

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 12 March 1980

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 gallery, where we have 90 students of Grade 5 standing from Heritage Elementary School, under the direction of Mr. Snarrah. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

We also have 40 visitors from the New Horizons Club, from the constituency of Emerson, and we have 10 visitors from the YWCA Career Orientation in Preparation for Employment Group, under the direction of Mrs. Pat Ross.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain Resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make, and I have several copies here for the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce today that the Energy Assistance Program for public recreation facilities introduced in 1979 will be continued for the year 1980. The program is designed to assist the public recreation facilities adversely affected by the powered standard rate, or more commonly referred to as the demand billing. The assistance is based on the difference between the demand billing and general service rate for Hydro's billing year from November to October.

A survey of some 1,100 recreation facilities in the province revealed that only 150 of those were on the demand billing system, and that about 51 percent of these are adversely affected by the demand billing rate. Assistance will be provided directly to the consumers that are adversely affected, and the program will be continued in 1980, and will be reflected in July and December hydro bills.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that this is one area where the recreation facilities which are facing increasing costs will be able to not only maintain their present levels of expenditures because of the five-year Hydro freeze, but this will also help them out with an adverse effects that demand billing did have on the recreation facility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 10th Annual Report of the Ombudsman for 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson) introduced Bill No. 24, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate The Manitoba Club.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister advise when he will be meeting with the School Trustees of Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. KEITH COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, we will be meeting with that particular School Board on March 21st.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the concerns expressed by parents and teachers in Winnipeg School Division No. 1, and the special problems confronted by that School Division, influx of children from outside the city, from northern points and elsewhere, as well as immigrant children, can the Minister advise whether or not there will be provision within his Budget, monies in order to deal with the special problems of Winnipeg School Division No. 1, or if indeed he will be seeking approval by way of Supplementary Supply for the provision of additional monies for the Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, these problems that are highlighted by the Leader of the Opposition have existed for some time in Winnipeg School Division No. 1, and perhaps it is quite correct to say that it is unique in that regard. We do have provision within the Budget, within the Estimates, to make some additional funding to help alleviate the problems that exist because of this unique situation, and I would be quite prepared to expand on that particular funding when I get into my Estimates.

MR. PAWLEY: Dealing with the special grant, Mr. Speaker, to the Winnipeg School Division, that the Minister is referring to, the special grant to the schools' existing grant, is the Minister indicating that that existing grant will be increased this year, which I believe would be the first time since 1977 that the grant in fact has been increased?

MR. COSENS: Again, Mr. Speaker, without going into the details of everything that is in my Estimates, and I would be quite prepared of course to go into it in some detail when I do get into my Estimates, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we have increased that particular grant.

MR. PAWLEY: Will the Minister be advising the Assembly prior to advising the School Division of any additional assistance?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, once again, when I get into my Estimates, then everyone concerned will be notified of that particular increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, two or three days ago the Member for Inkster posed a question in relationship to the electronic heat sensors known as hot box detectors which warn train crews when overheating in an axle or bearing box might pose the threat to the continued operation of the train. These electronic devices are employed by the railway to supplement other measures such as regular visual mechanical checks, all of which are designed to protect against the possibility of damage to the trains.

His questions was the location of, and where and when. CP Rail has had a continuing program for several years of installing detectors in areas where incidents

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

of hot axles or bearings have previously caused problems. The company is progressively installing these supplemental safety precautions in areas where incidents of such problems have been less frequent.

The area between Winnipeg and Brandon referred to by the honourable member as one such area where the problems have occurred less frequently. However, the company plans to install some detectors in that particular area in the year 1980. This will include at least one detector within 30 miles of the western city limits of the City of Winnipeg. When it is in operation later this year, it will add to the measures already regularly taken to assure safe operations of trains approaching Winnipeg from the west. CP Rail already has 18 of these detectors installed on its track between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay.

Just one other point that I think the member is probably aware of, but the Railways Companies inform us that there is really no need for those types of detectors within the city limits because the trains have to be speeded up, I guess, is the only expression you can use, in order to create the friction which occurs, which causes the particular problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister responsible for Corrections. Has the Minister, between yesterday and today, been able to determine whether there are any existing procedures, or any possible innovative procedures, whereby a present prisoner, a mother of four children, aged 32 years of age, who was sentenced to nine months in prison, can be given some type of merciful treatment by society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House that the Federal Parole Board has given the lady in question day parole, which is six days at home with her children, and one day in jail, and all seven days will be counted as part of her sentence, and she will qualify for the third remission as well off of her sentence.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that she is entitled now to far more than the usual visiting privileges.

Can the Minister tell us when this procedure will become effective?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, it is now in effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In view of my questions over the past week relative to the Kellogg Foundation, is the Minister now willing to share with the House the information that he gave to the Winnipeg Tribune confirming that this project will be going ahead?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I can't confirm that the project will be going ahead, Mr. Speaker. In response to questions from the media at the time that we were trying to bring the incident to a conclusion, I reported, and I believe I reported correctly and conscientiously, that we had given conditional approval. It still depends on the compliance of the municipalities in the Swan River Valley, who are concerned and involved in the proposed project.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, as a supplementary question, I would ask if it is not true that the municipalities have been lining up to get this funding, and whether the Minister would also confirm, as he is quoted in the Tribune as saying, that the project will not require any funds from the province. He qualified that statement last week in answer to my question.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any difference in the quote attributed to me in the Tribune and in the answer I gave the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The fact is that the funding for the project is being

supplied by Kellogg, but our concern has always been, and it is a concern that develops out of some limited experience at least in these exercises, our concern has always been that it would be a project of the kind that would generate cost and expenditure for the province, and I still can't guarantee that that won't be the case. We have reasonable assurances that we will not find that to be the case.

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

MRS. WESTBURY: On another matter, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Lotteries, is it true that some employees of the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, namely distributors, have been informed that their jobs are going to be eliminated, informed informally that their jobs are to be eliminated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. The situation in Manitoba is one where the Western Lottery-Manitoba' distributor is charged with the responsibility of distributing the tickets, that group of course is made up of the Arts Council, the United Way, the Manitoba Sports Federation and now total community involvement. To my understanding ticket sales are at the level that has been consistent over the last number of years and I cannot see that, but I can check into it for the member and get back to her.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, who has frequently indicated that he is not that concerned with the cut of teaching positions in relation to declining enrollment. I would like to know that, given that the City of Winnipeg School Division is going to cut 40 positions because of declining enrollment and 110 positions because of budgetary problems and financial support from the province, does he have any concern for the quality of education in the Winnipeg School Division, where people have indicated that they feel their children will become students in second-rate schools, and as one parent put it last night, there would be overcrowded classrooms with demoralized teachers?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Elmwood has asked this question before, but I would merely reiterate for his benefit that we have been assured by the Winnipeg School Division Board that they see no threat to the quality of programming offered in their division. They are the people who are responsible, who have been elected to those positions, they have accepted that responsibility, and we have their assurance at this time that that quality is not in danger.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister apparently is not fully recognizing the concern of parents and teachers in the Winnipeg School Division. I ask him as an educator, as a man who has spent his adult life as a professional educator, whether he would choose, whether he sees a choice between larger classes of students or reduced programs, vis-a-vis the quality of education. Can he advise us and advise the public of his recommendation in that regard?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, there's a certain sense of this being a hypothetical question, but on the same token, let me say to the Member for Elmwood that you have to take a look at the type of classes that he is referring to in this case. If we're talking about special education classes, well then certainly there is a necessity for keeping that teacher ratio very low so that they have time to deal with each student in an individual sense. If he's talking about academic classes at the secondary level, then again the proper teacher-student ratio there would perhaps be a different number.

As he knows, within educational circles, there has been an ongoing debate for years as to what is the proper teacher-pupil ratio, and there are all sorts of research studies that would support this particular figure, research studies that support another.

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

I merely say to him that I don't think you can look at this in a global sense, you have to look at specific situations. If we're talking about classes that require a great deal of individual attention, then quite naturally we want to see that that teacher-pupil ratio is kept low. If we're talking about the so-called normal academic class, then the teacher-pupil ratio is something that is open to argument and debate as to what is the ideal number.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that the Winnipeg School Division has asked for a loaf of bread and the Minister has offered a stone, I would ask him whether there is any point in the meeting with the Winnipeg School Division and the Cabinet on March 21st? Are they simply going to be told that there's no more money, or is there something in the Estimates that we are unaware of, something other than what has been indicated to the school divisions already?

MR. COSENS: Again, Mr. Speaker, I think I've answered that question on a number of occasions. As far as what particular concerns may be brought forward by the Winnipeg School Division board, we will certainly hear those at the time of our meeting on March 21st. If he wishes to talk about the Winnipeg School Division being offered a stone, I would suggest to him, they have been offered the same amount of funding at the same particular level as held for a number of years. Plus, I have already told the Leader of the Opposition that within our Estimates this year there is a special grant that goes to Winnipeg School Division No. 1, and that grant has been enhanced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Education. If it is a fact that the provincial government is providing sufficient funding for education, could the Minister explain why, at a time of declining enrolments, the Winnipeg Teachers Association is stating that class sizes in Winnipeg will be increasing by 12 percent next year, while homeowners are being forced to pay an additional amount of property taxes, both general and special levies?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Member for Rossmere that I don't think there was ever a time when I was a member of the teaching profession that I felt that government funding was sufficient, and I would harken back to the eight years in which the gentlemen opposite were the government in power. So to use the word "sufficient" in this case is really not applicable. I am sure that people that are funded by the government never feel that they receive what is sufficient in that regard. But the government has to fund at a level that they feel is practicable and possible at the particular time they are in power.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it then the position of the Minister that an increase in class sizes of more than 12 percent is not something with which the government should be concerned, is not something which will affect the quality of education, and the fact that this increase in class size at a time of increase in property taxes has no relationship whatsoever with what the Minister is doing and the funding that the Minister is providing to the school board?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, again, we're dealing with a few "ifs" here, and I think the Member for Rossmere is throwing out, if this is the case, and if that is the case. I suggest to him that he has to look at what the teacher-pupil ratio happens to be in a particular school division, compare it with what teacher-pupil ratios are across the province, and see if in fact, he feels that an increase in that particular ratio is harmful or not. Perhaps he would find in this case that it was the lowest teacher-pupil ratio in the province, and had been for some time.

So rather than his great concern in this instance for one particular school division, he might well be looking at some others that have had, for many years, a much higher pupil-teacher ratio.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister whether he would agree that in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, there are special problems with respect to students that are not faced by other school divisions in this province, problems dealing with native children, problems dealing with children in migrating families, inner-core problems, just all kinds of problems that are not faced by other school divisions, and therefore, I would ask the Minister whether he would not agree that Winnipeg One should have a lower pupil-teacher ratio than other divisions?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I think I addressed that particular question when I was replying to the Leader of the Opposition at the beginning of the Question Period. Certainly we recognize that there are specific problems there and we have a special grant that goes to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 that in some way helps them deal with those unique problems that they have.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. Further to his statement this afternoon that Cabinet is meeting with the school board from Winnipeg, after the date, and I believe it's March 15th that school boards are required to submit their budget, is this an indication then from the government to the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, that there will be no additional funds due to them?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly has never been the practice of the government to depart from its funding schedule that applies to all school divisions of this province, and I cannot see, in this particular instance, that we would be departing from that particular practise. Again, I have mentioned that there are special funds within my Estimate that I'll be discussing that apply to Winnipeg No. 1, and I'd be quite prepared to go into them at that time.

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

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I had asked the Minister on two or three previous occasions whether he could give me the dollar value of the Foundation Program for Winnipeg No. 1. I wonder if he can now confirm that it is \$33.4 million and not the less than \$30 million that the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 had been using as a basis for doing away with some 110 teaching positions.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, as I've said before, I would be quite prepared to go into those particular figures as they apply to Winnipeg School Division No. 1, or any of the other school divisions in the province, at such time as I'm in my Estimates.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for not answering my question a third time. I would like to ask him, then, if he can confirm the number of teaching positions that Winnipeg No. 1 is planning to abolish, and can the Minister give this House an assurance that there will be no decline in the quality of education in Winnipeg Schools?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, as far as the number of teachers employed by any particular school division, that falls under the jurisdiction of that school division. I must inform the Member for St. Vital that school divisions do not report to me instantly the decision that they may take on their staffing at any particular time. That particular number, or that particular information, is something that's relayed to my department at such time as the final reports are filled out at the end of June in each school division. I will not know the exact number

of teachers employed by School Division No. 1 until the schools open in September. That is the responsibility of the school division.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a further question of the Minister of Education to learn whether he has ascertained whether or not the allegation of a reduction of 110 positions in the Winnipeg School Division accountable for their financial distress is, in fact, a deterioration of the quality of education in Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question is obviously repetitive, as have been a number of questions put forward by members opposite to date, and I suggest it be ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Government House Leader for the advice. However, I'll leave it up to the members to determine the type of questions they wish to ask. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Honourable House Leader interrupted my question, I want to give the Minister an opportunity to respond to the first question I've ever heard asked of him as to whether or not he has looked into the allegation that a reduction of 110 teaching positions - or positions rather - positions in the Winnipeg School Division which are allegedly going to damage, deteriorate the quality of education in Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would answer to the Member for St. Johns that the Winnipeg School Board has stated on a number of occasions that they have decided that they will take that particular staff move to reduce the number of teachers by, I believe the member mentions 110, and at the same time they have assured the people who elect those same school trustees that it will not, in any way, harm the quality of education in that school division.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then. In view of the fact that the Minister has never denied that he is responsible for the quality of education in the Province of Manitoba, is he saying that the school division of Winnipeg No. 1 has made that decision of a reduction of 110 on its own responsibility, and not because it suffers from lack of funds with which to finance their budget? Would they have done this even though they did not have the pressure of insufficient funds to support the school system?

MR. COSENS: Once again, Mr. Speaker, school divisions have some responsibility, in fact the complete responsibility, for the budgeting of the moneys that they receive from the provincial government and the moneys that they receive through their special levy. If a school division decides, in its wisdom and its judgment, that they will take certain steps to reduce the amount of local levy, at the same time taking those steps without in any way endangering the quality of education within their division, that is well within their jurisdiction.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Education has made it clear that he has no intention of increasing the funds available to the Winnipeg School Division to maintain the quality of service, is he prepared to admit that the school division has no likelihood of obtaining any further funding from the Province of Manitoba, whether or not they meet with him on the 21st day of March of this year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, following up the biblical theme that was set by my friend, the Member for Elmwood. Given the fact that the school division is being asked to make bricks out of straw, will the Minister, or has the Minister analyzed, or will he analyze as to whether the public schools within the school division are going to be able to maintain the same level as are being obtained by publicly-funded private schools within the same division?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Minister does not care whether the private schools and the public schools show a disparity, or at least won't answer the question. May I ask the Minister whether he will adopt the approach of the Minister of Health, and the First Minister and the Attorney-General with regard to block funding? Will the Minister permit the City of Winnipeg School Division to use the funds that are now obtained by the division for all schools, to be applied as they see fit without reference to whether the schools are public or private? Will he give home rule and block funding to the Winnipeg School Division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the funding that accrues to Winnipeg School Division as to the other school divisions in this province amounts to something between \$1,100 per student, if we look at it in per-student terms. The funding that the Member for Inkster refers to that accrues to private schools that exist within that division that can comply with the requirements necessary before they can receive any government funding, that particular funding per student amounts to something in the area of \$390 per student.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer the question, whether he will now permit the Winnipeg School Division to use the funds that they obtained from the provincial government on a block fund basis, and that they will be able to use those funds for the public schools within our province, because the Winnipeg School Division has shown extreme solicitude for the private schools and has been ignoring the public . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find the question repetitive.
The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Education is being educated, I wonder if we could start with the Minister of Health.

I'd like to have the Minister tell us the criteria for the eight percent that will be given to the hospital for the operating budget when the cost of living is nine percent, or even higher, and especially when some of the items, such as x-ray films and supplies, the experience has been that they have been over 20 percent. How does he feel that they will maintain the hospitals with that kind of a budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there will be, no doubt, some consultations between the Health Services Commission and some hospital boards with respect to their particular challenges, as has been the case in the past. The budgetary increase that we would like to strive for, and wish everyone to aim for, is eight percent, but like last year, we stipulated an average across-the-board median increase, some facilities received more, some received less, based on the areas of responsibility and the patient load and the referral category, and various other considerations like that, into which they fit.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Health feel that this is realistic? Isn't it the case that last year most hospitals had a deficit and they'll have one again this year? And then the Minister says last year that it would be exactly the same thing, eight percent across the board and some less, I

ask the Minister how many did not use their full eight percent to fight a nine percent inflation last year? Does the Minister have these things?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in fact, most hospitals did not have a deficit last year. The number of hospitals that showed a deficit last year was very small, and in many individual instances, there were, as I say, discussions between the hospital boards concerned and the commission that produced solutions to some of their budgeting problems, in some cases it was on the basis of advice, and additional principles that were applied, in some cases it was a matter of upward revision of their budgetary allotments. And the same thing will take place this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister still has not answered my question. How can eight percent be enough to cover a nine percent, at least a nine percent cost of living, plus all the supplies and many of the other things that are going 20 percent, plus any wages. The wages, most of them are on two year contracts, but what about that? It's not realistic. Does the Minister feel that the hospitals are going to make an effort when this is something that cannot be done?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the experience of the last two years has been that hospitals generally, health facilities generally throughout the province have streamlined and improved their performances in terms of cost efficiency and in terms of the necessary support of quality patient care and services. There are very, very few hospitals or members of the MHO who have not indicated to me in one form or another over the last two years that they feel that the exercise that we embarked on co-operatively between government and the health facilities, was productive and positive, and has created a more efficient operation.

Now, we're not going to permit quality of patient care to suffer, we have not up to this point and we won't in the future. If it requires individual negotiation and attention, it will receive individual negotiation and attention, but there has to be a target to shoot for, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Well, it is a realistic target. My honourable friend says it isn't realistic, he has no proof of that, Mr. Speaker. There can be instances where some facilities require more, others demonstrably will require less, and it will even out, we hope, to approximately eight percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister responsible for environment. Could the Minister assure this House at this time whether or not there is any danger to the residents of the area due to the recent CNR derailment in and around McGregor, and the resulting chemical leakage that is reported?

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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I received a report early this afternoon that the leak had been discovered in one of the valves of one of the tanks. That has now been sealed and it is anticipated that the track will be cleared some time early this afternoon. It will require about four or five days before the cars containing the vinyl chloride will be removed and shipped back or forward, whichever direction Dow Chemical would wish them to be sent for transfer into new cars.

But in response to the specific question of my honourable friend, the danger is now minimal, since there is no more seepage of the chemical.

The Dow Chemical people have monitors on site, three of them downwind from the scene of the accident, and one upwind, and are continuously monitoring to ensure that no further leakages take place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Further to the question from the Member for Portage, can the Minister indicate exactly how much leakage occurred

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

during the entire episode, in other words, what sort of quantities have escaped into the environment?

MR. JORGENSEN: At this moment, that has not been determined and will not be determined until the car is set upright and can be accurately measured. My understanding is that once the car is set up right, they can measure accurately the amount of the seepage. It is not anticipated that it's a great deal. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the railway officials to remove the snow which contains the contamination and spread it over a fairly substantial area so it can be dissipated into the atmosphere as soon as they are hit by the sun's rays.

MR. COWAN: I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, as to the last statement. Has the Minister checked with other authorities in regard to environmental waste management and transport of hazardous chemicals as to the advisability of taking a known carcinogen and a known pollutant and spreading it out so that it may dissipate into the environment at large. Has he checked with other officials and other experts on this area to ensure that there is no inherent danger in subjecting our environment to this sort of abuse?

MR. JORGENSEN: In response to my honourable friend's question, Mr. Speaker, officials of the environmental branch have assured me that this is the proper procedure to be taken and they have done so with the concurrence of our environmental people.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister indicated in a press report, I believe, that there would be a procedure available to the public to be able to make representation in regard to this environmental incident. I would ask him if he could be more specific as to when and where such an inquiry would be held, and if the full results of not only that inquiry, but also the monitoring that is going on by Dow Chemical and the environmental branch and other interested parties will be made available to participants who wish to appear before that public inquiry in regard to making suggestions as to how to avoid incidents of this manner in the future?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet reached the stage where I have determined that a public inquiry will be held. What I have done is asked my officials to contact the various people that were on the site, the Emergency Measures Organization, the Fire Commissioner's Office, municipal officials, etc., and they are going to be asked to give me a report on their impressions. When that report is received and their recommendations have been considered, then we will consider further just what steps will be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Attorney-General and the Honourable Member for Roblin in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Manpower.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Morris McGregor (Viriden): I call the Committee to order. We are now on Resolution 18, 4.(a)--pass.
The Member for Wolseley.

MR. R.G. (Bob) WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a matter of privilege. On page 527 in the debate with the Member for Wellington we were talking about providing the Committee with a list of the number of wiretaps in a particular given year, namely 1979! The matter of privilege is that the newspapers in talking to the Member, either that or the sound system is not too good in here, said, "Yesterday's debate was kicked off by Bob Wilson, MLA for Wolseley, who alleged telephones in the Conservative caucus room were tapped during recent RCMP investigations."

Mr. Chairman, at no particular time did I ever say that and I cannot see anywhere in the particular Hansard, and I can only assume that that information was printed by a Miss Boyens based on conversations with the Member for Wellington; either that or it is a matter of the sound system in this particular room does not carry right so that they get the story correct.

I think that the Member for Wellington has used my particular case on a number of occasions, and each time he mentioned it the paper always says "Wilson has been charged with Conspiracy to Import and Traffick in Narcotics", and every article in the paper mentions that. I think that the Member for Wellington is mentioning my particular case just so that they will continue for the fourth, fifth day, sixth day or whatever, how many days it has been going on, that I have to read that. Why can't the news media just print what I say and forget about all the nonsense about what may or may not happen in the future. I am talking about the Estimates that are before us, and every time I say something they always have to add that little information for the public, and I am sure the public is quite well aware of it.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)--pass; 4.(b)--pass. We are surprising everybody this morning.

A MEMBER: Keep going, keep going. Page by page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,749,800 for Attorney-General, Land Titles Office--pass.
Resolution 19, 5(a) - the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is under the Section, but due to the sophisticated copying equipment that is available today and the fact that copies have gone from approximately 25¢ a copy down to three or four cents, I wondered if the Minister might review the absolute windfall and bonanza to court reporters who are able to charge for a transcript of a trial many fees in excess of 10¢ a page. I wonder if the Minister might enlighten us as to what. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could draw to the attention of the Member for Wolseley, court reporters are 5.(d) and we are on 5.(a)(1). If he would look down the page I think it would fall more in line.

MR. WILSON: All right, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)--pass; 5.(a)(2)--pass; 5.(b)(1) - the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I wondered if the Minister might care to comment on the acceleration of charges that occur when a defence is filed in Queen's Bench and when a defence is filed in Country Court and Surrogate Court. I wondered if he might comment on last year's prices and this year's prices.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

MR. MERCIER: There is no change in fees, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILSON: Would the Minister care to elaborate as to what years the fees did go up, or have they gone up?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, they went up approximately. . . Which fees, Mr. Chairman, is the member concerned about?

MR. WILSON: Well, I believe the cost of filing in the Queen's Bench has gone up to \$30, and I am not sure, but I believe the cost of filing a defence has gone up.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe those went up during 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)--pass. The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a number of courts, one of which is the Court of Queen's Bench, and I believe that it is a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench which deals with applications for wiretapping orders. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I want to re-emphasize my concern about the fact that all of the parties who may be affected by telephone wire interception never receive notice, never become aware of the fact that their telephone conversations may have been monitored. In fact . . .

MR.SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Burrows started off by indicating he wanted to reiterate. The point of order I want to raise is that this is indeed repetition and therefore should be ruled out of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Reiteration only to the extent, Mr. Chairman, that I am making reference to an item which was debated under another appropriation, which I feel is quite proper to be debated under this appropriation because it involves the courts, namely, the Court of Queen's Bench.

Now we were told, Mr. Chairman, that the subject of investigation is notified. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to you that, in making application for the order, the affidavit must show the names and addresses, if known, of all persons, the interception of whose private communications there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe may assist the investigation of the offence. So in other words, Mr. Chairman, from the way the legislation reads, and it's quite obvious, that an order can be obtained to intercept conversations of individuals unknown. And I can understand that happening. The police may have reason to believe that a crime of some kind is either being committed or about to be committed by persons unknown, and one way that they hope to track down the individual or individuals who maybe involved in the commission of the offence is by intercepting telephone conversations. So therefore, even the subject of investigation may never receive notice, because at the preliminary stages, at what ever point and time the police may apply for an order to wiretap, they may say that the individual is unknown, and because he is unknown to them, therefore when it comes to meeting the notice requirement, to whom do you send a notice if the person is unknown?

And, Mr. Speaker, dealing further with the responsibility of the judge in acting upon the affidavit with respect to an application for an order of this kind, it says, "If a person is not known, a general description of the place at which private communications are proposed to be intercepted; or if a general description of that place cannot be given, a general description of the matter of interception proposed to be used."

So for that reason, I am concerned about our legislation, the federal legislation giving the power, the right, to grant orders of this kind, because surely if the affidavit can be in as vague and broad and general terms as this, then there is no question that the effect of that order may affect many many innocent people unknowingly. I feel that the legislation the way it's written is bad, and I believe that there are many who share this view with me. I believe that if the Minister would check on - I'm not sure about the reaction of the law-makers, the attorney-generals, the judges, the police in Canada, to this type of legislation,

but from what I have found on the debate and discussion of this issue south of the 49th parallel, there is concern about the effect of wiretapping legislation, and the adverse effect that it may have, the harm and injury that it may do to countless numbers of innocent individuals, and those individuals may not even have any knowledge of the fact that their telephone conversations are being monitored, and may not even be aware of the fact that this type of thing is going on.

So once again, when we are speaking about the role of the judges, I want to impress upon you, Mr. Chairman, that I consider this legislation an infringement upon the privacy of the individual, and a piece of legislation that certainly is in need of close scrutiny, and an amendment or repeal, rather than just a blind perpetuation of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5. The Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN (Wellington): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring a matter before the committee that I think is of some relevance. It's one that was discussed and studied by the Juvenile Justice Committee. They made a recommendation which interestingly -and this perhaps is the purpose for discussing it here, through you, with the Attorney-General - interestingly was countermanded by the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench. So, we have a situation where the Juvenile Justice Committee has made a recommendation, and the Court of Queen's Bench has said well, that's not going to be the law in the courts of this province, at least insofar as it applies to the senior court, The Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Chairman, this respects the question of public hearings of cases into juvenile offenders. When I appeared before the Juvenile Justice Committee, I remember quite distinctly that Provincial Judge Gyles, Chief Judge Gyles, was of the view that The Juvenile Offenders Act, the federal Juvenile Offenders Act, forbade any publication of proceedings in the Juvenile Courts. He was of the opinion that there was no allowance in the legislation that could allow that sort of public involvement in such court cases.

Subsequently, there was a landmark case in the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench where that opinion was superceded and overridden by Mr. Justice Benjamin Hewak. Mr. Justice Hewak did, in fact, rule that Juvenile Court trials are open to news media. He ruled favourably in that regard. He said that so far as nothing would be done to identify the accused in court by the media, he was satisfied that it was in the public interest to do so. What I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister, is what position he takes vis-a-vis the stand taken by the Chief Provincial Judge of the province, and the other eminent judicial authority, Mr. Justice Hewak in the Court of Queen's Bench, which side does he fall on? Does he agree with Judge Gyles or Justice Hewak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is referring to a decision in the Court of Queen's Bench as opposed to a recommendation from the committee. Obviously, the decisions of the courts are the ones that have to be followed. If he would like to continue on this subject, there is some further information I am trying to . . .

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary. I would just say, and as I said to the Juvenile Justice Committee, I guess in the beginning of 1979, that the disclosure of events in the Juvenile Courts, a matter of judicial record, which is not now a public record, would give the public an opportunity to see that justice was being done in the courts. There is, in my opinion, a great deal of ill will that has been created in the community as a result of the secrecy provisions in the Provincial Juvenile Judges Courts. It seems to me that there is a great deal of misinformation that has been disseminated about the quality of justice in those courts. I know a lot of people speak of those courts being too lenient on delinquent offenders. There are even some people who think the courts are too harsh with juvenile offenders. There are some lawyers who complain that the same standards of justice are not accorded juveniles as adults in the same level of the court system. They talk about evidential rules being discarded and certain essential civil liberties not being accorded the juveniles appearing there.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are all these complaints, I think that it only serves the system to allow the public, through the media, to view the

proceedings. Justice Hewak said when he allowed the journalists into the courtroom chamber, he advised them that they would, of course, pursuant to his authority not be allowed to print the names of the juveniles or their parents, but that they could disclose to the media the events, they could talk about what the juvenile did or was alleged to have done, and the sentence. So that at least, for instance a juvenile is charged with a serious crime such as armed robbery, the public could be assured that the judge had made an adequate disposition and a fair disposition of the case after the trial. To me that made a lot of sense. It seems to me that for years we have been operating behind a blindfold with respect to juvenile matters, and as a result there is complete distortion of reality in terms of the public's perception of what is actually happening in those courts.

I think of courts, such as the Juvenile Courts, to be meaningful to the communities they serve throughout Manitoba. They have to be open to those communities in a sense that the communities can see that the kids that are being dealt with are being dealt with appropriately, in a manner that is consistent with the inherent sense of justice of the people who live in the area. You know, I think there has got to be some checks and balances. I don't think it is adequate to say as has been, I think, suggested by the Juvenile Justice Committee, that the interests of children are better served by the courts in total secrecy. There are a lot of lawyers who feel that the kid's interests would be better served if it were known what sort of disposition were made of their cases. So that is what I am asking.

The Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you, has suggested that when there is a judicial decision, that that should be given precedence to the opinion of the committee. Well I am not disagreeing with that, but I am not sure that Justice Hewak is in a position to bind the Provincial Judges Courts. He has just said that The Official Offenders Act does not preclude him from exercising the unilateral option of allowing visitors before the court, and so what in effect he has suggested is just that the old argument about the Act affecting a prohibition against such disclosure does not hold water. So I am asking the Minister, in view of that, whether or not he agrees with the Juvenile Justice Committee or the Court of Queen's Bench? Would he instruct the Provincial Judges Courts to open their proceedings on the same basis as the Court of Queen's Bench?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, my concern with the court system is that we have what we call the Province of Manitoba. We have a very fine court system, and I wonder at what point in time has this court system subverted or bypassed in favour of a pocketfull of federal Crown lawyers and federal authority. Under The British North America Act, does that mean to say at any point in time the federal system can move in and tamper with justice under the Province of Manitoba's system?

If I may elaborate, I wondered if the Minister could explain what a preferred indictment is. It seems to me that if there was a particular court system in the province, and if this federal pocket of lawyers can accomplish this rare species, namely, the preferred indictment, I wondered at what point in time either the Minister or somebody can say, "Hands off, this is the Province of Manitoba," the same as Peter Lougheed does with the oil, and the same as British Columbia does with their fisheries and lumber. What I am saying is, under what circumstances does the federal government bypass the authority of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As was indicated in the Throne Speech that this government is committed to open government disclosure, and as the Minister, I am sure well recalls from the 1977-78 Estimates, with which he lived for six months and a week, from October 24th, 1977, within which there was a breakdown, there was a separate line for each court - the Court of Appeal, Court of Queen's Bench, County Courts and Surrogate Court - as opposed to lumping the four into the one line that we have under the present Estimates.

Could the Minister give us a breakdown of Salaries and Other Expenditures for each of the four courts within this appropriation?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the previous, since the Budget of 1977-78, which he refers to, we amalgamated the staff of the Court of Queen's Bench and the County Court and Surrogate Court into one staff to provide for more efficiency in the use of the resources available to the courts, so we don't have a breakdown. There is not a separate staff for Queen's Bench or a separate staff for County Court or Surrogate Court. We combined them in the year 1978-79, so we don't have the separate figures available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.
The Honourable Minister - I cut you off.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that's fine. I thought the Member for Burrows might continue.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Member for Wellington, the particular section of The Juvenile Delinquents Act says that the trials of children shall take place without publicity, and separately and apart from the trials of other accused persons. That does not mean that the judge cannot allow other people or outsiders to attend the trial. In fact, you will probably have read of the experiment being conducted in Brandon with respect to juvenile jurors, in which juvenile jurors are being allowed to attend the trials, and that's an experiment that is being carried out on which a report will be submitted within a few months.

Mr. Chairman, I think more importantly, with respect to the whole area of juvenile offenders, I would hope that the new government would be proceeding with The Young Offenders Act which was before the previous Liberal Government for some time. The Conservative Government indicated at a meeting of attorneys-general in October of 1979, at which time they distributed proposals with respect to that legislation, and asked for comments, that they intended to proceed with that legislation this year. We have been reviewing the proposals contained in the Act. I sent the proposals to the criminal law subsection of the Manitoba Bar for their comments, and expect to receive their comments in the very near future, but I think it would be an improvement in the whole system if legislation along the lines, in general, of The Young Offenders Act were brought forward by the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, I don't disagree, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says that it would be of great improvement and reform to have the third reading and proclamation of The Young Offenders Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister. The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: That matter, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister appreciates and has indicated, has been before parliament seemingly forever. I can't remember when its progress first began, but it seems to me that it's been bogged and mired in various committees and cul-de-sacs of parliament for some many years, certainly during the whole duration of my political career since 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the problem I brought to the Minister's attention, though, can be redressed without waiting for the final enactment, proclamation, of that particular piece of federal legislation. The Court of Queen's Bench has taken steps to open the courts to the reporters, subject to a ban on the publication of the accused juveniles' names. What we've asked the Minister is to issue a similar directive to the Juvenile Courts under his provincial jurisdiction which, by the way, Mr. Chairman, as I'm sure you'll appreciate, handle by far the lion's share - pardon the pun - of all such cases before Manitoba's courts.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is good reason - and they were expressed by Mr. Justice Hewak on behalf of his court - to open those doors, as I said earlier, to allow public assessment and evaluation of what's taking place in our Juvenile Courts. In the absence of that sort of ongoing evaluation, I would suggest that the respect for our courts, the confidence in our courts, will be continued or will continue to be eroded, and will continue to deteriorate, as I'm sure the Honourable Minister is aware, Mr. Chairman, as are many members seated around the table.

One of the more controversial elements of the Juvenile Justice Inquiry was the question of even-handed justice in the Juvenile Court system. Many of the

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

deponents before the committee indicated that they had observed a rather unusual, unprecedented and somewhat uneven justice being disseminated as between various judges in the court. They said that there were irregularities as between the types of dispositions that were, made as between the members of the court, and it was on this basis that they suggested that there should be public scrutiny.

You know, Mr. Chairman, because we have that sort of public scrutiny in the adult courts, the public is made aware of such distortions, so that when a Tuxedo businessman steals DREE grants and is subject only to a wrap on the wrist - I think, in that case, there was a \$3,000 charitable contribution ordered - the Minister is impowered and enabled to make an appeal on the basis of public protestation.

We are also aware, as the Member for Inkster has brought to our attention, because through the media, that a lady who misappropriated welfare funds in order to assist the recreational resources of her particular community was sentenced in a rather seemingly inordinately harsh manner, and we now find that authorities have been able to effect some amelioration of her situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest respectfully to the Minister that there are very good reasons why the matters before the Juvenile Court should be made accessible to the public through the media. I don't think it's ever a question of allowing the names of the juveniles to be published, it's rather a question of allowing people to know what's happening and whether or not there's consistency and seemingly appropriate justice management in that particular area of the court system. It's highly unusual. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it's the only court I know of where the judges will not allow the reporters through the door. They stand on their right to reject visitors to the courtroom, and they will simply ask all reporters to leave. So, I don't even know if the local newspapers bother to send reporters down to the Juvenile Courts any more. I think over the years they've had too many abrasive brushes with members of the judiciary

But I think that a firm directive on the part of the Attorney-General would I think, I would hope, would ameliorate the situation and effect the necessary reform. And that is what I'm asking the Minister to comment on, whether he'll issue that directive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, under the court system, since there was no response forthcoming, I think it is time in light of the - I've already been in front of the firing squad as far as the media goes, and I would think that it's about time, like Diefenbaker would say, I took off the white gloves. And I think that under the court system, we have a system where we have a fine group of judges here that are very intelligent, that have a university of life degree, and I fail to see how a group of Crown lawyers can go into a situation in front of the courts, commit perjury, and not be charged, and not be investigated and convince a group way off in Ottawa to sign a preferred indictment, which takes away the rights and privileges that all Manitoba people have in appearing before a court system.

It seems to me that this fantasy created by the Crown lawyers was so unbelievable that Judge Deniset not only freed this member but removed a ban on travel which was also obtained by tenuous and false statements by the Crown lawyer. I had asked a question . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, isn't that case before that courts now? We can't use this committee to start discussing this. If the member feels that he wasn't treated - he's talking about his own case and the judge in with a guy, I think that's wrong, Mr. Chairman. We're not here to make a judgment on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Member for St. Boniface does have a point. The Member for Wolseley. Please conduct yourself accordingly.

MR. WILSON: All right. I had asked the question, if the Minister would explain what a preferred indictment was, because what we have what we call the court system in front of us, where we're spending \$1.9 million, and if we have a system in place, why would the taxpayers of Manitoba want to go through what a

preferred indictment causes, namely a trial by jury at a cost to the taxpayers of approximately \$300,000.00?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, to the Attorney-General, I would ask if the province of Manitoba has made recommendations to the federal government vis-a-vis the young people in conflict with the law and the recommendations as far as the amendments that have been suggested over the past number of years. Has the province made a proposal or stated a position relative to those changes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the Member for Wellington that I forwarded the package of material from the Solicitor General of Canada to the Criminal Law Subsection of the Manitoba Bar for their comments, which I anticipate receiving in the relatively near future. The matter is also being referred to the Department of Community Services for their comments, and my own department are waiting to get all of the recommendations and concerns back from the affected departments before we formulate any recommendations to be made to the federal government.

MR. BOYCE: My question is prompted by your suggestion that it was forwarded to the legal profession per se. Following through on some of the questions by the Member for Wellington, I thought the care and treatment of juveniles other than that part of it which deals with law enforcement, there seems to be creeping in more and more the inference that we're dealing with criminals, and as far as I'm concerned, the public policy in Manitoba, as it is in Canada, is that the only time we're dealing with juveniles who may be criminals is if they're tried before a court of competents and that individual is raised to the adult court.

One of the dangers, as I understand it, and many other people understand it, and insist, that we're not dealing with criminals, and some of the questions which came from the Member for Wellington and the responses by the Attorney-General, in my view, imply that there is a shift in public policy taking place, because when we're talking about dealing with juveniles, the only time that the public so far wants the legal profession to be involved in the adversary system as we know it before the adult courts, is if they are actually adjudged by a court to be a criminal in the adult court.

There exists, prior to 1977, which was the start of a different approach to juveniles through the family courts, and albeit there were some problems with the treatment panel concept, there is great pressure by some members of the legal profession, some of them have expressed lack of confidence in undertrained social workers, I think the term was used. I would ask the Attorney-General if he could share with members of the Legislature the opinions of the government vis-a-vis the changes in the young people in conflict with the law. Not just the Department of Community Services and the legal profession, but other members of the public who have some interests in this field.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to indicate in any way that juvenile offenders were to be treated in the same way as criminals. I think it just so happens that the lawyers in the main, who would belong to the criminal law subsection of the Manitoba Bar would be the same lawyers involved in juvenile court matters, and criminal court matters, and it seemed to me to be the appropriate section of the Manitoba Bar Association that might be most concerned with the proposals for the changes in law.

The Department of Community Services, I would expect, would involve Children's Aid Society, perhaps, or other reporting agencies, to their department in their review of the legislation. As I've indicated, we are awaiting these responses, firstly an indication from the federal government that they still consider this, as the former government did, a matter of some priority that they wish to proceed with, and in fact still wish to hear from us as to our comments on the draft legislation that was put together, at least forwarded to us from the previous Conservative government.

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

MR. BOYCE: I agree with the Attorney-General, this has been a matter of priority for 16 years that I have been involved, and I just was wondering, and commenting on the section of The Juvenile Delinquency Act, is it the intention of the present government to make a recommendation that the ban on publicity be lifted?

MR. MERCIER: Are you referring to the publication of names?

MR. BOYCE: That section of the Act which prohibits publication of proceedings, is the government recommending that that not be included in the new young people in conflict with the law Act?

MR. MERCIER: As I recollect, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the federal government have proposed any change in that particular aspect in the new legislation, but I will check that matter out and advise the member. In fact, I am prepared to give him the whole package of material that we received from the federal government last fall in order that he might review it all and let me know what concerns he might have with respect to it all.

Unfortunately, I apologize, I don't have that material with me.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I already have a stack about four feet high of this kind of information. What I am more interested in and am pressing the Attorney-General for, is the position of the government of the Province of Manitoba vis-a-vis those recommendations which have been kicking around for the last four or five years in more or less final draft or suggested draft form. Has the government of Manitoba taken a position vis-a-vis those?

MR. MERCIER: Not yet, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1) - the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Before we move on to any other points, I was wondering whether the Minister wanted to take this opportunity to answer my question. Is he going to make any direction to the court respecting the policy now in place in the Court of Queen's Bench? Is he going to make a recommendation that the Court of Queen's Bench officially stated policy be adopted, put into effect in the Provincial Judges Juvenile Courts, or is that matter going to be under review?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the legislation as it stands is discretionary in the hands of the judges. I would be concerned about issuing a directive to judges. I would be prepared to discuss the matter with them at the next opportunity of meeting with the Provincial Judges Association.

MR. CORRIN: Actually are we on 5.(a)? We have been discussing Provincial Courts, are we on 5.(b), excuse me, or 5. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1). We passed 5.(a)(1) and 5.(a)(2). We are on 5.(b)(1).

MR. CORRIN: I have nothing further on that Item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)--pass; 5.(b)(2)--pass; 5.(c)(1) - the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, at this juncture I want to discuss, and I think that it behooves this committee to discuss some of the decisions that have been made by the Provincial Judges Court this past year, particularly some of their most notable and well publicized efforts respecting one Mr. Burton Cummings, rock star, and another gentleman who builds houses with DREE monies. There seems to have been, Mr. Chairman, in both cases, a predilection and preference on the part of the court in dealing with - and I'll use this so you can take this as an expression in quotation marks, "a certain type of offender" namely, a Tuxedo businessman and a Los Angeles, or should I call him a Hollywood rock star, to be inclined not towards fines to the general revenues of this

province, not towards jail, but towards special relief by way of charitable donations of the accused's own choice.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the Honourable Minister, I would indicate that I take very strong exception to that particular practice on the part of his provincial judges, and I say so on an unreserved basis. I simply feel that it is. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CORRIN: Is this a point of order, or what's the . . .

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order please, if I might. I think the member is aware that the Cumming case that he refers to was prosecuted by the federal Attorney-General's Department. . .

MR. CORRIN: Who cares? We pay their salaries.

MR. MERCIER: . . . that that is clear. With respect to --(Interjection)-- Well, he says, "Who cares? We pay their salaries?" The matter was prosecuted by the federal government under the jurisdiction of the federal Attorney-General. He had an opportunity to appeal if he wished; he didn't. We have no control or jurisdiction with respect to that matter.

With respect to the second matter he raises, the DREE grants, that matter has been appealed by my department and has not yet been heard in the Court of Appeal.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Minister in raising his point of order is missing the point.

First of all, I would remind him that the salaries of provincial judges are indeed a matter under his responsibility. . .

MR. MERCIER: Well, do you cut the salaries?. I don't think the sentences are . . .

MR. CORRIN: We are not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that salaries be cut, as the Minister somewhat facetiously I suppose, indicates, but rather that a directive be made to the provincial court jurisdiction that accused convicted of crimes shall not be allowed the discretion to donate monies in lieu of fines to the general coffers and revenues of this province to charities of their choice, but rather that in order to indemnify the public for the very high expense of criminal prosecution - and we just had the best example I think we have had in many a good year in the Hong Kong case, whereby by conservative estimates, I think it was agreed that the costs may have been as high as between \$13,000 and \$16,000.00. Mr. Chairman, through you, with respect to the Minister, I would indicate, given the fact that the costs of these prosecutions are very high, our judges may not be the best paid members of the judiciary in Canada, but they are certainly paid at a fairly high level. The same, of course, pertains to members of our prosecution staff and all the other members of the judicial system's bureaucracy that serve and service the courts.

So, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is a cost intensive exercise, and in view of the fact that the public deserves to be reimbursed for the great expense it is put to when it has to prosecute people such as these two - and I stress these are just two isolated examples which gained some notoriety in the past few months - I believe that it is incumbent on the Minister to direct provincial judges to assure his ministry and his government that all fines that are levied through that court system are returned to the general revenues of this province in order to indemnify the taxpayers for the costs they are put to to pursue and prosecute people such as Mr. Cummings and the other individual.

Mr. Chairman, when those stories were topical in the newspapers, I remember reading an interview with one of the provincial judges in case, and that individual indicated that it had been his practice to levy these sorts of exemplary sentences for a number of years. He indicated this wasn't an isolated situation, but rather he had been exercising some discretion for a number of years, and he had been allowing people to choose to pay a fine, rather than to the public purse, to a charity of their choice. This, Mr. Chairman, respectfully from my

standpoint, simply seems inequitable. It doesn't seem just that judges should be in a position to make decisions that essentially affect taxpayers. When they give money to charity, it means that you and I, Mr. Chairman, have to pay more money by way of taxes in order to subsidize prosecutions against these people.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, as other members have at various points in debate, and deal with the adequacy of these sorts of dispositions. Whether or not it reflects true justice, I think the Honourable Minister is to be commended for his appeal in the Peitsch case. This is the case involving the Tuxedo businessman and his misappropriated refunds. I think that was imminently good sense to pursue the appeal, and hopefully that individual will be dealt with at least as harshly as the lady who misappropriated the welfare funds for her community recreation facilities.

But, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that, I would like to know whether the Minister is willing to take a thoroughly determined position, well-defined and determined position, relative to the imposition of these sorts of fines.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Leader of the Opposition was listening, and that the official critic of the Attorney-General's Department was listening, and the members of the news media were listening, because the Member for Wellington has just put forward a most astounding position. A couple of years ago, Mr. Chairman, and on numerous occasions since then, there has been much discussion about the independence of the judiciary, a concept with which I agree, and we have tried to govern ourselves by. And now the Member for Wellington is suggesting that if I don't like a particular sentence of a judge, I should issue an instruction or a directive to provincial judges, telling them not to do that. He refers to one particular case which is not within our jurisdiction, but a federal government prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, if that principle were to be accepted, it could be extended so radically to completely erode the total independence of the judiciary, on the assumption that it's not too easy to imagine a situation where, if that principle is accepted, the Attorney-General would direct a particular disposition of any case to a judge. And I hope that the Member for Wellington was not suggesting that; but he certainly implied very strongly, Mr. Chairman, a real intrusion into the independence of the judiciary.

If the Attorney-General's Department is not satisfied with the disposition of a matter by a judge, the proper and only recourse is to appeal that decision to a superior court. It is most improper, I would suggest, for the Attorney-General to issue a directive to the provincial judges in this case, as the Member for Wellington suggests, directing them not to do, or to do something, in the area of sentencing. I think that would be most improper, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere. The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General has, to some extent, distorted what I have said. He has done so because what he effectively does in making his rebuttal, or his policy statement, is found his argument on a fallacious premise. He suggests that I am recommending to him that he erode the independence of the judiciary, and he says that principle is the one which I would ask to be that overwhelming principle which is of paramount importance to me, Mr. Chairman, should be, should be on my recommendation, eroded, on the basis of my statement, and my argument.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that my submission was not a statement in accord with the comments made by the Honourable Attorney-General at all. What I am suggesting is that the judiciary has a responsibility to enforce the law as it is defined in the various legislative enactments which they interpret. But nowhere, Mr. Chairman, absolutely nowhere, Mr. Chairman, is it written in any law that they should have a discretion as to where the fines they levy should go.

Now they have accepted the fact that they have this discretion. I don't know where it's written, maybe they're right. Maybe because it's not written, they can exercise this sort of discretion. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, and even if it were written, the law is wrong. The taxpayers pay the salaries of all the people who prosecute before the courts. The end conclusion of a successful prosecution, if it results in a fine, should be something consistent with the ends of justice from the point of view of the taxpayer too, because that's why we're in the court, to protect the taxpayer and the law-abiding citizen.

And what we're suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister not interfere with the judges' administration of justice. Just remind them who pays their salaries, who it is that provides the fiscal fodder to pursue these criminals, and if in the case such as the Hong Kong case where we spent \$14,000, \$15,000, if in such a case there is a successful prosecution on the part of the Minister's department, we're merely suggesting that the fine that's levied, if a fine is deemed appropriate, should be returned to the provincial coffers.

We don't think that a taxpayer should be forced, in the spirit of restraint - I think my learned friend can accept this and understand this - we don't think that the taxpayer should be forced to subsidize criminals, because that's in effect what is happening. We have a criminal, Burton Cummings is a good example, but there were dozens of other cases, this judge indicated similar disposition, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cummings, or Mr. Peitsch, notwithstanding who it is, if they have to pay three, or five, or \$10,000 fines, should be paying them back to the people of Manitoba, not to the charity of their choice.

Why should Mr. Cummings be able to donate money to the Rock Stars Benevolent Fund? What sense does that make? I don't give a damn, frankly, what Mr. Cummings thinks is worthwhile charity. I don't give a damn what Mr. Peitsch thinks is worthwhile charity. He received some worthwhile charity in the form of DREE proceeds.

And, Mr. Chairman, those people should be instructed by the court to pay their money, like every other good citizen when he comes into traffic court. I'd like to know, how many of us have had a parking ticket, or some other highway traffic violation? How many of us were given the option to contribute the money to the charity of our choice? How many? I don't think that there's a person who's ever had that experience, and I don't see why certain people should be treated exceptionally and differently. And it makes no sense; and if it's an ongoing process in the courts, as was indicated by the judges who handled these cases in the provincial system, then we should undertake to make sure that the money comes back.

It isn't a question of eroding the independence of any judge. We're not suggesting that he or she should not be able to effect justice in a manner that's consistent with the law. We're suggesting that they can implement the legislation on the basis on which it's written, but when that concludes, that rightfully the money should come back to the public purse.

And I don't see, Mr. Chairman, why the Honourable Minister sneers at that, and scoffs at it, and suddenly he's raising the spectre of eroding the role of the judiciary. That's with respect, Mr. Chairman, specious, that that sort of line of argument is only rhetoric, and it's only obscurantism at its best. It does nothing but obfuscate the reality of the situation.

We should not be delegating the handling of public money to appointed officials such as the judiciary are. They are not elected to deal with public funds; we are. We should be the responsible agents for the receipt and expenditure of public funds.

As I said, there's no reason if Hong Kong would have been successful, and a fine of \$15,000 levied against one of the convicted accused, that the \$15,000 that we spent shouldn't have come back here to the benefit of the taxpayer. There is no reason. And if we did that, Mr. Chairman, if we stopped being penny-wise and pound-foolish, then some of these Estimates, we'd have more money for the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and Manitoba Legal Aid, and we would better be able to indemnify ourself to the continuing expense that the people of our society are put to in the protection of their rights and liberties, vis-a-vis the criminal element.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would recommend this very strongly to the Honourable Attorney-General. I don't think that he need worry about such matters. I think he'd be best to concern himself, as other Ministers do, with the public purse.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the member's explanation of his previous remarks.

I still don't think it would even be proper to remind them who pays their salaries, implying a threat as to the amount of those salaries to be paid, depending on their kinds of sentences.

But, with respect to the Cummings case, again which was a federal prosecution, there was not a sentence in that particular case, as I recollect it. It was quite unusual.

As I recollect, the charges were not proceeded with, prior to which Mr. Cummings made a \$1,000 contribution to some organization. So fact, in that case, there was no sentence by a provincial judge.

And, with respect to the second matter, as I've indicated, that matter is under appeal.

MR. CORRIN: I know that the Member for Rossmere has a question and the time is short. I just want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that the judges, when discussing this matter with the press, indicated that these were not exemplary circumstances; that they had been following this practice over a number of years on the basis of their own discretion; and that it was a fairly routine matter in the provincial justice system.

So, notwithstanding that I may have used bad examples - and they were topical examples, and that's why they come to mind - the point is that it is a practice in the courts, one which we are aware of, and I'm asking the Attorney-General to take measures - if he doesn't wish to, that's fine - somebody one day presumably will. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dealing with that matter of the judges' discretion and the fettering of that discretion, that of course happens all the time. I certainly would agree with the Attorney-General, that it would be improper for him to go and have discussions with the judges and say, "This is how we want you to sentence", and that type of thing.

But, it is done all the time with our law. Surely we are fettering a judge's discretion when we say that, for a certain type of crime, he cannot put a person away into jail for longer than six years. Or, when we tell a judge, "You can't fine somebody more than \$1,000 for a specific offence", surely we are fettering a judge's discretion in that type of a circumstance.

And there is nothing wrong with passing a law that says a judge doesn't have the right to have an accused person pay a sum of money to his particular favourite charity or political party, or any other cause that the judge may happen to be espousing at that particular time. There is nothing wrong with that.

To suggest that somehow we're fettering a judge's discretion by passing a law that says that you are not allowed that type of sentencing; again we're not fettering a judge's discretion.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Member for Rossmere that that's fine. Judges are there to uphold the law. But there's a difference between a law and a direction, or a conversation, or a telephone call, from the Attorney-General . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order. The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks - and I think Hansard will attest - I did indicate that it could be done optionally on either basis. I didn't suggest that there be a clandestine call to a particular judge. I suggested that there could either be a general discussion with the judiciary, through their counsel or association, and there could be some clarification on this point or there could be legislative reform, both of which are within the purview of the Honourable Minister. That's my point of order. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we spent a considerable amount of time yesterday listening to the Member for Wellington explain his concerns about the rights and liberties of all citizens and upholding their rights and liberties. I agree with the Member for Rossmere. It's fine to pass a law to limit the judges' discretion, because they're there to uphold the law and to pass sentence in accordance with the law. But there is a significant difference, one which I do not accept, in the Member for Wellington's comment, that I should issue an instruction through a conversation or even through a meeting with provincial judges. If we are going to give instructions, that should be done through the law, through passing some legislation, not through a mere meeting or directive

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

from any attorney-general to provincial judges. Something like that should be and has to be processed through the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the exchange and I must say that I have mixed feelings. I agree and disagree with both members. I think that what started it all, is the Attorney-General said, well, it was a federal prosecutor that did the work and we can't do anything about it, and I think that's definitely the wrong attitude. If he is responsible for justice here in Manitoba, it doesn't matter under whose jurisdiction, I think that he's got to see whoever he has to see to make sure that it is done. Now I certainly would not agree that he should go and tell a judge and remind him of who is paying him and how much he's getting and so on. I think that would be ridiculous, and I think that if I was the judge I'd blow the whistle fast too, if that was the case. That's very dangerous. But I agree with the Member for Rossmere that something should be done.

Now another thing that I disagree with my colleague from Wellington, is the question of money. I don't think that the Attorney-General's department - they're there to try to get people to obey the law, and you've got different penalties, and to me they're penalties. I hope the hell were not going to start finding out how much money we can get under this department. Definitely the cost should be by the people that are committing the acts, but there is a limit, and I certainly would not want a steadfast rule that you can't do any of these things at all. I think in certain cases it might be. I know some people that dealt with juveniles, the case that they had, to repay certain damage they've done, to order them to take a paper route and turn the money over to the people that they had wronged. But the thing that is very important - first of all, it's a penalty - but the most important thing also is that justice be the same for all. That to me is the big point.

I think the Member for Wellington certainly has a case. The Member for Inkster has been repeatedly standing up in the House until he practically forced the government to do something about it. You know, you can steal a loaf of bread, and they throw the book at you; other people, because they're in a different position, they get away with murder. I think that's the most important thing, and I think that's what the Member for Wellington started to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1)--pass; 5.(c)(2)--pass; The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I'm now leaving the Chair for Private Member's Hour.

SUPPLY - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): Members of the committee, come to order. Page 69, Resolution 91, 3. Manpower Division, 3.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Just give me a second, Mr. Chairman, until I get the books open at the right page. The Manpower Division, Mr. Chairman, conducts research on manpower requirements, labour marketing conditions, manpower program evaluation and other matters of concern to the department. It co-ordinates and participates in inter-governmental negotiations and other activities relating to manpower and immigration policies and programs; facilitates through the administration of the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, the development of persons to the level of skilled tradesmen; provides training, counselling and relocation assistance to special needs' individuals to improve their access to employment and/or trades training; develops and implements job training, job creation and job placement activities for youth.

The section that we're first dealing with is the Research Branch. The Research Branch is responsible for conducting studies and providing information in support of effective planning management policies in the labour and manpower areas. The branch has a complement of 15 regular status SMYs consisting of a director of eleven research officers and three administrative support staff.

During the past year, the major accomplishments of the branch were identification of training needs and critical skills' shortages, development of labour market information to support career counselling, analyzing expansion of information on the labour market outcomes of training, reports of major provisions and working conditions in Manitoba collective agreements, and over the next 12 months we are expecting research to give particular emphasis to the following areas of priority concern:

Program evaluation, information systems' development - the research branch is presently commencing a comprehensive review of all manpower division programs. The aim of this work is to develop management information systems to enable program performance to be assessed, thereby enhancing effective management.

The number of staff, Mr. Chairman, last year there were 14 and this year there are 15.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, since this Manpower Division section of the Minister's department is the first one we've dealt with that has a considerable number of items that relate to the Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement, and since the Minister has indicated that there is a comprehensive review being done by the specific section under way now, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the annual review, like for last year's administration of the NORTHLANDS Agreement which, as I understand it, in the past has reviewed each program section, whether that review was completed last fall and whether that NORTHLANDS review will be made available to members of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I would suggest, with respect, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister responsible for the NORTHLANDS Agreement as such, which is the Minister of Northern Affairs, could more precisely answer that particular question.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would take it upon himself to see if that information is available, because I think that he was the Minister responsible, in fact at the time when the review would have been done, would have been completed, and also it will help us in our consideration of this section of this department, because there are a number of items that would have been reviewed and evaluated in that report. So I wonder if the Minister would give us some commitment to see if that report has been done and if it would be available to us.

MR. MacMASTER: It's been several months since I was Minister of Northern Affairs. I'm sure the Department of Northern Affairs is reviewing, and in fact, preparing for future negotiations on the NORTHLANDS Agreement as such. I am in the reverse position now that I was a year ago where in fact, those type of questions that the member is asking, I answered for all of NORTHLANDS, and now departments, like now I'm in a position of using a portion of it as it relates to my programming. I can give the assurance to the member that I will contact the Minister of Northern Affairs and assure him that they are preparing, I know, as I'm sure he knows that they are preparing to sit down with the federal government and discuss a new type or an ongoing type or some new approach to the NORTHLANDS Agreement. I think that's really what his concern is and that's a very legitimate one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, in a similar vein, I wonder if the comprehensive review that the Minister stated is under way at this time, whether any information on that comprehensive review if he'll be able to make any of that available to the House as we go through these sections of his department.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: We have several documents that have been produced which I'm - I don't whether its the Member for Churchill or I guess the Member for The

Pas is asking the questions. They can certainly share them if they'd just take them across to them. It's some documents that the research department has put out, not necessarily towards the member's question but to give him an idea of the major provisions and negotiating working conditions in the Manitoba Collective Agreements, Manitoba Community Colleges follow up survey of the 1978 Diploma Certificate and short course graduate surveyed in the summer of 1979, outlook of job opportunities by major occupational groups, handbook on labour market experiences of community college graduates. Those are some of the type of research projects that we've put out, and I have a sample of a program, an individual program type review that we will be - the type of document that we hope to put out on the majority of programs as this format is put together and as we get into other programs.

I'd like to pass over to the member the first one that we have finalized, and then we'll be getting into others along this same line, so we can use this as a sample. This is the assessment of the 1979-80 volunteers in public service programs. It's the type of thing that we hope to put out every year, full of statistics, names, numbers, people, the whole situation.

I believe the Member for Churchill last year was on several occasions asking for different types of assessments of programming and this is a sample of the type of thing that we'll be putting out as the months go on, on all our programming. This is the first one that we have. I suppose that should go to the Member for Churchill. He was the one that was previously asking for that kind of thing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I see that both the Member for The Pas and myself, and of course, many others on this side have our work cut out for us this evening before we go into these Estimates tomorrow in trying to acquaint ourselves with some of the materials in the bundle that we just received from the Minister.

I'd ask the Minister because the subject is rather timely, to break into the Manpower Division at this time is a bit of a fortune that we had not anticipated in respect that the unemployment figures in the labour force statistics that came out yesterday were of such importance to the province, that we welcome any opportunity to discuss them in detail. And I would ask the Minister by way of breaking into the subject, what research this research department is doing in regard to analysing the trends, the labour trends, analysing the potentiality for bringing these people that have been taken out of the labour market, put on unemployment or welfare, bringing them back into the labour market, just what sort of long-term strategies that his department is trying or attempting to devise to deal with this very serious problem.

MR. MacMASTER: The member will find, Mr. Chairman, as we go through the Manpower Division that there are several new approaches that we're taking to training, in industrial training and apprenticeship training. The figures, yesterday, though they were certainly up from the previous month, they were identical to what they were last year and they were the best that they had been, in fact, in four years. They certainly weren't a substantial jump from year over year as they were from, I think it was '75 to '76 or thereabouts. 5.8 certainly isn't anything that we're pleased with, but considering the middle of winter, it's not totally unexpected that unemployment would rise.

As we go through this particular division, you will find under training and development in many of the other manpower areas, some of the approaches that we're making to the federal government on apprenticeship programming and seating in the universities or the community colleges. I think the members will be reasonably pleased with some of the information that will be given them.

MR. COWAN: This, Mr. Chairperson, was an argument that we heard in the question period, tomorrow, that we're dealing with a one-month period, a January-February rise in the unemployment. One would expect it because of winter months. One cannot take and isolate a one-month rise and say that that is indicative of a trend. As a matter of fact, the First Minister said, "No, we must have three or four months before we can start to determine trends." But if one examines the figures very carefully, and I'm going to have to question the statement the Minister just made, when he said that these figures aren't as bad as the changes that

were taking place between '75 and '76, or '76 and '77, or '74 and '75 for that matter. It doesn't really matter because I can tell you, and I have the figures before me, Mr. Chairperson, that this increase in the actual number of unemployed, this 6,000 people added to the unemployment rolls, taken out of the labour force, the employed force - they're still in the labour force, but taken out of the employed statistics and placed into the unemployed statistics is indicative of some major dislocations in the economy. That there was never in the past 14 years, which is as far back as my figures go and I'm certain we can go back further and find the same situation exists, but without having the figures before me, I would be hesitant to do that, but there was never in a one-month period, such as that, from January to February, using those figures, a 6,000 person increase in the number of unemployed.

As a matter of fact, if we want to go through the figures: '78, there was a 1,000 increase; '77, there was a 2,000 increase; '76, there was a 4,000 decrease in the number of unemployed; in other words, the numbers actually went down February over January; '75, no increase, no decrease; '74, a 2,000 worker decrease; '73, no increase; '72, a 2,000 worker decrease; '71, a 2,000 worker increase; '70, a 1,000 worker increase; '69, 1,000 down; '68, 1,000 down; '67, the same; '66, 1,000 up. In other words, we're dealing in areas of 1,000 and 2,000 except in the year of '76, when it was a 4,000 worker decrease. Now, those are actual figures, we're not using a seasonally adjusted basis here. The Minister says that he likes to use the seasonally adjusted basis, so we can do exactly the same process. We can go back, and because these are statistics that are in the past, we are afforded the luxury of, assuming that they're somewhat correct, that over the long-term they would prove to be basically correct. And we can go back and we can see this year on a seasonally adjusted basis, the number of unemployed in February increased by 5,000 over January. That's what the figures show us, the latest figures that have come out. We can go back the same way, and I won't go through all the numbers, but the largest increase in any period, February or January period, was 3,000 in the past 14 years.

So what we have here is a situation that is far out of proportion with what had existed previously, and that's just taking one segment of the figures. We know when we talk about the employed, that there are 6,000 less employed in February than were in January. We know that on a seasonally adjusted basis there are 5,000 less employed. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairperson, if we do it the other way, and we can do it the other way also, we can say well, how does February of 1980 compare with February of 1979? The Minister just told us, using the unemployment rate, using one figure out of a series to try to explain the situation.

The Minister just told us that there is no real cause for alarm. But if we look at it from a different perspective, using 1979 and 80 figures for the month of February, we find that in actuality there are only 1,000 more workers employed in February of 1980 than there were in 1979, and that is out of whack with what had happened previously in other years. That is not indicative of what one would expect in other years, Mr. Chairman. So it is not only tragic in human terms, but statistically it is significant, the changes that we have experienced. We are experiencing an no-growth situation.

As a matter of fact, if we use seasonally adjusted figures, which we can, if the Minister prefers to use those, February 1979 compared to February 1980, what we see is that there are 1,000 less workers on a seasonally adjusted basis working this year of February as opposed to working last year of February. That is significant. It is not only significant statistically, as I said, but it is significant to the people who cannot find the jobs, people who are coming on to the labour force, because there are increases in the labour force, that there are significant increases, and these people are not being able to find jobs.

If we look at the labour force statistics, we see that January over February, there were on an actual basis 2,000 more people entered the labour force. And yet we see the number of employed dropped by 6,000. This all compounds upon itself and upon itself and upon itself and upon itself until the situation becomes almost synergistic, and by that I mean one occurrence coupled with another occurrence has an impact far greater than either those two occurrences alone or added together, it's where your whole equals more than the sum of your parts. I'm glad I got that right. Sometimes I use that example and I don't quite get it right, but this time I did. That too, is significant, that I have finally been able to provide that in the proper order. But that aside, notwithstanding.

What we do find, that while there are less people employed, we would expect to find more people unemployed, and that's exactly what we find. We find that February 1979 over February 1980, there are 1,000 more unemployed, whether you look at it from a seasonal or an actual basis.

As a matter of fact, and here's . . . I'm going to be very careful to preface my remarks here and to point out that what I'm doing statistically right now is not exactly kosher, that it is not exactly the way one would want to deal with statistics, but I want to make the point, and I will leave it up to the honourable members and others who are listening, to determine whether or not the point was worth making and to try to extrapolate the inferences that I believe are inherent in what I had to say.

But if you compare October 1977 over February 1980 on a unadjusted basis, you will find that there are 12,000 more unemployed people today than there were when that government took power. Now let me point blank, and point out that October and February are not months that you can actually compare because of the discrepancies in the work available to people because of the seasonal nature of our economy. So you can't really compare October and February on a one-to-one statistical basis like that. You have to do it on a seasonally adjusted basis, and that makes the figures a little bit different.

But it does not matter to one of those 12,000, or to any of those 12,000 persons, that they are a statistical anomaly. The fact is, there are 12,000 more people unemployed today than there were when the government took office. And that is significant, because this government's claim to fame has been their tremendous job creation record. And how much better they were than us from 1974 to 1979, or from 1976 to 1978, or from 1973 to 1977. I mean, they've mixed the figures up so much, as I said before, it's like watching someone at a rummage sale, finger through all the clothes, and fit the statistics that fit them best, take them and wear them out as a brand new wardrobe, and leave the rest behind. And we have to assume that from that they have drawn an accurate picture of what actually happened, and they have not; they have not painted the whole picture.

I don't want to go through that again. I went through that in my reply to the Throne debate. I think the points that we made then are still pertinent points. I think they are even more significant in light of the latest unemployment statistics. But the fact is, there are 12,000 more unemployed.

If we use seasonally adjusted levels, then we're only talking about 1,000 more unemployed. So even if we do try to iron out the discrepancies that are due to the seasonal nature of employment in this province, this country, any country for that matter, we still find that there are more unemployed today than there were when the government took office. Statistically, there is 1,000. Actually, there are 12,000.

On the number of unemployed, February over January, it is the largest onemonth increase since at least 1966. That's as far back as my numbers go. But there is something else in these figures that we must consider be significant. And if we take the First Minister at his word when he tells us that the one-month figures don't mean anything, that there has to be a trend, and then he says, three to four months would be what we would consider a trend. If we look at the last three to four months, Mr. Chairperson, we find that the number of unemployed in this province have been increasing steadily in the last three months. As a matter of fact, in November, on a seasonally adjusted basis, there were 22,000. In December, it stayed the same; there were 22,000. In January, there were 23,000, and in February, there were 28,000. So what we are seeing in fact is not a one-month anomaly, but we are seeing a trend, and that's what the First Minister tells us what we must look for; that's what the Minister tells us what we must look for. And when we look for it, we see that it actually does appear before us, that there is a trend, that the conditions are worsening on a month-by-month basis.

Mr. Chairperson, that brings us to the unemployment rate. We saw the unemployment rate increase on a seasonally adjusted basis by one percent, February over January for the year 1980. In other words, in the past month, those 6,000 more unemployed have translated themselves into percentage terms, a quantity that is equal to one percent, a one percent rise. And the Minister tells us again, we would expect a rise in unemployment in the month February over January. That is perfectly natural. Well, I am not saying that it follows any natural laws, that there should be more people unemployed in February than in January. I am saying that if you don't try to attempt to take some control over the economic environment, that that will naturally follow. And that is why we have programs

that are intended to bring people on stream at different times and take people off stream at different times, to try to smooth out the boom and bust cycle. But regardless of that, the fact is that that 1 percent increase in one month, on a seasonally adjusted basis, is greater than any other increase, February over January figures going back again to 1966, at least 1966. It may go back further, I'm not certain because I don't have those figures available. But I think the 14-year period is enough of a period on which to base some conclusions and to make some observations. So on a seasonally adjusted basis, it is the largest February over January increase since at least 1966.

As a matter of fact, in four of those years, Mr. Chairperson, there was no increase at all, so 4 of the past 14, there has been no increase; in 3 of those years, all occurring under an NDP administration, Mr. Chairperson, there has actually been a decrease using seasonally adjusted figures. So 7 out of 14, there has either been no increase or there has been a decrease. So I don't see how it follows that we have to anticipate and accept an increase in February over January. The statistics show us that we don't, that we have an even chance, a 50-50 split that it may not happen. And it won't happen if we are able to rest some control of the economic circumstances, but that again is another debate for another committee or another time during this House.

Let us look at the employment rate on an actual basis. We've looked at the seasonally adjusted levels first out of deference to the Minister who prefers to use those, and I can agree with him that they are appropriate figures to use at certain times, because they do tend to try to smooth out dislocations in the employment picture that are perhaps not indicative of long-term trends but are only symptomatic of short-term problems that occur on a regular basis.

But let's look at the actual levels. It increased, Mr. Chairperson, in January, from January to February, from 5.9 percent in January to 7.1 percent in February; greater than it was in this month last year, which was 7 percent. So it's increased not only month over month, but year over year on an actual basis, Mr. Chairperson. That figure also is significant in its magnitude. Again, one could say, well, you're going to see that sort of an increase, January over February, and I think statistically, if I can make a quick computation, in only 5 of those 14 years have we seen an increase in the actual unemployment rate, February over January. So statistically, one would expect it not to increase.

The argument I'm trying to make becomes somewhat obscure at this point, but the point that has to be made is that we do not have to have that jump in the number of unemployed. Actually, we can have a decrease, and we have more cases than not in the last 14 years had such a decrease. But the 1.2 percent increase is the largest increase of any increase, February over January, in the last 14 years. So our February-January figures 1980 are again the largest increase in at least 14 years, perhaps more. Also the largest in Canada. So if we add another dimension into the picture, Mr. Chairperson, what we have is increases that are out of tune with what has happened historically in this province and are also out of tune with what is happening in the rest of the country. When the Minister says, and I forget which Minister it was, but one of the Ministers during the Throne Debate said that, we in Manitoba are bucking the trends, that we're on an upswing when everyone else is on a downswing. Well, we are bucking the trend but it's a flip flop. We're bucking the trend because we're on a downswing, when not everyone else is on a downswing, Mr. Chairperson. So the figures are serious, indeed.

I know I have a tendency to get lost in those statistics, to overuse them, but I think we have to be aware - I think the Research Department has to be aware of just what it is we face. We face an abnormal situation in this province right now. It is a trend, it is a deteriorating trend, the figures are bad, the figures are awesomely bad, the figures are terrible, Mr. Chairperson. They are inexcusable. There is no reason for them, they do not have to be, there is no natural law and don't let anyone try to convince you that there is a natural law that says that February is going to be worse than January. It is not the case. It does not have to happen, it may well happen, and it may well happen in spite of everything any government tries to do. I'm not saying that these sort of occurrences can be avoided in 100 percent of all the cases. I'm not saying that a government can always put its affairs together in such a way as to avoid these sort of employment dislocations. That is not the case. No government, no matter how capable it is, no matter what philosophy it brings to its office, no matter how skilled its personnel are can avoid these sort of occurrences from time to time. But when they do represent a trend, when this government does have reign

over a province that is bucking the natural trend, the national trend, by performing worse in all instances than the other provinces, by performing worse than the NDP did under - if you take their 9-year average - and we can throw those statistics back and forth. I'm certain we will but the facts are, nonetheless, that we are in serious trouble. And what compounds the seriousness of the situation, Mr. Chairperson, is not that we have that sort of unemployment, is not that we have a 1.2 percent increase, because we're not talking about statistics when we get it down to the bare bones debate. We're talking about people, we're talking about people.

But the seriousness of the situation is, the synergistic effect that this government has in the situation is their inability to cope with the situation, because they have on ideological blinkers that say we cannot interfere with the economic order of the day. Laissez-faire attitudes towards the unemployed, and when you have a government that treats the unemployed and the situations that create unemployment in a laissez-faire manner, usually you have, Mr. Chairperson, a government that compounds the problem. That there are ways of dealing with unemployment, that there are ways of dealing with slow growth and no growth, which is the situation that we face in this province today. But they are ways that one must think out in advance, one must analyse, one must have a commitment to and then one must, most important of all, after they have put forward a program, they must put that program into action. No good to anyone sitting as a position paper on some Minister's desk, no matter what it does, absolutely useless, worthless, not worth the paper it's written on until it is put into action. And no matter what their staff tells them, I know, and you know, and the people know because we have the experience of the past nearly three years now to guide us, that that government is going to do nothing of any significance to deal with the problems that occurring, not only in Manitoba but throughout the industrialized western society today, throughout the world today. This is a global problem we face, Mr. Chairperson. I'm not trying to minimize the Manitoba situation by saying that. I'm just trying to clarify the situation. It's, serious here but it's also serious everywhere else.

And there are governments that are trying to deal with it in a positive way. There are governments that are trying to develop programs and policies that will enable them to have some effect to forestall some of the disastrous impacts that this high level of unemployment will have on a society. Because it is going to, Mr. Chairperson, it is going to permeate its way throughout the entire social economic order.

When you have these types of increases in unemployment, when you have the large numbers of unemployed that we have today, you are going to find that your whole system is strained. You are going to find that you will start to see splits. You will see more cases of cirrhosis of the liver. And two or three years ago in this House, I gave a debate on that, I explained some of the work that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had done in the United States, in analyzing the impact of a 1 percent increase in the unemployment rate. And they found invariably, that two or three years down the road, there were significant changes in the society; that using a 32 or 33-year period could be attributed directly to an increase in unemployment. Because when people are out of work, they experience all sorts of problems. And those problems manifest themselves in the society at large.

So, you are going to see more people with cirrhosis of the liver in a couple of years being admitted to the hospitals because of the inaction of this government. You are going to see that, unless something happens that changes the situation around. Why are they going to be there, Mr. Chairperson? They're going to be there because they turned to alcohol. Why do they turn to alcohol, Mr. Chairperson? They turn to alcohol because of the frustrations that they are experiencing. Why are they experiencing frustrations, Mr. Chairperson? They are experiencing frustrations because the government that sits on that side of the House refuses to do anything of significance to deal with the economic situation of the day.

You are going to find more people suffering from heart attacks, statistically, but again we're talking about people. That is the case. Why? Because there is strain that comes with being unemployed. There are family strains. You are going to find more marital breakdowns, more people not being able to hold their families together because of unemployment. Those are the type of social impacts that we're going to feel because of this. And the list goes on and on and on. As a matter

of fact, if you want a microcosm of it, if you want to look at it in a situation where it is very easy to pinpoint some of the social implications of high unemployment rates, you just go up north.

And the Minister has been in some of the reserve and Metis communities, and some of the industrial communities too, that have suffered through high unemployment rates for long periods of time. And you have increased social problems. In many respects, Mr. Chairperson, you have third world conditions - conditions that exist nowhere else in this country, nowhere else in the industrial, western world except in isolated pockets of poverty, poverty that is created by lack of opportunity to work. And we will discuss that throughout this Session. We will have more to say on that, because that is another area of great failing of this government, Mr. Chairperson.

There are certain areas where governments that come to office with certain philosophies are less capable of performing efficiently and effectively than other areas. One is the Workplace Safety and Health, Mr. Chairperson. We'll talk more about that at another time. But that is an area of great failing of this government.

Another area of great failing is exactly what we're talking about today - their job creation policies. Their job creation policies are not what they would have us believe they are. They are not doing the job that I would anticipate that they had hoped they would do. There are areas where we see Manitoba falling farther and farther and farther behind in relationship to its record of previous years, and in relationship to what is happening in other provinces; a couple of areas of great failings.

The north is another area of great failing, and we will discuss that under the Northern Estimates; we will discuss it under other Estimates. And I'm not so certain that the government, or our government, or any government, can adequately deal with the problems that northern Manitoba faces in regards to unemployment. As a matter of fact, let me make that statement even stronger if I can, Mr. Chairperson. I am certain, that no government can completely deal with all the problems that northerners face. But, at the same time, I am equally as certain that government is not doing all that it can. And all you can ask of a government to do in any area is all that it can, all that you can ask of an individual is that they do their best. And they are not doing their best. They are not doing all that they can. And that is why, in Winnipeg, we see the high levels of unemployment. That is why in, Red Sucker Lake, God's Lake Narrows, Brochet, Lac Brochet, we see the high levels of unemployment.

That is why we see those conditions not getting better but getting worse, and that is a tragedy. The tragedy is not that this government in two years, or two--and-a-half years, has not been able to correct the injustices of 100 years. We weren't able to do it in nine years. We tried, but we bloody well did our best. We gave it our best shot. And I think that the people in the north know that. I think that the people here know that. And I think that's why we see the levels of frustration percolating and bubbling outside of this House. I think that's why we see the conditions that are there.

But having said that, Mr. Chairperson - I know my time is short - having said that, I can only encourage the Minister to make the most effective use of this research department to deal with what has come to be an extremely significant set of statistics that have been presented to this province just as of yesterday.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(1)(a)--pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, while we are on the Research section, I have a few questions for the Minister. One would relate to some questions that were asked yesterday in another section, but may be more aptly asked here, and that is in regards to what is called industrial democracy or placing of workers on boards of corporations. And I know it was talked about in terms of boards of Crown corporations under the previous government, although no final action was taken before 1977. I wonder if there is any research being done in that regard, and whether any thrust is being given to that particular area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I explained last night some of the directions that were taken, and the precise question that the member has asked, and the answer is no.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could share with us his opinion, or his view, of that approach to increasing worker involvement and that approach to hopefully improving labour-management relationships, whether he sees any validity in that particular approach, or whether he has dismissed that approach as a possibility.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I think the question was directed to research. If a research in that particular direction, then the answer was no. I have gone into substantial detail in the last few days of the approaches that we're making in other areas but not the precise approach that the member is talking about, and I don't really think we should be philosophizing why we're not doing that. I have, at great length, gone into some of the directions that we're going, particularly through the Cam McLean committee, and we spent I don't know how long in the House here going over some of the things we are attempting to do in that particular direction.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to push this matter with the Minister. It is an option that has been tried in other jurisdictions and in some cases found to be a practical and worthwhile approach, and it appears that the Minister has totally dismissed it as a possibility, and has decided to take other avenues or other approaches.

I wonder if this research section, Mr. Chairman, did any planning, or any feasibility studies or any research into the location of fire-training facilities that are scheduled for northern Manitoba, where the best location would be for that kind of facility, and whether there were existing facilities already in some locations that might have been expanded to use for the Minister's thrust in this area.

MR. MacMASTER: No, they didn't, Mr. Chairman. The request has come for the City of Thompson quite some time ago, and that is being presently reviewed and discussed with the City Council.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would then undertake to have the facilities already existing at The Pas looked at and see if they might be worthwhile to use his research in that area, to avoid any duplication of services available in northern Manitoba.

The other question, Mr. Chairman, is in relation to employment and to the complex problem of job opportunities in employment, especially in northern Manitoba. And the statistics tell us in terms of . . . I'll ask the Minister specifically if his research department has available to it the statistics of the welfare roles, that is, the number of unemployed employables on the welfare roles for northern Manitoba, whether his department looks at those figures in terms of their planning for new programs and policy development.

MR. MacMASTER: I would think the Department of Health would deal with that on a provincial, and certainly the federal Department of Health would have those figures. I don't precisely have them.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is within this section been any effort to make some guesstimates at the provincial level in terms of unemployment rates. I know that's a federal responsibility and the Minister and I exchanged some questions and answers yesterday in terms of the treaty Indian still being left out of the unemployment figures. But does this section of his department, or does he have any information as to the statistics, as to the unemployment rates on reserves, and therefore the realistic unemployment rates in northern Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: No, I don't, Mr. Chairman, but the Member for The Pas is aware that I have had communications with the federal government in relationship to them establishing those figures. And if, in fact, they wanted some assistance from our particular department, we are more than willing to co-operate with them in any way, shape or form, to attempt to establish what those true figures are.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I assume that this section would be the one that would have that responsibility. I know that, at times, we've had figures

for remote communities, Indian Metis communities, and the more remote communities, figures of anywhere to 35 percent unemployment to 75 percent, to even 90 percent unemployment in some communities. And I wonder if this is the only section of government that might have that information now, and if not, where else might we find that information.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I've heard those figures bandied around also, and certainly, in some cases there is some validity, and in other cases it is certainly questionable. But my department is not in the business of taking unemployment statistics. I have said, and I repeat, that when and if we can convince the federal government that that's a meaningful exercise - and I think it is - then we're prepared to assist them to the best of our ability in establishing those figures. But no, we don't. I guess it's as straightforward as possible. We're just not in the business of doing that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the Minister, and I am surprised at some of the answers. I gather from what he is saying that the Department of Health, as he indicated, is actually Community Services, would be more knowledgeable with regard to where the pockets of unemployment are, what their numbers might be, and so on, and I don't doubt that that is the department where the statistics are kept.

But since this Minister is responsible for research on manpower requirements, the labour market conditions and manpower programs, then surely even though the statistics are kept somewhere else, isn't it his responsibility and really the responsibilities of this particular division and its research program, to look at those statistics and try to develop programs to meet the problem wherever it exists; whether it's a 35 percent unemployment; whether it's a 90 percent or whether it's just a straight under-employment?

Isn't it the responsibility of that department to look at these figures and say, "We have a problem here. We have a high under-employment. We have a high under-employment, but we have to come up with some sort of programs, whether they be manpower retraining; or what sort of jobs can be created in this area, whether it be a very small area or a section of Manitoba?"

To simply say, well, we can be consulted and we stand ready to be consulted by the Department of Community Services, just isn't enough. I think the onus is on this department and on this research group to say, here is a problem, what are we going to do about it? What sort of programs can we develop? What sort of ideas can we come up with to meet the problem, to try to modify the impact of the problem? As I say, whether it be in training, whether it be in job creation, whether it be in the programs which can help create jobs.

As I understand it, and in reading the description of this particular division, that the research department certainly is charged with that kind of responsibility. Now unless I'm wrong in my concept of what they're doing, and I would like to hear from the Minister if I am wrong, that in fact they have to address themselves to the problems of manpower; whether that manpower is already working or whether that manpower is sitting idle.

It's their job, as the Department of Labour and Manpower, to devise new programs, come up with ideas to give to government, to make it possible for government to take whatever action is necessary to reduce the impact of unemployment, whether it be on a permanent or a transitory, but at least some attempt to ameliorate the unemployment that exists in certain areas.

The Member for The Pas mentioned northern Manitoba, and we know that there are pockets of unemployment there which are serious. And whether it's 80 or 90 or 60 percent, really is not the point.

The point is, isn't the research department addressing itself to this problem? And is it working to explore plans, programs, ideas whereby the government could address itself to the question of under-employment or unemployment in some of these areas, so that the government can then introduce programs to meet head-on this pressing problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Abe Kovnats): The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a good amount of information comes in through a variety of departments, which we in fact pass on to a provincial body called "The Manpower Needs Committee" and it's combined of provincial people and federal people who do, in fact, assess the needs of various areas and the needs of various industries.

That is an ongoing thing that we're consistently working at, and some of the findings and some of the situations we've encountered, some of the objectives come up underneath the next predictor section, the Federal-Provincial Training Agreement, which we discussed with the federal government in relationship to the various programs and training that has been put in place.

There are a host of departments that deal with job creation type of programs and have funds available for a variety of needs of people in various areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about the Manpower Needs Committee. Sure, I'm aware that the Manpower Needs Committee exists and that they work with the federal people to plan out the programs that are being offered at the community colleges and other training programs, and there's hopefully a real working relationship whereby some of these programs can be developed. But that's straight training.

I'm going beyond straight training. The Minister says they consult and they get a feedback from industry as to what kind of people they need in order to fill their needs within an industry, and this is fed to the Manpower Needs Committee, and if programs aren't offered, they're started up, or the programs that now exist in community colleges are expanded to meet a particular need. That I understand, and that's really quite simple.

If a perceived need is not being met, it can be met by either on-the-job training or community college training, and both levels of government proceed to support it. It's cranked up, and then down the line you hopefully graduate enough people to fill these jobs, which usually happens. Unfortunately you graduate enough, plus a few extras, and it's the extras that can't find a place. But be that as it may.

I'm more concerned where there is no immediate need by private industry, where in fact things are sluggish and people are sitting idle or under-employed. Then I ask the Minister, what is his research department doing, to say to the Minister, it isn't really a question of training people for unfilled jobs in this instance, there's not enough activity going on. And say to the Minister, in our opinion there has to be activity created and the government can do it by launching certain programs. Is this taking place in that division? Is the Minister addressing himself that way to the problem that the Member for The Pas brought up?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, just if I can refer to some of the things that the Manpower Needs Committee does. It's not just training requirements and training needs. They deal also with programs and services. They talk about placement and counselling, and the wheat program, and the outreach programs and nuclear programs; they discuss a whole bunch of the types of things and the needs that the member is specifically talking about.

They also discuss at that time, or during the course of their meetings, forecasting and program and services' review, and they analyze some of the things that they have been doing and if there is greater need to get into other areas. Those are the kinds of things that the Manpower Needs Committee do in fact discuss, and when we get to that section in the Estimates we have suggested to the federal government and worked out a different formula and a different working relationship for the Manpower Needs Committee to take into consideration some of the things that the member has talked about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. This particular section and the specific subject matter under consideration in the area of manpower, in the area of unemployment and in the area of pockets of unemployment, or what's called structural unemployment, I think is the area of the worst failure of the Provincial Conservative Government.

Because what we have, Mr. Chairman, is over a number of years programs developed to begin to deal with that historical problem, going back for a long time, when communities had to depend upon their natural resources to sustain themselves, and with the increasing population and the decline in the natural resources, the inability of communities then to survive economically and to have employment for people.

And, Mr. Chairman, this cuts across and affects all the departments, or most of the departments, of government. As I mentioned earlier, we now have in northern Manitoba the highest number of unemployed employables in receipt of welfare, which is a direct waste, Mr. Chairman, of resources, of provincial tax dollars, when people could be productively employed and are now unemployed and in receipt of welfare.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is aware of, but unwilling to do anything about the fact, that with this structural unemployment and with the high unemployment in the remote areas of Manitoba - and some of the rural areas face the same situation; some of the reserves and Métis communities in rural Manitoba face a very similar situation to the northern people - and, Mr. Chairperson, what has happened is, not only has there been no new programs undertaken, no new initiatives undertaken, no new opportunities created, but programs that were in existence, opportunities that were available have been done away with. And, Mr. Chairman, this is the most regressive, retrogressive action of the Conservative Government of Manitoba and the most destructive policy or program that has taken place under this administration, in my opinion.

The First Minister and the Minister of Labour are quite willing to talk about make-work programs, and, Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with him that make-work programs are not the very best solution to the problem. But I would urge the members opposite to consider the fact that make-work programs are better than having people on welfare, because the destructiveness that takes place on welfare - my colleague for Churchill mentioned the alcohol problem - there are numerous problems associated that cost the taxpayers of Manitoba a lot more money than in fact some of the job creation activities or subsidization of economic development was costing the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Because as the Member for Churchill said, when you have somebody out of work, then there's all kinds of other social problems. You have the increased use and abuse of alcohol. And one of the outcomes of that is the increased use of the court system, the increased use of jails, the increased use of hospitals, the increased requirement to fly RCMP in and out of various communities, an increase in the suicide rate, an increase in mental and physical illness in these communities.

Mr. Chairman, when this government came to office, the situation was not ideal, not perfect, but progress was being made. For the first time in many communities there was an enthusiasm and excitement for the fact that (1) they could have some determination of their own destiny, and (2) that they were able to support themselves and support their families.

The Minister of Resources is in the House; he's the one that's now getting it, and, in most cases, Mr. Chairperson, he deserves it. But he's the one that's now getting it, because all the pressure is falling back. Because there are no other employment opportunities, the pressure is falling back on the fishing industry and the trapping industry, so all the pressure is there now.

So in a community where you, let's say, had 40 fishermen before and 40 people in some other kind of employment, now you have 80 people trying to get into the fishery. The same thing with the trapping, the pressure is on the trapping right now. And there is a question as to how much pressure those resources can take.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone back, we've regressed at least 10 years, if not more, because that's what happened before, that the pressure was on the fishing or trapping. It could no longer support all the people in remote communities, and other kinds of employment were sought.

The Department of Resources was heavily involved in terms of using the lumber resource, the forestry resource in northern Manitoba, and opportunities were created there at the local level, often using local kinds of companies, through fencepost cutting, through pulpwood cutting, through furniture manufacturing, through all kinds of opportunities that the communities were ready and willing to take advantage of; the government was able to give some small assistance, and in the long run saved the taxpayer of the province of Manitoba money, in terms of taking preventive action, creating opportunities, instead of forcing people to be

on welfare, with all the problems that that causes. So we have the situation now, where all the pressure is back on those particular industries, such as the fishing and trapping; and even then, the Minister is trying to change regulations in mid-stream, and that's just not being acceptable to the fishermen of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson, it's very very frustrating to go to a remote community and have people tell you about their present situation, and the situation that is to a large extent, the responsibility of this government; its reduction in programs that benefitted these communities; its doing away with some of the programs in its inability to put anything in place in the programs that were in place in Northern Manitoba. But the people are saying things like - go into a native community, and I can recall just recently a person saying, "You know, lots of people think that we don't want to go to work, there's lots of people say we don't want to go to work. If you told me this afternoon you needed 20 men, I could have 20 men for you tomorrow morning." Mr. Chairperson, that's the situation I found in most of the communities, that people are wanting to have the opportunity to work. People are wanting to have the opportunity to be productive, and that opportunity is just not available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the kind of approach you need is a very comprehensive one, and I'm assuming, since this seems to be the only section of government now dealing with this type of issue, that this is the section of the department that would do the planning in conjunction with the people in local communities to get the kind of development that's needed going. Mr. Chairperson, I think you almost have to do it sort of on an order of priority. That is, if you have people on welfare, as I said, it's better to even have make-work projects than to have people on welfare.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are lots of other opportunities. There were opportunities to have economic development, to have job creation that, in fact, required very little government assistance to survive. We had in a number of communities, a small pulp-cutting operation. Sometimes they would need some financial assistance for purchase of equipment or machinery, or even to the stage of purchasing the chain saws to get the operation going, or some management advice, or some management assistance to provide opportunity in a community.

Mr. Chairperson, this might cost the taxpayer of Manitoba - I can think of one community in my constituency where they received a grant of \$5,000 to get this going. Mr. Chairperson, how many people does it take to use up \$5,000 if they are in receipt of welfare? It doesn't take very long. If you have those people that are cutting pulpwood out of work for two weeks or a month, then you've spent the \$5,000 in terms of welfare payments, instead of having people productively and creatively employed. So that's the kind of situation that we face, those opportunities have now been lost, have now been allowed to fall by the wayside, and an attitude in the communities of real depression or a psychological state where they think, well they can't do anything any more, because they had something going in the past. They were beginning to believe in themselves as people, as individuals, and as a community, that they could do things for themselves, and then we have the withdrawal of any support, or any assistance that was needed and the collapse of a number of these kind of operations. Now, Mr. Chairman, these operations are not always perfect; there is difficulty, and there is effort required, and the government has to be willing to take a risk to do something.

In remote communities and in the Indian-Metis communities, in order to provide this kind of opportunity - and sometimes the project has failed, Mr. Chairperson, and you have to realize that that is going to happen. But rather than take any risk at all, this government has just done away with this kind of program and this kind of project. All we have left is a special ARDA program that was in existence before, which gives assistance to fishermen and trappers, and some for economic development activities, although the way it's structured, that most of those activities are from people outside the particular communities that are carrying those on. And in relation to that, we have the Communities Economic Development Fund, which is basically an interim financier, or to give further assistance to the special ARDA program, and pretty well any other thrust, any other efforts of the province have been done away with.

You had the Department of Mines and Resources, which made a real effort in terms of changing the staff of that department from mere policemen of the resources to resource developers, to help people in the communities develop their own resources. And this is how some of the pulp harvesting, some of the sawmill operations got under way, Mr. Chairperson. But, Mr. Chairperson, that kind of

assistance, that kind of advice and financial backup is no longer available to a number of projects. And so, we're in a very unfortunate situation, where we have - and, Mr. Chairperson, there was some, I suppose, belief on the part of this Minister, on the part of the Conservative government, that somehow somebody else could take over some of those operations, run those operations, and we wouldn't lose the employment available.

And the same kind of thing they're saying, Mr. Chairperson, in regard to McKenzie Seeds. Well, we're not going to ensure that the jobs are still there, we're just going to privatize McKenzie Seeds. And that's what was done, Mr. Chairman, with a number of the small operations up north for providing employment for people in remote communities. We had the housing operation at Cranberry Portage, which was sold off to private industry and operated for about six months or so by private industry and then closed down; and 30 to 40 jobs lost to people in the Wanless-Cranberry Portage communities.

We had, in association with that, a cabinet-making or a Young's Point Plant, as it was called, employing fewer people, Mr. Chairman. But once again, sold off to somebody private, and a very short time thereafter closed down. We have the example of the Mistik Creek loggers, an operation started by the former government, first of all as a training program to train people in the logging industry, and then a self-sustaining logging operation selling the product to ManFor, employing if my recollection serves me correctly, anywhere from between 20 and 40 people depending upon the season and the cut allowable in terms of their sales to ManFor. And again, Mr. Chairperson, the operation sold off to private enterprise, privatized, and a year later closed down, again that job opportunity being lost to people in Northern Manitoba.

We have the example of the Pukatawagan log milling operation. Mr. Chairperson, this was an operation that, in fact, did have to have some subsidy to be viable and some government support in terms of some purchases from that operation. And again, Mr. Chairperson, sold off and then closed down by the people that took over that particular operation. And we have the other operations that were just closed down completely and not even an attempt made to sell them off or get somebody else to run them.

Mr. Chairperson, my favourite example of really of what you'd call mismanagement, or poor planning, or failing to think into the future, was the sale of Minago Construction, a company who, after the assets of that operation were sold, and every possible deduction made after those assets were sold from the profit of that company, every possible deduction made to try and get it as close to zero as possible, the government still ended up with \$300,000 in their pocket. A northern development project that employed people from remote communities in Northern Manitoba, mostly native people, closed down, the assets sold off and \$300,000 going back into general revenue; \$300,000 that could have been used to assist other projects or to allow that project to keep operating. Again, Mr. Chairman, it requires the co-operation between the various departments of government. Mr. Chairman, this Minister and this government has fallen down completely. They have fallen down completely. They have passed over, dismissed, been unconcerned in terms of what happens to the people in the remote communities, because of their failure to take action, because the reduction of the things that were being done in the past and forcing people on to a welfare state.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what other small successes this Minister might have, he has this serious failure, serious failure in Northern Manitoba hanging over his head, and he has to take the responsibility for it. In his previous responsibilities, in this responsibility when he's supposed to do something about manpower, he is the Minister responsible and he is the Minister responsible for the terrible failure and the suffering in Northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 4:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We're now in Private Members' Hour. Proposed Resolutions. Resolution No. 7. Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 - PETROCAN

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Citation No. 415 of Beauséjour, I'm wondering if the Speaker is considering requiring that this motion be separated for the purpose of voting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Until we get the resolution read, we don't know what we're dealing with.

MRS. WESTBURY: I was supposed to say that first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that:

WHEREAS PetroCan is an important organization available to Canadians to develop petroleum resources; and

WHEREAS PetroCan has demonstrated its ability not only to earn commercial profits but also to initiate exploration and development in new oil and natural gas producing areas such as the Labrador Shelf; and

WHEREAS PetroCan is now 100 percent owned by the people of Canada as a Crown corporation; and

WHEREAS PetroCan has the potential to deliver "oil at cost" to consumers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly is of the view that Petrocan should not only remain a 100 percent Crown-owned enterprise but also be expanded:

- (1) to become involved in future tar sands and heavy oil development;
- (2) to become the exclusive importer of oil into Canada, arranging purchases from exporting countries and thereby cutting out "middleman" profits;
- (3) to engage in production, refining and retailing operations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Citation 415 of Beauséjour, I was wondering if the Speaker is intending to require that this be separated for the purpose of voting. I hope that's the correct way to address that question.

MR. SPEAKER: I have had a request from a member that this Resolution be divided, for the purpose of voting and possibly for the purpose of debate, into one or motions. At this particular time, I think perhaps I should take the matter under advisement and perhaps the member can come to me privately and make some suggestions on how they would like to deal with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it's really necessary to take the motion under advisement. The honourable member has a number of procedures which he can utilize during debate, as well as making amendments which would suit her purpose. If the Assembly is prepared to debate the resolution now, I think we should proceed. I cannot see any real technical problems in respect to what the member raises.

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the honourable member is one that probably is worthy of consideration. I am the servant of the House. If there is anyone. . .

The Honourable Member for Brandon East on a point of order.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: It's just further to the point of order made by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Kildonan, and that is that if the Member for Fort Rouge is not too happy with this particular resolution, I believe it's in order for her to amend it at some stage, so you may wish to also consider that as one reason for not postponing the debate on this resolution at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: If I may speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to proceed by way of amendment if one of the honourable members would agree to second my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a valid point in that respect. I think that it should not be too difficult for the honourable member. However, I am still. . . The honourable member has had some indication that. . .

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, would it not facilitate debate if the honourable member proceeds. As I heard the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, she said she wanted to know whether it would be separated for the purpose of voting. We aren't at that stage and will not likely get there today. Between now and then, she will be able to find out whether she can get it amended or else speak to the question just before the vote is taken.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable to the honourable member?

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy for debate to proceed. I take it that you will be ruling on the matter of Citation 415 before the vote is taken?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If debate is allowed to proceed; once debate is started, I have no opportunity after that to change the wording of the resolution.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that you can't change the wording of the resolution but the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge said - and I haven't checked the Citation - that you could separate it for the purpose of voting, immediately before the vote is taken. And if you can do that, then your consideration as to whether you should do it could proceed after the debate. I am not certain of her suggestion that that can be done, but if it can be done for the purpose of voting then you wouldn't have to make that ruling until the vote came.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are any further words of wisdom, I would appreciate them at this time. However, if there is no serious problem with that respect, I feel sure the honourable member can probably find someone to second an amendment purely for the purpose of raising an amendment for debate at a later stage. On that basis, I will allow the debate to proceed at this time.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without question, this resolution, as it pertains to the existence and future of PetroCan, the national oil company, owned and operated by the people of Canada, without question, this is one of the most vital elements that we have today, as Canadians, in formulating a truly national oil policy in our country. It's but one element of a national energy policy, I admit, but nevertheless, it is critical. There is no question, Mr.

Speaker, that the security of crude oil supply in Canada is today our number one energy problem.

A great deal has been said about the energy crisis but when we examine the situation in Canada, we must observe that we are indeed very fortunate inasmuch as we are blessed with a great deal of natural gas resources. So much so that we seem to be able to afford an exportation of around 40 percent or more of our known resources, or at least 40 percent on an annual basis of what we estimate to be our availability of natural gas. And also we have many many supplies of coal, not only in Alberta, not only in Nova Scotia, but indeed our sister province to the west of us, Saskatchewan, I understand has a supply of soft coal which, at the present rate of consumption, would last the consumers of that coal for a thousand years or more. So indeed we are blessed with much in the way of coal resources; British Columbia as well.

And indeed, as we in this province are well aware of, we are endowed with a great deal of hydro-electricity, and of course it's true of developments in Ontario. Ontario is well supplied with electricity and certainly Quebec has developed very recently and is developing the James Bay project. So we are relatively secure in the supply of gas, coal, and electricity.

Where we cannot be sure however, Mr. Speaker, is the future supply of crude oil. Whether we would have enough crude oil to meet our needs from domestic resources in the future is something of a great question mark, particularly at a time when foreign crude oil supplies are becoming increasingly expensive and when their continued availability cannot be guaranteed because of international events.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that today Canada imports close to 20 percent of its particular crude oil requirements and by 1990, according to present trends and unless vigorous steps are taken on energy conservation I presume, it is projected that Canada will need to import about 40 percent of its requirements. So, Mr. Speaker, this is a fast-developing serious situation, and particularly when we remind ourselves that crude oil is very vital for motor vehicle transportation.

Given our dependence on foreign crude oil in the future and the prospects that we could be cut off from world supplies for political and other reasons, our oil supply is becoming increasingly vulnerable. And I suggest that we need early action and decisive action in Canada if we are to achieve this self-sufficiency in crude oil. And such action, Mr. Speaker, must be based on an integrated economic and industrial initiative, not only by the private sector and individuals but also by all levels of government.

And I think therefore, this is where PetroCan fits in in a very very important way. PetroCan has the ability to help us achieve this self-sufficiency. There is an enormous job that has to be done and I am sure that PetroCan is that one instrument that can enable us to ensure this additional supply in the future. It is supplementing the job that's being done by the private sector and in fact it has taken risks where the private sector has been reluctant to become involved. And I believe it did take the initiative in the Labrador Explorations and if it wasn't for PetroCan perhaps there wouldn't be the developments that are now occurring in the Labrador shelf today.

PetroCanada Limited can and should, along with existing companies, play a leadership role in achieving crude oil self-sufficiency in Canada and I believe that it can be obtained with good planning and good management in the years ahead.

And therefore, this resolution, Mr. Speaker, urges the federal government to retain the essential functions of PetroCan as a national petroleum company and indeed to expand PetroCan so that it can be even more effective. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that PetroCan should stay one hundred percent Crown owned. It should become fully integrated from coast to coast, involved in exploration, development, and production, right through to the refining and retailing stage. It should become the exclusive importer of oil into Canada conducting direct country to country deals with the exporting countries and cutting out middlemen where possible.

PetroCan should become heavily involved in future tar sands development, future heavy oil development, to deliver oil at cost or certainly at lower prices to our consumers, eliminating the need to guarantee profits to multi-national corporations to produce oil at world prices.

We say therefore, Mr. Speaker, that PetroCan has a very important role to play in stimulating exploration. We've seen evidence of this and we believe that the existence and strengthened existence of PetroCan in the future will cause even

more exploration to occur. We favor PetroCan as an organization because it enables us to keep more profits from the oil industry in Canada.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one of the great difficulties we have today in terms of the value of the Canadian dollar is that so many dividends and interest payments are now being made in the United States and elsewhere from foreign-owned corporations in this country. And unfortunately, the chickens have come home to roost. The foreign ownership of a great deal of our industry is now having a dampening effect on the value of the Canadian dollar by virtue of this outward flow of dividends and interest payments.

So we say this is one step in helping us to keep profits in Canada. It certainly gives the people of Canada a greater control over the industry in the future developments. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the serious problems we have is simply having insufficient information. Governments have insufficient information to assure themselves that there is adequate and proper development occurring. So it does give the public more information; it gives the public more control.

Certainly we are one of the few countries in Canada where the government plays a very minor role. I would say this is unfortunate. In most countries, the government, through its agencies, through any state corporation, does certainly involve itself more directly in energy development and energy pricing policies and all the economic aspects of oil and other types of energy development. So we are unusual in that respect, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have our government play a relatively minimal role in this area.

I think, in particular, oil has to be treated differently from other types of energy resources and indeed all kinds of resources. It's a matter of national self security; it's a matter of self interest; it's a matter of national security, because of the very vital role that oil plays in the economic life of this nation. So I think it is very fitting that the government of Canada play a more aggressive role in this whole area and I think it's very appropriate therefore that this Legislative Assembly support the idea of an expanded PetroCan and a strengthened PetroCan.

I would hope that members of the Assembly would get up and support this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, as we have laid it before you.

Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, there are many elements to an energy policy and I'm not suggesting that for one moment that this one Resolution, that this one entity, this PetroCan, this Crown-owned enterprise, is the solution to all of our oil supply problems. But I believe it's an important step in that direction.

I would also reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that so often when we talk about the energy crisis we don't appreciate the fact that we are relatively energy-rich in Canada and perhaps particularly the Province of Manitoba, or the Province of Manitoba in co-operation and in conjunction with the other provinces in the prairie region.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps one reason why we're having some difficulty in selling the output of Manitoba Hydro. We have Manitoba Hydro with excess capacity at the present time and we live in a world of increasing energy shortages and it seems to be very much of an anomaly, that here we are in a so-called energy short world and that we're sitting on top of both developed and undeveloped hydro resources.

But when we look at our immediate area, of course, the immediate market area being the prairie region of Canada, we see that we are living in this very very energy rich region of the world. And while I hope that we can sell some of our Hydro electricity to Saskatchewan and Alberta, I have to realize, as I guess all members of this House must realize, that we are looking at potential customers to the west of us, who do have considerable supplies of relatively cheap coal resources: Alberta which has abundant supplies of natural gas and which they can control as well. And indeed, we're looking at, even in the case of oil from refineries, there are certain qualities of oil that come out, heavy oil, bunker oil - I understand that come out of the refineries - that are very suitable for thermal generation and electricity, but of course are not used for the gasoline. This is after the gasoline is produced in the cracking plant.

So there is every indication that Alberta can proceed with the development of electric generation in that province by means of thermal resources; thermal generated electricity as opposed to importing the hydro renewable resource electric energy from Manitoba.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of economics and I guess, provincial self-interest. So I take this opportunity to say that I certainly do hope

that our Manitoba Hydro is successful in exporting hydro electricity to Alberta and perhaps to Saskatchewan. But I am not overly optimistic about the sale prospects, in view of the fact, as I said, of the abundance of energy resources in these sister provinces of ours.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we are talking about an agency, a nation-wide agency, a federal agency, but nevertheless in view of the impending crisis in oil supply - and I think that it's appropriate that this Assembly address itself to this particular issue and make its views known.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the Assembly to support this particular Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to address the motion of the Member for Brandon East, I have to wonder at the purpose of the motion. I think it's obvious to all of us that the issue of PetroCan and its involvement in the energy industry in Canada, is clearly a federal decision, the member made that point, but in going over the point he indicated that in some way we can have some effect on it and I'm not convinced that there is any possibility for us, as a government or as an Assembly, to take a position that is in any way going to change the mind or reinforce the purpose of the federal government, in dealing with PetroCan.

Certainly the government made it a major plank in its recent campaign and certainly I think that there's no doubt as to what its intentions are for PetroCan.

I have to wonder at whether or not we are attempting to, in some way, associate ourselves with a winner, given the results of the recent federal campaign. Take those results and bask in some reflected glory by associating ourselves with a policy that appears to be popular, more or less a "me, too" attitude; gather PetroCan into our bosom immediately and show the people that we support it in all respects because obviously that was one of the things that was put forward as an issue in the federal campaign. And as such, I think it's too broad an issue to be just dealt with in that way.

I think it's one that's probably very much misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. I think that we're being faced with the kind of opportunity to make a decision such as when somebody says, have you stopped beating your wife. If you answer yes, then in some way you acknowledge that you have at some time in the past, engaged in beating your wife. If you answer no, then the implication is, that you intend to continue.

It isn't as simple as that, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that nobody is lulled into that sort of a yes or no answer. Tell us immediately, are you in favour of PetroCan or not? Based on a whole series of preambles, which leads up to a rather questionable premise to begin with.

Similarly, does the motion imply, acceptance or rejection of the motion, imply that we believe that all aspects of PetroCan's current operations are in the best interests of the majority of Canadians? Or, having accepted that there is a role for PetroCan to play and perhaps what many of the things that it has done to date are in the best interests of the majority of Canadians, does it follow directly that by expanding its involvements, it will even better serve the interests of the majority of Canadians?

I think it's a little like saying if an aspirin cures a headache, should we not automatically take two aspirins.

If we acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there is a role for PetroCan to play, if we recognize that any provincial government's position can have little effect on the federal government decision, ultimately with respect to PetroCan, then this is only an indication of conceptual support, for PetroCan. And if that's the case then I think we ought to be very certain as to the concept that we are supporting.

For instance, the Member for Lac du Bonnet in his recent speech to the House, and I'll quote from Hansard lest I be accused of distorting, it said:

"And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind pointing out if it was I that had to make the decision, that I wouldn't need any more than one oil company in Canada and that oil company should be owned by the Canadian people. I have no hesitation whatever, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to you that there should be only one oil company in Canada and it should be owned by the people of this country, to provide a service in the energy field for the people of this country." --(Interjection)-- Yes, one farm, too, yes.

That's the danger, Mr. Speaker, in addressing a motion of this nature. That members from that side may indeed have different concepts as to what we mean by support of PetroCan. And I think it's incumbent upon us to define, very clearly, and to take it apart piece by piece and see just what of the motion is capable of being supported by all of us in the best interests of all Manitobans.

Because it's not a simply motherhood issue. All in favour stand up, do you like or do you not like PetroCan?

If we are talking about a monopolistic situation, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated, then of course that's something that I cannot support, because a monopoly of any sort is not a good situation, even in private business, indeed.

If we are talking about an industry in which two or three giants have the control of the entire industry, then obviously that makes for a great many difficulties, and that can lead as much to inflation as can governments and their expanded spending, no question.

But if on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we're being asked to replace the involvement of two or three giants with an involvement of a total government monopoly, then that's just as bad, if not worse. We have a monster over which we have very little control. --(Interjection)--

We have control once every four years and that isn't enough, I'm afraid. Any business that operates on an analysis and a review once every four years, Mr. Speaker, is certainly nothing that can be supported. --(Interjection)-- Make it three years, to the Member for Inkster.

On the resource development side, let's take a look at part of it. PetroCan's an important organization available to Canadians to develop petroleum resources. Certainly that's something that I think can be supported in large measure. It is an important organization. It's the largest Canadian-owned company in the oil and gas industry in Canada. And the latest figures, the production of crude oil and natural gas liquids amounted to 24 million barrels, making it the seventh largest in Canada; and 144 billion cubic feet of natural gas, the second largest in Canada. So it is an important organization.

The second premise of the motion, Mr. Speaker. PetroCan has demonstrated its ability not only to earn commercial profits but also to initiate exploration development in new oil and natural gas producing areas, such as in the Labrador Shelf.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps in many respects the question of profitability, certainly it has demonstrated in recent times, a profitable situation, but we're at the beginning stages in which PetroCan yet, is operating with facilities and operations that it has merely bought in recent times; and they were profitable prior to being purchased by PetroCan. They have continued to be profitable in the short time in which PetroCan has been involved in the operation.

I think, like any business or any industry, we need a longer time to examine and fully appreciate the ramifications of those government interventions.

About its involvement in exploration and development in the frontier regions of our country, Mr. Speaker. I think we have to examine that in a little more detail.

In all cases, of course, it's been a partner in those activities. It holds a majority interest in the renewed optimism of the Labrador Shelf. It has been responsible for continued exploration on the Nova Scotia Shelf. It's a partner in Chevron's initial Hibernian oil well discovery. In each of those cases it has of course a minority interest and it is involved with other corporate partners.

PetroCanada similarly, is presently a 100 percent Canadian owned corporation. I don't think there's any indication that there's an intention to change that, Mr. Speaker, not on behalf of the present government. --(Interjection)-- No, I'm sorry, but the previous Conservative government in Ottawa had plans to distribute a part of the shares of PetroCan's directly to the Canadians. --(Interjection)-- Would not have changed its Canadian ownership. Would not have changed its Canadian ownership, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to examine the premise that PetroCan has the potential to deliver oil at cost, to consumers. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to examine the premise of whether or not PetroCan has the potential to deliver oil at cost, to Canadians. At what cost? The cost is set currently by federal policy and I don't think there's been any demonstration or of any assurance in the dealings of a country-to-country basis, that the deals benefit the purchaser any more than the producer. --(Interjection)-- At the end of my time, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, I don't think it can be assured, or it has been assured in the past, that on a country-to-country basis there were any more benefits to the purchasers than there were to the producers. --(Interjection)-- What profits?

Okay, let's take a look at some Crown corporations. The post office delivers a service at cost. The CBC delivers a service at cost. What advantage in profits do they return to the taxpayer of Canada? None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. So there's no automatic assumption that can be derived. --(Interjection)-- What is the meaning of delivery at cost? What does it mean to you that the CBC delivers a service at cost? --(Interjection)-- What you know is what it costs the taxpayer in the final analysis. That's exactly what you know about delivering service at cost, when it's a Crown corporation, you have absolutely no control whatsoever.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the areas of PetroCan and its involvement in research and development and exploration, I think we can all acknowledge that there's a role that can and is being played by the involvement of PetroCan.

At the same time as there are private people being involved in the exploration industry, we also know that it's not possible when you're dealing with international companies to direct the areas in which their exploration takes place.

It's also arguable I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that international companies, dealing in the field of exploration and development of new sources of petroleum, may not be able to look at the long term, and the long term and the investment with long-time payouts, may be something that international companies are not prepared to make. Perhaps current pricing policies in Canada do not provide them with enough incentives. So there is a role for PetroCan, as a partner, to direct in exploration in certain areas, frontier areas, and I think it can be argued that PetroCan has had some positive effect in that area.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we're being asked to look - and an obvious one, and one that is mentioned in the Resolution - that PetroCan should become involved in future tar sands and heavy oil development.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to indicate that PetroCan is already heavily involved through ownership in the Syncrude Development, through ownership in the Alsands Development. We are involved in the tar sands and the heavy oil development of this country. And no doubt, Mr. Speaker, given the massive long-term costs that are there, it's a wise move.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, what about its operation in the refining commercial distribution side? I think that's an area that's open to debate. I think that's an area in which all Canadians and all Manitobans would rather have a little more information, would rather ask the question, was it worth the investment of \$1.4 billion, Mr. Speaker, to purchase Pacific Petroleum, to have us involved in competition in every corner service station in this country? I suggest not, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to you that it's a highly competitive field.

There are many many many different retail operations, and they control the costs in the marketplace. They ensure that we get oil and service at the least possible cost, and it's not PetroCan's involvement that can or will determine any more surely that we are going to be getting oil at the lowest possible cost in the Canadian marketplace.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's no more justification for any government involvement in an industry and a marketplace unless the services provided are essential to life, or looked upon as a utility, or unless there isn't fair competition within the marketplace.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to suggest that there is nothing of value in the motion that has been brought before us. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, in examining it, that we can suggest that there are some things that aren't exactly acceptable to all Manitobans, and indeed to the majority of Canadians, and are not in the best interests of the majority of Canadians.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is well for us to support those aspects of the Resolution that are supportable.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland, that the motion be amended by deleting the entire second clause of the preamble and substituting the following:

WHEREAS Petrocan has assisted a private sector in initiating exploration and development in new oil and natural gas-producing areas.

Further, by deleting Clause 4 and replacing with:

WHEREAS PetroCan is involved through joint ventures in future tar sands and heavy oil resource development.

And deleting the balance of the Resolution, in its entirety and replacing with:

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that PetroCan should continue to be operated as a Crown corporation within the framework of the Canadian oil industry, where it can be demonstrated that the operations of PetroCan help to achieve the goal of Canadian energy self-sufficiency through the efficient and economic development and supply of petroleum resources.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member indicated that he was prepared to answer a question at the end of his speech. I would now like to put the question.

If the member believes that the people of Manitoba don't own Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephone System and so on, why does that board report to a committee of this Legislature, in his opinion; and why does his Cabinet, or our Cabinet, the Premier of this province, appoint a board of directors to run those utilities, if he believed that that utility is not owned by the people of Manitoba?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I suggested that in my discussion. I'm not sure where the Member for Lac du Bonnet came up with that assumption.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member indicated that the people of Canada would not own PetroCan; that it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member entering into the debate? Does the honourable member have another question?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes. In the member's comment, to which he indicated he was prepared to answer a question on, he had indicated that the people of this province don't have control of their own utilities. And I simply ask him, if that is the case, why do those utilities report to the people of this province, to the Utilities Committee, and indeed why does the Cabinet appoint a board of directors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, quite to the contrary. I did not say that, and if the member will examine Hansard when it comes out, I said there was a place for government involvement in public utilities.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a copy of the amendment before me, but I hope that perhaps one will be forthcoming.

Naturally, it's going to emasculate the intent of the Resolution as presented by the Member for Brandon East. But this is not unexpected, Mr. Speaker, that such an amendment would be submitted by the government.

Knowing their philosophy, and their hang-ups on anything being done collectively by the people, that is successful, is a no-no as far as the philosophy of this government goes.

The Member for River Heights, in his opening comments, mentioned that the Resolution was, I think he said a "me too". You know, get on the bandwagon now. Get on with a winner. Join the winner, in that the Resolution is supposed to . . . He believes that the Resolution was presented since the election, and I would like to inform the member that the Resolution that was presented by the Member for Brandon East was presented to the Clerk and the Speaker, before the election.

So, I think the Member for River Heights doesn't understand what is taking place in the House, because the Resolution was there before the federal election took place.

Now, another comment that I noted the Member for River Heights mentioned, was that he didn't think this was a provincial matter. It came under federal jurisdiction, and that we as a provincial group did not have any influence in promoting or extending the role of PetroCan and pleading with the federal government, or

recommending that it do so. But I would ask him, what was his leader doing when he suggested, in this House, that he recommended that the price of energy - he recommended to the Clark government - that the price of fuel and the cost of energy rise to the world price as soon as possible? --(Interjection)-- I am saying that he has said that. He is quoted in the press as having said that, and he said it in this House, that the price of energy should rise to the world level as soon as possible. That was his recommendation, Mr. Speaker.

So I ask the Member for River Heights, what was his leader trying to do? He must have had some influence, Mr. Speaker. He must have felt that he had some influence on what was taking place insofar as his statements were concerned. And I presume that being of the same stripe and colour as the federal government at the time, he must have had some influence in formulating policy of the federal government to increase the cost of energy as soon as possible to the world price.

Mr. Speaker, PetroCan, I want to support the - I am not going to support the amendment - but I am going to support the Resolution as presented by the Member for Brandon East.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there are things in our society, in a society such as ours, a mixed economy, where the people can collectively do things better than the private sector. And this has been demonstrated insofar as hydro is concerned, insofar as our education system is concerned, insofar as our health delivery service is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I, for the edification of the Member for Ste. Rose and other members opposite who have made erroneous references to the Premier's statement of the energy pricing conference, read the appropriate text from that statement:

"Because in our view it is unfortunately necessary that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I'm sorry, the member has not got a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, we have demonstrated that we can deliver health services much better collectively than the private sector could. We have demonstrated that we can provide a better education than the private sector can. We have demonstrated that we can provide a road system in our province, in our country, and I am sure that the Minister of Highways will back me up on that; that we have provided a public automobile insurance second to none in Canada, Mr. Speaker, second to none. Not by my statement, Mr. Speaker, but let's take the report from Ontario, the report as tabled by a Conservative government of Ontario, which indicates that we have the most efficient, the best, and the lowest cost insurance in Canada. There are things that we can do collectively much better than the private sector.

Now I have just outlined a few points that will prove what I am saying. There is no getting away from that. I think that PetroCan and the development of resources is another area that we can collectively do things better than fragmentation, duplication, and so on, and I say that PetroCan is a very very important vehicle in the future of this country.

Now PetroCan of course came about because of pressure, by New Democratic Party members in Ottawa, at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal government was in a minority position and needed the support of people like David Lewis and Tommy Douglas in order to provide a responsible government and conduct the affairs of our country. So, lo and behold, Petro Canada came into being as one of the price tags for support from the New Democrats, and we know what the Conservative government was going to do with that. They were intending to dismantle it. Fortunately the people decided to dismantle the Clark government instead.

Mr. Speaker, we have an investment of approximately \$923 million in PetroCan. That was our investment. And I know this bothers the Conservatives because, you know, PetroCan has assets now; that \$923 million has now gone up to \$4.2 billion - \$4.2 billion, Mr. Speaker. And we have now assets valued at \$4.2 billion. So I say to the members opposite that they had better take a broader look, not a narrow-minded blinker tunnel-type vision that we see most of the time coming from

members opposite, and recognize that we have made tremendous advances in providing education collectively, in roads and health services and many other things - in public auto insurance - that we can keep on doing these things where it should be done.

I'm not saying that everything has to be done collectively; I'm not saying that. I'm saying that there are things where it is better for us to do that and this is one of them; this is one of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Tory proposal would have . . . Well, we don't know what their proposal was because we've had so many; we've had so many different proposals. The first proposal was to sell it outright, get rid of it, dismantle it. And then when the heat came on, when the pressure came on, well, they had to modify their position. I don't know . . . I haven't kept tabs on how many times they changed their position but I know they have changed at least two or three times on PetroCan but the last one that I heard of was that individuals retain 30 percent. That was the proposal: retain 30 percent. Individuals would be given 50 percent.

Well, you know, it's nice to receive something that you already own. You suddenly become a capitalist. You become rich. You have just been given something that you already own. How ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, how ludicrous. Twenty percent would be available to the public through a share offering. Mr. Speaker, how many of these shares would end up in . . . Well, I believe they said that three percent would be the maximum that anyone could own. But I say I think we could start a little company here on that side of the House or on this side of the House, whereby we would own quite a block of shares, Mr. Speaker, collectively. We would own quite a block of shares.

I would dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the day after those five shares were given to everybody. I could go down to the pub, Mr. Speaker, and buy up quite a few shares. I could buy up quite a few shares in the pub, Mr. Speaker, for people who needed a few bucks to buy a case of beer. And I am sure the Member for Minnedosa would know that because he goes to the pub once in a while. I thought he went last night, by the way. Listening to him in committee, I thought he had been to the pub during the supper hour.

Mr. Speaker, a horrendous plan. The five shares would be given to every Canadian over eighteen years of age, Mr. Speaker, and individuals still in incubation or still in the mother's womb, I'm not sure they wouldn't be given any shares, but those who are born would, in eighteen years - they would have to wait eighteen years to get their shares, Mr. Speaker, - but anyone born after that would not be entitled to any of those free shares, anyone born after that. And the cost, the commission cost, the distribution cost of distributing these shares, these five shares to these people, all the people who are over eighteen years of age and all those people who would have to wait up to eighteen years to get their shares, would amount to about \$125 million in transfer costs, in commissions and so on, to whoever does those transactions.

So it was a horrendous proposal, Mr. Speaker, but that's the minimum that the Conservatives could live with because they couldn't save face any other way. That was the only way they were able to save face on what they had originally proposed.

Mr. Speaker, we at the present time produce about 1.9 billion barrels of oil per day and, Mr. Speaker, . . . No, Mr. Speaker, I retract that statement; I want to say that we require 1.9 billion barrels per day and that we produce approximately 1.6 billion barrels per day. So we have a shortfall of approximately 300,000 barrels, which is not that great of a shortfall. It's enough; you know, it would be better if we had our entire needs provided by Canada but. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative proposal was that after taxing the Canadians, gouged out of the farmers, gouged out of the fishermen, gouged out of small business, gouged out of industry; after \$90 billion of taxes and ten years down the road, we would be self-sufficient but we would be still importing, according to the Conservatives, 250,000 barrels per day. In other words, all our programs of energy, conservation, and extending pipelines to Quebec City and further east, we would only be advantaged with those programs by 50,000 barrels. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't good enough; it wasn't good enough.

There are ways that we can use PetroCan to improve our position, to become self-sufficient, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that over the years that we should

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

gradually have these foreign companies Canadian owned, whether we have them divest themselves so that this money can remain here, perhaps ten percent per year, and over a period of years that these companies become Canadian owned.

That is the minimum requirement because in five years time, Mr. Speaker, I don't care which government it is, whether it's a Conservative government, a Liberal government, or a New Democratic government, the people will be clamouring that we nationalize those companies. They will be demanding that we do it and we will have no choice but to do it five years from now. Because the transfer of payments out of Canada in dividends will be so massive that it will throw our balance of payments out so badly that we'll have to come to grips with that question.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it's 5:30. Perhaps I could . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The hour being 5:30, when this subject next comes up the honourable member will have three minutes time left.

MR. ADAM: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair, and the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)