and he stated first of all, speaking to the Speaker of the day in Ottawa: "I have to say with reluctance, because the bill is introduced by a colleague of mine, that as labour critic of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, I cannot agree with this bill." He also went on to say this: "I am saying that I cannot support the bill for several reasons. First of all, the vast majority of unions in this country, democracy functions." As an ad-lib, to the members over there, when you say that unions are not democratic, here is your own labour critic saying that they are democratic and they do practise democracy. But to quote what the honourable member said: "The vast majority of unions in this country, democracy functions and it functions well. The strike record that we have had in Canada, which has improved recently, was extremely serious 18 months ago. I see some honourable members on the government side nodding in agreement. It may very well be serious again but I am not sure, and I am not persuaded from anything that I have learned of this bill, that would necessarily eliminate strikes in this country or eliminate the incidents of strikes by the introduction of right to work legislation as has been advocated by the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange, by the ICB, the Independent Committee of Business associations in British Columbia, and we'll be hearing more of this." And given the record, when we were in the Labour Estimates last year, of the backbench of the Regressive Conservative Party and their anti-union attitude to the workers in the work force of Manitoba, I say to the honourable members, at least heed what your labour critic said in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

And so, in closing, I say that I am prepared to support the resolution that my honourable colleague, the Member for Inkster has introduced, because it in itself, in the resolution, while it doesn't guarantee everybody a job, at least says that everyone has the right to a job, but not at

the expense of stealing a job from somebody else, or union busting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to speak on this resolution, but I have always deemed it a privilege to exercise one's opportunity to speak on the Private Member's Resolution. It offers every member in this Chamber, including Treasury Benchers, the opportunity of perhaps speaking a little more freely and less restrained, if I could use that word, in terms of necessarily, in all cases, mouthing, you know, laid-down government policy. I think it is worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, to remind ourselves of that every once in a while, that this is a Private Member's Resolution and a Private Member's Resolution is precisely that; it offers all members in this Chamber, regardless of party affiliation, to make the kind of more personal comments that the individual feels.

Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting resolution. It was designed in a very clever fashion by a reasonably clever and astute politician, the author who is known to all of us, whose name appears at the front of the resolution, the Honourable Member for Inkster. You see, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was designed so that members on this side of the House would, in a kind of a knee jerk, automatic fashion, vote against it. Now, I am suggesting, and that's why I took the time to indicate to, particularly members on my side of the House, that I intend to vote for it. But that shouldn't disillusion any honourable members that I don't see the particular cleverness with which this resolution was put together. The honourable members opposite know full well that there is a very strong support, whether people fully understand it or not, but there is a very strong support for the way people conceive, the way people believe what this phrase means, the right to work. Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite, particularly members of the New Democratic Party, recognize that that support is particularly strongly felt with many supporters of the Conservative Party, particularly strongly felt with many rural Conservative Party supporters. And so they wish, by virtue of this resolution, they wish to embarrass us by voting against what appears to be the right to work, which has been supported with such unanimous fashion by the strongly-based Rural Union of Municipalities meeting and they expect, by having us vote against this resolution, to confuse our troops back home in the country. That is the cleverness of this resolution and the way it was worded.

It was worded to bait us, Mr. Speaker, and I say this with the greatest of respect, perhaps succeeded in baiting my colleague, the Minister of Labour. I was not here at the time the Honourable Minister of Labour chose to address himself to this resolution, but having sat with the Honourable Member for Inkster for some years, knowing his style and knowing how he sets out, indeed it is used in law enforcement terms, in a procedure of entrapment, much frowned upon by the civil libertarians in our society. But the Honourable Member for Inkster, in the wording, in the clever development of this resolution, set out to entrap the Conservative Party into an automatic reaction to it.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I just set that out at the outset to indicate that he has not entrapped the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I see through his scheme and I will have not a great deal of difficulty in supporting this resolution. However, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of trouble with many aspects of it, which include virtually all the "Whereases."

For instance, in the first Whereas: "Whereas the right to perform productive work is essential to enable maximum self-realization of the individual." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is such a nice, general, motherhood phrase, but I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is essential for all of us to do productive work. There are many occasions when I don't particularly feel compelled to do productive work. I don't particularly know that it is always essential for me to do something productive for me to find my self-realization. Mr. Speaker, I raise that first question.

The other question of course is, Mr. Speaker, who defines in our society what is productive work. I mean, there are those who would look on basket weavers as not necessarily doing all that productive work in our high technology, industrial society. There are those who sit under the shade of cottonwood trees and play the lute that don't particularly view that as highly productive work essential to one's self-realization. But, Sir, to that lute player, that is, if you have ever been a lute player, it is very very comforting and very self-fulfilling and contributes a great deal to one's self-realization.

So, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is fraught with difficulties and is also the kind of dogmatic, controlled-to world that comes so readily to the minds of honourable members opposite, also leaps out of this resolution. They obviously say, some agency will decide what work is productive. Somebody, some board, some commission will decide when a person will find something that is contributing to his self-realization. That fits the kind of mentality, the kind of mold of my honourable friends, my socialist friends on the other side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we go to the second Whereas, and I have just as much difficulty with the second Whereas which says, and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should say more. "And Whereas the economic system under which we live fails to provide the opportunity." Well, Mr. Speaker, that always bothers me when I hear honourable members opposite speak about our economic system as failing. Because, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about alternative economic systems that they then may wish to allude to or strive to. Mr. Speaker, would it not be more reasonable if we shared a little more common bond with honourable members opposite, that if we recognize that our system needs improvement, that our system isn't 100 percent perfect, that our system doesn't provide all of the things that some poets or writers have written that a utopia should exist of, Mr. Speaker, but no, they don't, they are again very dogmatic about it. The economic system that we operate under has failed.

It then begs the question, what economic system is it, Sir, that the honourable members opposite see? Mr. Speaker, is it a fair description of our economic system? Is it a fair description of our economic system that has, and I'll just quote back some of the words — I can't quote them verbatim — of the last speaker when he rose and read about the status of a particular state in the union of those great states, but certainly, Sir, in general and in this province and in this country, we can pride ourselves. We can talk far more positively about the state of our life in this country and this province, the quality of that life in this province, that all governments of all political hues have contributed to over the years. When we look and we worry about, and correctly worry about the fact that we have unemployment in our midst, but is it really serving, or is it to a point of becoming destructive when we recognize at the same time that we have a great deal of freedom in this country. We have a great deal of freedom in terms of what work we wish to do.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, when we introduce every month the unemployment statistics in this Chamber, is that there isn't concurrently with that figure, the figures published by the Manpower Agency, the Unemployment Insurance Bureau, the number of jobs that are vacant. That there isn't a listing somewhere of just going through the newspapers. Today, as we debated in the Question Period or in the Ministerial Reports Statement Period, the problems of unemployment, and they are there. Today as seen in our daily newspapers are three, four, five pages of Classified Want Ads of people, persons, companies, individuals wanting and looking for people to work in the widest of spectrum of occupations. Mr. Speaker, it's one of our freedoms, one of our privileges, that in an open society we don't tell anybody where to work and how to work and under what conditions. — (Interjection)— No, we don't. And our people in our Work Force, professional self-employed or labour, is free and they do move around with a great deal of mobility, and they move around with a great deal of effort in the attempt to seek, very often to improve, or just simply to change their vocation.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if I had taken up the training as a bricklayer, or as a tinsmith, and one of my colleagues, community courses, and worked at that trade for ten years, that's not to say that I want to spend the rest of my life doing that, and I will often give up a well-paying secure job to do something else. Many of us right in this Chamber have done it. That's one of the privileges, that's one of the freedoms that we have in an open society.

Mr. Speaker, in making those comments again, because my honourable friends will so quickly take out of context anything anybody of this side says, that is not to say we have not got some very serious and, in particular segments of our labour force, unemployment problems. But, Mr. Speaker, when we have to in this province, when Inco in this province has to reach out to Newfoundland to try and fill jobs in Thompson, then Mr. Speaker, there's obviously some truth to the subject matter I just spoke of, that the question of choice is one that is held very, obviously very dear to us, whether we choose to work at a particular job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Resolution talks about government establishing what everybody should be working in, if the Resolution talks that government should dictate at what job you're going to be happy in, if the Resolution says what kind of particular vocation is going to make you find your self-realization, that's a different matter. That's a different matter. I know of some jurisdictions where that is practiced daily, where that is practiced daily, and they have no unemployment, and there is no problem of unemployment in countries of the kind that I just described.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know I'm saddened, and perhaps always worn to some extent, when members opposite — and I must say I find it coming forward so much more frequently now, not simply from members opposite, but all too often too from some of the leaders in the organized Trade Union movement. I have to say not all, but in some instances. I particularly hear that echoing to us across the ocean waves from Great Britain from time to time when they cry, in a very militant fashion, that the economic system has failed. This system is no good. It has to be overthrown. And that's what I read, Mr. Speaker, in perhaps a somewhat gentler tone, in the second Whereas that says that the economic system has failed. I beg to question, honourable gentlemen opposite, what system are you suggesting to us? Are you suggesting for a minute that we don't have, in

the words of the former First Minister, a mixed economy now? Are you not suggesting that we aren't carrying on with, as we debate the Estimates of our individual departments, the amount of public involvement in our economy, whether it's in Highway construction, whether it's in drainage construction, whether it is in the provision of Education or Health or other Social Services, yes indeed, and whether it is in the Capital and Construction Industry in terms of the dollars that we put in, whether it's in the development of our Hydro Resources.

There's no question that we all in this Chamber, New Democrats, Conservatives, and even the odd lonely Liberal, recognize that it is not a black and white situation, that we live in a mixed economy

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ENNS: The suggestion therefore is that the economic system to which we have all been party of has failed, begs the question that obviously lurks in the back of your minds that you want another system. I'll leave it to your own vivid imaginations as to what that system is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, finally of course, what bothers the honourable members opposite most, I suppose, about this Resolution and this whole subject matter, is the phrase, "the right to work". It has such a nice ring to it, and it seems to be so imminently filled with common sense, and Mr. Speaker, it is a problem to honourable members opposite because the right to do many things has become far more important in our society. Mr. Speaker, we have set up Human Rights Commissions that judge on such matters. I can't hire a female baby sitter that way in the papers; I have to hire a baby sitter, but I haven't got the right to work. I haven't got the right to exercise my religious convictions if they are such that it compels me not to belong to an organized Labour Union. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, it is. Oh yes, it is. And Mr. Speaker, we protect the rights in so many other ways.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's coming to the top where we are, and thank God we are aware, of a far greater level of awareness about the necessity for protecting the individual rights in so many walks and areas of our lives, where we set up elaborate machinery, Human Rights Commissions, Boards and others, pass legislation protecting and safeguarding that individual right that we have every right to believe is one of our greatest heritages and one worthwhile protecting and preserving. We have trouble with that simple concept, "the right to work".

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are the extraneous things that come in. It's not a question of Union busting, it's not a question of low wages, it's not a question of high wages, it is a problem of whether a person has the right to work. There is certainly nothing contained in the Resolution that says, the right to union organizing is in any way impeded or withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, it's that problem perhaps that bothers all members most about this Resolution and what has prompted the Honourable Member for Inkster, as I said at the outset, to cleverly draw up this Resolution so that he could expect the automatic kind of knee-jerk reaction on the part of the Conservatives to vote against it and thereby befuddle many people who otherwise sense that perhaps there is some support for this concept within the Conservative Party and within our supporters throughout the Province of Manitoba, that they then don't fully understand why and for what reason we are taking this particular action. Well, as indicated, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the Resolution and befuddle the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Will the honourable member permit one question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: There's one minute left in his time.

MR. BARROW: Will the honourable member not admit that this religious group, and I assume you're referring to The Plymouth Brethren, did not have to belong to a Union. They had to pay Union dues to any charity of their choice and have the same privileges as any Union member?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to define what constitutes one's religious beliefs or any other beliefs. I'm simply saying that this was an accommodation recognizing that any person working within a group where a Collective Agreement existed, this was an accommodation on the part of that particular religious sect or group towards the problem of saying, okay, my religious beliefs prevent me from joining that Union, but I will, you know, have the same amount of money taken from my pay cheque and designated to a charity of my choice. But what if that particular

action was opposed to a religious conviction? That was a convenient method of accommodation arrived to cover that particular situation.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it's always a tough act to follow the Minister of Highways, but as my colleague for St. Boniface says, "But it is an act," and we were once again — in fact, it's going to be very interesting to see how he votes because it's not quite clear to me. He says he will support this Resolution and I expect that he'll be the only member on that side who will, or there'll be perhaps a division, an honest division, on that particular issue.

I was sort of detracted from the thrust of the Minister's remarks because he tends to bring in his musical background. He's a very good singer and he now, instead of referring to what the rest of us would refer to as a banjo or a guitar, he comes up with the old reference to a lute. He's a good lutist, I suspect, and I remember last year he was also with the Member for Wolseley working out a musical act whereby a missing musical instrument would then be referred to the Minister who would then find it within a couple of hours, and I certainly enjoyed that particular day when the Member for Wolseley discovered a missing piano — it had been missing for ten years — and within hours, Mr. Speaker, within hours the investigative ability of the Minister of Highways, then the Minister of Public Works as well, was able to ferret it out.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, I asked him whether he could find at that time the missing kazoo of Premier Greenway which was missing for 75 years. He wasn't able to locate that but I'm sure if you gave him enough time he could locate the Lost Chord. He certainly has that ability. It's just a question of how long.

Mr. Speaker, I also was interested in the remarks of the Minister when he said that people were confused about the expression "right to strike", and he is correct — the "right to work", sorry, the "right to work". He is correct in that regard, and Mr. Speaker, he is arguing that this particular proposal is confusing the issue, and I say to him that when the average person in society is approached and asked about the right to work, they think that they are talking about this type of Resolution. That's where the confusion is. And polls have been taken. There were some figures thrown out one day on the radio and when they were examined they were just absolutely destroyed because the poll was first of all limited and the people who answered in regard to the poll believed that they were talking about the right to work; namely, the right of every Canadian to have a job. That is what people think. That is the appeal and the confusion on this whole question.

So the Minister wants to argue that the Member for Inkster is complicating the issue and detracting people from their proper position on the so-called Right to Work Legislation. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the people are misled by the phony, so-called Right to Work Legislation that is being touted in certain segments of the business community, not in all segments, but it certainly has been in the construction industry and so on.

So I agree with my honourable friend on this point, that there is confusion about what is meant by Right to Work Laws. On that I do believe we share the same opinion. But you know, Mr. Speaker, today we had the First Minister under a barrage of questioning, I thought, showing very poorly. He is a very good debater, he is one of the top debaters in this House over the last twenty years, but he was quite flustered today, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, was not handling the barrage of questions that were put to him and we can argue, we can argue all we want about the adjusted figures of unemployment, the adjusted figures, the unadjusted figures, the out-migration figures, etc., but I make this general point, and our government was not totally successful in eliminating unemployment, but it's something that we tried to accomplish.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that when you're over 3 percent of unemployment, you have a serious problem, and you have to endeavour by government policy and by government programs to cut that down to a manageable size. We get figures here that we're getting actual figures of 6.9 and 7 percent and then seasonally adjusted figures of 5.4, 5.6 and so on. I say that that is a serious problem and nobody can take heart from that type of a figure.

The First Minister today dodged the issue, he did not deal with the question of out-migration. He keeps talking about job creation, talking about unemployment, but the fact is that the combined figures of unemployment and out-migration tell the complete picture, and I say that some Manitobans, many Manitobans are voting with their feet against this government. They are leaving the province and we heard the stories. When we were in government, Mr. Speaker, we were led to believe by the members of the Opposition in the election and in this House, that when they took over the exodus of firms leaving and Manitobans leaving would reverse, that there had been this horrendous left-wing government for eight years in Manitoba and that people had flocked to other parts of the country. For instance, some poor businessmen and my heart goes out to them,

they left Manitoba because the New Democratic Party was elected and they went to B.C. Then the people of B.C. voted for another New Democratic Government and then, I don't know where they went, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if they jumped into the ocean, or whether they went over the Rockies into Alberta.

Whatever they did, Mr. Speaker, they were refugees, they were Manitoba refugees from the Schreyer administration. But you know, Mr. Speaker, in the last year there's been 10,000 refugees from the Lyon administration. And there have been head offices leaving and that was not supposed to happen. That was not supposed to happen. We were told that by voting for the Conservatives, the exodus of head offices and people would stop. It didn't stop. In fact, it's accelerated, so my honourable friends, they created the climate for business, Mr. Speaker, they have spent 18 months shaping and modifying and moderating and monitoring, and they have created this healthy business climate in which bankruptcies accelerate and head offices continue to leave.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the fact that it is healthy for people to work and that most people get satisfaction from being fully employed. Now that is really what is called the Protestant ethic. It is a very old concept that has been imbued in most of us —(Interjection)— They call it Socialism, that's right, they call it Marxism. People who want to work, this is called Communism by the Minister of Highways and we heard something about Marx today. You know the First Minister I don't know if he has ever in his life read a book on Socialism. I know that he did borrow a book once on Socialism, Mr. Speaker, because I took out a book last fall by Ivan Ivakumovic — it took me a year to pronounce his name — he was a professor at the University of Manitoba. He wrote a history of the —(Interjection)— Wait a minute, I wasn't the only one who took it out. I took out this book and I browsed it and looked through it. It was a current book on the history, I believe, of the New Democratic Party and then I was phoned by the librarian and asked whether I could return the book because the Premier wanted to read the book. After twenty years of condemning Socialism and he didn't know anything about it he decided he should look into it and see whether —(Interjection)— Well, perhaps that's a possibility. He might have been checking on my reading habits rather than trying to improve his own. But I know that if he has never read a book on Socialism, Mr. Speaker, he did borrow one, so that at least is to his credit.

And the interesting thing is that people are willing to travel to find employment, I mean they are willing to inconvenience themselves, they are willing to pull up roots or pull up stakes, travel to far away places to find employment. I think that shows the desire of people to want to work, which is a deep-rooted and, I believe, a healthy attitude on the part of people. You know, there are even rich Conservatives who could certainly retire, who certainly don't have to go to the office and work hard and promote and peddle and produce, who can simply sit back and clip coupons and applaud the reactionary policies of the government, say what a great day this is. But you know, Mr. Speaker, they don't do that. They do continue to work. They do continue to produce because they find some satisfaction in that even though they have achieved financial independence and financial wealth.

There is a current view, there is a current philosophy which I really think is very unhealthy and that is the ever-increasing attitude on the part of some members of society to retire early. They think the goal in life is to make money fast and retire young and then spend all your time either curling —(Interjection)— Well, I see I'm getting agreement from the back bench. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that those members on the back bench were hungry and that if they weren't going to make it on the basis of ability into the front bench, they'd devour their own to get there. They would literally eat up these members ahead of them, outshine them, but now they tell me no, they're just here for a couple of years then they're going to go back home and curl all winter long, or go with my good friend the Member for Virden back to Hawaii. He was big in Hawaii, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid of pursuing that point, but I'm told that they just gave him a rousing reception there. He was a hit. He was a hit in the legislature and on the beaches of Hawaii. The biggest thing since the Japanese invasion of Pearl Harbour. The Member for Virden might have bombed there too, but we don't have the full report.

Mr. Speaker, the notion of retiring early, making money, going south I think is very unhealthy and I think that older people, Mr. Speaker, who spend their time in southern climates are not, in fact, living out their life in any purposeful way. You can get sunburned and, worse than that, I think it's bad for the brain. You get what is called "jungle rot" by sitting around on the beach, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Well, there's other names for "jungle rot", Mr. Speaker, but I don't want to use medical terms during this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone, the other day, who is the kind of man that I look upon as a block of granite, a strong, tough rough-hewn farmer from southwestern Manitoba

made a point —(Interjection)— Well, my colleagues are not as kind. They're not as kind, they say he's a block of salt. But at any rate, I call him a block of granite. Mr. Speaker, he made the point that he would offer a job to any university student on his farm, and if not on his own farm, he'd get him a job. If somebody came wanting a job, he'd get him and, you know, the sympathy —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he said that he would offer a job for anyone or find a job for anyone who really wanted to work, and that is the problem that there are many people, thousands of people in this province who want to work, who are looking for employment, but it is not available.

That is the seriousness of the problem and I say that the Member for Gladstone as an example of the backbone of the Conservative party he should be concerned that his government is not able to provide a variety of jobs. Now I don't know what kind of jobs he's offering to people. I'm sure he can offer summer employment, but for instance, he can't apparently offer jobs to unemployed construction workers or skilled tradesmen, electricians, plumbers, to architects, to engineers, university graduates and so on. He has to be concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the broad range, the full range of human ability and human experience, not just someone looking for a summer job. I don't fault him for that. I think he has the right attitude there, that he's willing to help in the temporary field. But he's got to be concerned about the skilled person and the person who has qualifications that are not being met at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, there is so many requirements of our society. One that bothers me a great deal and I intend to speak on during the Estimates in terms of recreation is the fact that many community clubs in Winnipeg as an example they have facilities, there are thousands of youngsters who use them, and they're on short hours. They're only open a few hours in the evening, they're not open after 4, they're not open on Sundays, and so on. There are hundreds and thousands of adults and children who want to go skating, who want to use community clubs etc. There's no staff to run them, they can't get the volunteers, they can't hire the staff to do it. We have our museums and so on that are on short hours, our art galleries and so on, we have all kinds of investment in capital goods and we're on short operating hours. We're just throwing money away by not utilizing these particular resources.

Mr. Speaker, I assume I have only a moment or two left but I say this in conclusion. I say this in conclusion that what our government tried to do when we were in power would be scorned by many left-wingers, many left-wingers. We tried to bring projects forward, and we tried to create employment when there was a downturn in the business cycle. That was our aim. If you examine our policies, you will see when the economy was overheated, we did not put projects forward. When the economy was in a downturn, we brought projects forward in an attempt to create employment and in an attempt to help the economy along.

And the honourable members opposite fail to understand that point. They say when there's a downturn in the business cycle, let it hit rock bottom. We don't care how high unemployment is; we don't care what dislocations there are; they don't care how many bankruptcies; they don't care how many head office leave. They want nature to take its course. They don't want to interfere in the scheme of things. And I say that that is a negative and outdated philosophy of government, Mr. Speaker. And I say that this government will one day, one day, in the next couple of years, have to stop a policy of inaction and reaction and they will have to introduce some positive policies to improve the working climate in Manitoba, to stop the outmigration, and to attack the unemployment statistics.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

HON. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very timely resolution that we're dealing with at this particular time in our session. I would even suggest that the Union of Municipalities who brought this subject matter to light during the late summer and early fall months, brought a subject matter to the attention of the man on the street and the legislators and many others that deserves the attention and debate of members here and others as we try and resolve the concerns of an awful lot of people about what is the right to work? And, I read the tone of this resolution and a lot of the members opposite in trying to analyze their speeches like the member that just sat down. He still believes that every citizen should bow to the state when he gets up in the morning and he should bow to the state when he goes to bed at night and thank him for the crumbs that's on his table and for his job and for all the red tape and regulations and taxes and things that citizens are expected to bear when they're living with a socialist type of government.

And England, it comes to mind real quickly some of the many problems that that great country has endured, they're still enduring them, since the Second World War where they went from one of the leading nations of the World until the socialists got their hands on control of the treasury

and they are just slowly but surely moving backward day after day. And it's very interesting to see some of the legislation that's on the books in that great country which has come about from labour governments of the time.

And, Mr. Speaker, why would the Union of Municipalities in assembly in the Convention Centre in Winnipeg pass a resolution such as they had with a majority of some 85 to 90 percent? Why would they, they are elected people the same as we are, they are dedicated, loyal, hardworking citizens that understand what work is all about, who are not afraid to get their hands dirty. In most cases they're rural people, farm people. But nevertheless, they are the salt of the earth I call the people that give up their time and their talents to be devoted to the municipal affairs of our province. And they must have a concern, Mr. Speaker, otherwise, that resolution wouldn't have been on their Order Paper and otherwise they wouldn't have supported it to the extent of some 85 or 90 percent.

And what was the concern, the main concern of those people at that particular communication? I suspect it likely hinged around or it came about as a result of the strikes in the construction industry. And that was a disaster for Manitoba. It was a disaster for the other provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta. And I don't know who was to blame for it, I don't know what side was at fault. — (Interjection) — I certainly do, I give a damn, I really do, I'm concerned that it actually happened and that it tied this province up in knots and the other jurisdictions as well. So, besides the municipal people being concerned I congratulate the Honourable Member for Inkster for bringing the resolution so that we can discuss the matter because I join his sentiments and I think it's a very, very timely subject.

And why, Mr. Speaker, are we dealing with the right to work? I, like the Member for Lakeside that spoke a few moments ago, find it very difficult today to see the newspapers, daily newspapers in our city with pages and pages of jobs that are available. Now, how come that those jobs are not filled? Are there not people capable, educated people or tradespeople in this province or from other jurisdictions that can fill those positions? And I think that on this resolution, the right to work, we had better put an amendment in here to put some teeth in this resolution and see if we can't find why these positions are not being filled at this particular time in our history. It may be the fault of our system. It's possible, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the courses that are being offered at the university level or at the Red River Community College level are not courses that's tuned in for the times. I'm not certain about what the problem is, but there is a very serious problem there and maybe we should tie that thinking into the resolution as well and deal with the other part of the problem besides the right to work. So, I don't hold all the doom and the gloom that members opposite paint, the picture they tried to paint today on the stats that were laid before us. I think it was very, very encouraging for me to learn that 22,000 more people are working as of January, 1979 than there were in 1978. That's progress.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has not solved the problem because as members know, there are still a lot of things to do yet to make it a better society than the one that it is at the present time.

So, we look at this resolution now, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Inkster puts before us. Now, how would you possibly legislate that, and I'm surprised that the members opposite haven't, because it's their resolution, that they don't give us more information or more suggestions, Mr. Speaker, or more ideas as to how we can put this thing to work, how would you possibly legislate, Mr. Speaker, the right to work? They walk up to the door of the legislature and say, "I'm John Doe. I demand a job." And that's it. He has no qualifications just we get him a job, whether we like it or not. How, Mr. Speaker, would we manage this labour force all these people that we are providing them with jobs? They say they have the right to work. Could you imagine the bureaucracy we would have chasing all these people down to see if they still wanted to work productively? And I have no quarrel, I'm not hung up at all, Mr. Speaker, with the resolution. I think that the right to work is something that everybody should enjoy. I like work. I've worked hard all my life. I can't say that it's done me any harm, mentally or physically. I think it's part and parcel of our life. If we get up in the morning early and go to work and produce some goods and services for the state to tax everybody will be happier.

But I would have a hard time, Mr. Speaker, crawling out of bed at 5 o'clock in the morning and going working for the state, especially if these were the guys I was working for across the way over there. That would cause me some great anxiety, Mr. Speaker, in fact I would likely climb back into the sheets again and find an excuse for maybe sleeping in late. —(Interjection)—

Well, I know, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless, it is a matter. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this matter next comes on the Order Paper the honourable member will have 13 minutes. I'm leaving the Chair and the House will resume at 8:00 in committee.