

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 19, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I should like to, at this time, table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Government Air Division for the year ending March 31, 1978; and as well the Annual Report for the Department of Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act; and Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster) introduced Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Cultural Affairs concerning the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra. Could the Premier assure the House that representatives of Cultural Affairs and/or the Arts Council will meet as soon as possible, in an attempt to resolve their financial crisis?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable the Acting Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport could better answer my honourable friend's question.

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question asked by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I have spoken this morning with the Chairman of the Manitoba Arts Council, and I have been assured that the Manitoba Arts Council will be working closely with the Symphony over the next short while, to try and develop a fair and reasonable formula for not only continued funding of that particular organization, but also to try and work out a formula for deficit reductions so that the symphony can continue to function in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since the province may be partly responsible for the dire straights of the symphony, I'd like to ask the Minister whether he would be prepared to reevaluate provincial funding which has been frozen for several years due to a restraint program and only provides five percent of the total operating budget.

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

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member has to realize that one of the problems that was facing different arts groups over a number of years was the problems of getting funding at the end of the year for that year's operation. And, what we did several months ago to try and alleviate that particular problem is provided catch-up grants to the different organizations and I think a grant totalling something in the neighbourhood of \$79,000 to the Winnipeg Symphony was one of those groups that was involved. We are undertaking through the Arts Council to meet with these people and to try and establish a proper and equitable formula for funding and as the member knows, I haven't met with them myself but I understand there are several other problems such as — it's a combination of problems dealing with subscriptions to the symphony as well as other funding problems that they've got. So, it's not a straight, simple problem that can be dealt with very readily. We're going to have to sit down with the people and in discussion with them try and work out a reasonable solution.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister, the concert in the park program which provided \$15,000 income for the symphony was cut when he was responsible for the Department of Cultural Affairs. Would he be prepared to recommend the reinstatement of that program to help out the symphony?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the — and we went through this last session — one of the programs funded by the Cultural Affairs Department is summer festivals. It deals with dancing in the park, with the other particular program that the member mentioned. What happened last year is the program wasn't cut, it was somewhat curtailed but there were other groups in the City of Winnipeg that were given the opportunity to perform. The funds for that particular program were established and taken from lottery's funds and the different groups were advised that it was on an interim year to year basis. So, with regards to that particular program, I'd have to take the question as notice and see what the Minister of Cultural Affairs is planning to do with that particular program this year.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. The amount was taken from the lottery fund. The share, the province, the provincial share or the money that belonged to the Manitoba Arts Council is one of the partners, which one?

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

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to clarify this particular program that was mentioned by the Member for Elmwood is aside from the ongoing funding and commitments of the Art Council to the Winnipeg Symphony. It was a program established whereby there were several special events put on during the summer months. It was a special summer festival program and that was taken directly out of lotteries, I think it was in excess of \$100,000 the total particular program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the answer, but he hasn't answered the question. Was that fund taken from the provincial share of the lottery or the share that belongs to the Manitoba Arts Council where they make their own decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. BANMAN: No, this is a special program that was established by the Cultural Affairs Division of that particular component. The money did not come from corporation aid; it came from the profits of the particular lotteries — the provincial portion.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. I would like to ask the minister whether he and his government are prepared to proceed with the expansion of the Assiniboine Community College in the City of Brandon this

year, the expansion, which had been previously planned by the former government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Any expansion or building program, Mr. Speaker, will be discussed during my Estimates.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the Legislature whether there is still a serious problem of overcrowding of both staff and students at the Assiniboine Community College?

MR. COSENS: I cannot advise, Mr. Speaker, on that particular question, whether it is a matter of serious overcrowding or not would be open to some debate. Certainly there has been some need for a new facility in the area of heavy duty mechanics for some time, and whether it is overcrowding that we're talking about, or whether we're talking about a new facility that would better accommodate equipment is another matter.

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister then could apprise himself more thoroughly of the problem and advise the Legislature whether indeed there is truly a problem of shortage of space, one that goes beyond merely the housing of equipment, but a shortage of space for staff and students.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to apprise, not only myself, but the honourable member opposite of that information.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On February 23rd, the Minister of Finance took a series of questions as notice, and I want to acknowledge that he filed what purported to be an answer, which I want to acknowledge, of a memo dated March 5th, by Judge Tritschler, the Commissioner of the Nelson-Churchill River System's Hydro Inquiry. In the light of the fact that Mr. Tritschler replied, and I agree with his statement that it was not appropriate for him to respond to the question in the light of the fact that the Minister of Finance now stated that he did not take the question as notice for other ministers, I would like to address a question to the Honourable, the Minister of Highways to ascertain from him, whether he or to his knowledge any other member of the Conservative Cabinet of 1966-69 has had any interviews with Counsel to the Tritschler Commission, relative to the terms of reference and relative to the policy decisions of his government at that time.

MR. INNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns is, of course, at full liberty to ask any Treasury Bench member as to what his or her particular relationship was with the Tritschler Inquiry. Speaking for myself, I had an occasion to speak to the Commissioner himself, dealing with the matter of being of some assistance in finding out certain Hansard passages that covered that particular period of time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much and thank the Honourable Minister for the forthrightness with which he answered the question although to be exact the question was directed to ask whether he had had any meetings or interviews with Counsel rather than Mr. Tritschler. I'm assuming that by not answering the question as to Counsel that he did not meet with Counsel and he's nodding that that is correct.

So, Mr. Speaker, since he's been forthright in that way I wonder if I could address a question to both — well I guess, to the First Minister who also comes within that category.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in fairness I don't know that the First Minister heard the question I addressed to the Minister of Highways. So then I will address the same question to the First Minister whether he or to his knowledge any other Minister of the Conservative Cabinet of 1966 -69 has had interviews with Counsel to the Tritschler Commission relative to the terms of reference and also, and more specifically, relative to government policy of that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that as notice and make the appropriate enquiries and let my honourable friend have an answer.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to spell out that my question was whether the honourable Minister did or any of his colleagues that he will make the enquiries. May I just point out to him that the Minister of Finance took as notice that same question and responded by filing a letter from Mr. Tritschler saying that it was not appropriate for Mr. Tritschler to respond to the question and I agree absolutely with Mr. Tritschler that it was not for him to respond. I agree with Mr. Tritschler's comment.

MR. LYONS: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to inform myself of the information that my honourable friend has at hand and respond to him in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources, Environmental Management, etc. Could the Minister advise me whether in view of weather conditions since Friday, where there has been a steady and persistent thaw, whether there is now any immediate problems with regard to flooding in the Province of Manitoba and if it's been necessary for his Department and EMO to formulate any plans of an immediate nature with respect to water conditions in the province?

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

HON. BRIAN RANSOM(Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, the most recent information I have was based on the situation as of Friday and at that point there was really not considered to be any significant change from the previous predictions of the Committee but that there is a subsequent report expected on the 22nd and there will be an updating then but I'm advised that at that time it was not considered to be substantially changed from the previous report.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the 22nd is three days away and in further view of the fact that there has been an abrupt, from the point of view of flooding, unfavourable change in weather conditions, does the Minister think it might be of some value to get in touch with his officials to see whether more immediate consideration should be given to the present situation.

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

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with my officials rather constantly on this question over the past couple of weeks, and as the honourable member knows, they have had considerable experience in the flooding and flood-fighting situation in the province over the years, and I'm confident that they are prepared for any eventuality.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that Mr. Justice Tritschler now says that his terms of enquiry extend for Hydro's operation for thirty years, can the First Minister advise whether there is going to be any direct investigation as to whether the decision to proceed with Nelson River development in 1966 was one which came spontaneously from the Board of the Manitoba Hydro, or whether it was not a dictation of the Roblin Conservative Administration?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my honourable friend for not being up-to-date on some of the recent news headlines and so on, as he apparently is. My reflective memory tells me, however, that the 1966 announcement was an announcement that was made after some four or five years of study by Manitoba Hydro. My reflective memory also tells me that, unless I'm mistaken, the capital estimate for the first works on that program were approved unanimously by all of us as members of the House at that time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, indeed since many of the things that my honourable friend has said would apply to programs that followed 1966, and in view of the fact that the Commissioner is supposed to be engaged in determining whether political initiatives preceded the announcements, various ones, and since the Commissioner now says he's going back to 1966, I wonder how the Commissioner can make a decision on these questions without calling as witnesses the very people who were involved in the administration at that time, as he has called witnesses of the people who were involved in the administration after 1966.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend would agree that my honourable friend is enquiring as to a matter of the conduct of the inquiry. The terms of reference as I recall them, and I don't have them in front of me, were such as to give the Commission, in my recollection, full authority to look into any or all aspects of Manitoba Hydro's operations on the Nelson-Churchill River and Lake Winnipeg systems from the beginning, and I'm certain that the Commissioner, when his report comes out, we'll see to what extent he dealt with all of those matters.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then could the First Minister confirm that Mr. Justice Tritschler confirms that he is going back to even dates preceding 1966, and that whatever conclusions he will be making with regard to those years, he will be making them in any event without culling any evidence from the engineers or the politicians who were involved at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. May I suggest to the honourable member that if he checks Beauchesne, Section 360, No. 3, some further limitation should be generally understood. A question may not seek information about proceedings in a committee which has not yet made its report to the House."

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister advise whether or not any consideration is being given by his department to the possibility of expropriating the golf course at Winnipeg Beach and adding it to the existing park facilities there?

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

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: A question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise whether or not he has received or his department has received the report from Keith Knox pertaining to the difficulties being encountered within the department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can advise that I have not yet received a report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Labour. In light of the recent events at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation in Flin Flon, can the Minister confirm that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in the United States has determined that exposure to lead has profoundly adverse effects on the course of reproduction in both males and females, and has recommendations that both male and female workers who plan families not be subjected to conditions that would result in lead-in-blood levels higher than 30 milligrams per litre of whole blood?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Labour, I'll be glad to take that question as notice.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister then. While he is undertaking to take that as notice, can he also ask the Minister to confirm that OSHA has further stated that if the intent of the OSHA standard is to protect workers from reproductive effects, adverse reproductive effects, there is still no justification for treating women separately from men at smelter

operations?

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that as well.

MR. COWAN: Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Human Rights Act. In light of the fact that the record conclusively indicates that there is little justification for singling out women of child-bearing age for removal from workplaces where lead exposure is a problem, is the Minister prepared to investigate the practice of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation, the practice of them discriminating against women at that operation by refusing to employ women of child-bearing age in the smelter or, worse yet, to encourage such employees to undergo sterilization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if there were to be an investigation, the investigation would be done by the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a fourth question.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister prepared to recommend that such an investigation take place, in light of the new evidence that has been presented today?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, an investigation can be commenced upon complaint of any individual, including the Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a fifth question.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. A question to the individual responsible for the Human Rights Act. As an individual responsible for that Act, is the Minister prepared to initiate such investigations or cause to have such investigations initiated by that department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received any complaints from any members of the public which I could refer to the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a sixth question.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then prepared to accept the comments today given to him before this House during the Question Period as a complaint, and therefore to initiate such investigations?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the member's concern is. If he has a complaint, he can submit it to the Human Rights Commission as any other member of the public and he could have done that earlier this morning and not wasted the valuable time that has expired between then and now.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister Reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System. Has the Minister had the opportunity to read the interim report from the Tritschler Commission dealing with Manitoba Hydro's rate increase applications to the Public Utilities Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Responsible for MPIC.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm assuming the Minister will read it because it has some relevance to the Manitoba Telephone System.

I'd like to ask the Minister whether he is satisfied that it is proper to treat applications for rate increases differently from the two major Crown Corporations in that MTS has to submit its applications to the Public Utilities Board while Hydro does not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Responsible for the Public Utilities Board.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that there always has been a difference in the manner in which the Telephone System has been submitting its rates to the Public Utilities Board for approval and those of the Manitoba Hydro.

MR. WALDING: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am aware of what the Minister says has been the practice for some time. I am asking the Minister whether he is satisfied with this practice, whether he should discuss the matter with the Minister Reporting for Hydro to satisfy themselves whether the two utilities should be treated differently and if so, why?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, reverting to the member's first question relative to the interim report of the Tritschler Commission, certainly those observations will be considered and where any matters of policy relative to the present manner in which rates are submitted by Crown corporations is considered, then the government will make their decisions known.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I direct my question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, the people of Snow Lake, and there's 2,500 of us, we really appreciate the new hospital. Although you will never know the underplay to get this hospital built. Someday I'll fill you in. One disturbing fact about this hospital Mr. Minister, is there's no facilities for child births and Snow Lake has many, many Conservatives there who are natural breeders as per your leader and child birth is. . . Now, Mr. Minister, if you're going to go with your caucus policy, I think the least you can do is remedy this absurd situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I'm with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon on that. I am surprised, to say the least, that that should be the impression that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon has about the new Snow Lake Hospital. It may well be that there are not two physicians engaged yet and as he knows under the College of Physicians and Surgeons Practises and Procedures, there has to be more than one physician available for obstetrics but that would be the only roadblock in the way. The hospital is designed to accommodate maternity cases.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Government House Leader. In light of the Attorney-General's concern about not wasting valuable time of the House, would he explain to his colleagues on the Treasury Bench the meaning of the motion to go into Committee of Supply and assure the House that henceforth other business of any Minister whose Estimates may be debated will not take precedence over business of the Committee of Supply?

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

MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On March 13th I addressed a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources in regards to the status of the Fairford Dam. I wonder if he has that information at this time?

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

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the release has been 1,000 cfs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to follow up the question that was asked by the Member for Burrows which I understand the silence of the House Leader on. Does the House Leader consider it conducive to the business of the House that a Minister who is before a Committee of Supply would consider holding a press conference during the time when he is before Committee of Supply or wouldn't the press conference be held at other hours when his Estimates are not being considered?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the situation that my honourable friend is referring to, so I am not able to comment on it.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the House Leader would then confer with the Minister of Finance, whose Estimates were before Committee of Supply on Friday afternoon, who attended at his Estimates Friday morning some twenty minutes late because he had scheduled a press conference at that time? And, Mr. Speaker, while the House Leader is considering that —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, if he didn't call a press conference, he gave it as an excuse to the Members of the Committee that he was at a press conference at that time. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House Leader to get an explanation with regard to that because I can't regard the Minister of Finance as doing that. He'll merely challenge me to a fight in the hall.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Education —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on a question of privilege or order?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK: It's a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The member, I realize, is referring to an interruption, what he says an interruption of twenty minutes last week' presumably was on the way between here and the Estimates room to which I was somewhat late, but they refer to a press conference. Certainly I never called a press conference, Mr. Speaker, there was no press statement issued. I simply tabled a report that was supplied through me as the Minister to which the report would normally be handed and I was asked questions about it and I was somewhat late for the Committee. There's some substantial difference, Mr. Speaker and I think it requires a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that what he was doing was providing an explanation rather than a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on the question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege I must say that it was not in any hallway that the meeting took place. It was in the room across the hall here and there was quite a group there so that the point of privilege should be — Now, of course, I may also be invited out into the hall, but I take my chance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for St. Johns he didn't have a point of privilege either. The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish the impression to be left that it would be two against one. I wish to put a question to the Minister of Education. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll try for the third time to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Following the questions which were raised last week relative to the City of Winnipeg School Board, would the Minister, again, look into his budget to see whether he can provide moneys for the City of Winnipeg School Board so that the Chairman of the School Board, Mrs. Myrna Spivak's invitation, "Let them go to camp where they will eat cake," will be fulfilled by having money from the Provincial Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Will the Minister of Education confirm that he has received complaints, protests from parents within the Evergreen School Division pertaining to a program called Building the Pieces Together?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I've had letters in that regard. That's quite correct.

MR. PAWLEY: Will the Minister confirm that he caused the discontinuance of the promotion of that program by his colleague, the Minister of Health, without consulting first with the Evergreen School Division?

MR. COSENS: No, I cannot confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister indicating to the House that he had discussions with the Evergreen School Division and/or its officials prior to advising the parents that protested to him that the program would no longer be promoted by the government?

MR. COSENS: At no time did I have any discussions with that particular school board, Mr. Speaker. That program falls under the jurisdiction that my colleague, the Minister of Health. Any letters I wrote in reply to parents of the school division in question stated that this was not a program of the Department of Education. It was within the jurisdiction of that particular school division to treat it as supplementary material. If they wished to have it in their school courses, they might, if they chose not to that was their decision.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm that on January 8th of this year that he did, in fact, write to a parent that was protesting the program advising them that the program will not longer be promoted by the government and furthermore the copy of that letter was sent to the First Minister without any consultation, without any copy of that letter being forwarded to the Evergreen School Division?

MR. COSENS: Quite correct, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health advised me that the program was not being promoted, that the material was available for school divisions who wish to use it in much the same way as various other government publications are available to those who wish to use them.

MR. PAWLEY: Will the Minister confirm that this program, in fact, was launched as a result of joint action, promotion of the program, as a result of joint action on the part of both his government and the Evergreen School Division.

MR. COSENS: I am not aware of what government was promoting it, Mr. Speaker. The program was launched long before we came into government, as I understand, I'm not aware of what Department's may have promoted it at that particular time.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister then advise the House as to why he advised one Edward J. Isfeld, January 8th, under whose jurisdiction this program falls, that you've been assured that there would be no longer any further promotion of this program.

MR. COSENS: Very simply again, Mr. Speaker, because I had been advised by the Minister of Health that his Department was not going to promote it further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition for the sixth question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I question to the Attorney-General. In view of the questions posed to him earlier by the Member for Churchill, can the member indicate why he will not refer the complaint referred to by the Member for Churchill to the Human Rights Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member that his question is repetitive.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I was under the assumption that the Member for Churchill had the capability to write a letter to the Human Rights Commission. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks I am erroneous in arriving at that assumption then could perhaps I take it up with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Is the First Minister prepared to continue to develop policy directions as suggested by Professor Ruben Bellan in the conference on the economy this weekend held by the NDP Caucus wherein Professor Bellan has suggested the government should increase spending on job creation and more importantly, provide tax incentives for private enterprise to do the same?

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was not invited to the particular conference to which my honourable friend makes reference. Even if I had received the courtesy of an invitation, Sir, I couldn't have attended it. But I noticed with some interest the comments in today's newspaper by Professor Bellan to the effect that governments should be providing tax incentives to the private sector and encouraging employment creation programs. The fact that we have been doing both of those things over the last eighteen months and the fact that our unemployment rate is one percent lower in Manitoba than it was a year ago, perhaps bears out some of the wisdom at least in what Professor Bellan is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister and I would like to ask the First Minister, in view of recent advertisements in newspapers by Manitoba Data Services Limited, inviting applications for new positions in that company, which I believe is an agency under the Manitoba Telephone System, can the First Minister advise the House whether there is now a change in the philosophy on the part of the government with respect to the operation of public enterprises?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Speech from The Throne has already made reference to the fact that a new Act will be introduced to the House and that will be the appropriate time in which information will be furnished to the House.

MR. EVANS: Well, can either the First Minister or the Minister of Government Services advise whether the Manitoba Data Services is a public utility or whether it is an enterprise engaged in a competitive business.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Manitoba Data Services is a agency of the Manitoba Telephone System. Shortly there will be a new Act which will be introduced into this House.

MR. EVANS: Well, would the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, advise the House whether he is acknowledging that there is some value in having a publicly owned enterprise engage in a competitive industry?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to acknowledge many things and I would ask the honourable member to await the legislation at which time he will have the opportunity along with myself for a very full-fledged debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The hour for question period having expired. The Honourable

Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the business of the House. Is it the intention of the Honourable House Leader to have Municipal Affairs start in Room 254, because we would prefer that it didn't until tomorrow, and just deal with Health today.

If the Minister insists that he wants us to continue, we'll do our best.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have just received a nodded assent from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that tomorrow is satisfactory — or tonight, if that's all right.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it would be preferable tomorrow. We did indicate that we would prefer Government Services, and the Minister is now back. I'm not suggesting that he . . . okay, we'll go with Municipal Affairs, and Government Services to follow Municipal Affairs.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 46 in the main Estimates. We are on Resolution No. 63, Administrative Services, (d) Program Review and Evaluation (1) Salaries—pass; (2) Other Expenditures — the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a minute to maybe inform the House, or the Minister of Mines, I believe, who said this Dettal Plan was not in the north. Well, the Minister of Mines contradicted the Minister of Health and said there was no plan, as such, in the north.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we had this plan in Flin Flon, that was the point of the north when we introduced this plan, and it was introduced in Flin Flon, and I'm happy to say the parents were very very happy with that plan. The children, of course, as happy as they could be with any dental plan. And who was unhappy? The only people who were unhappy were the dentists, and in my honest opinion, the dentists only second to the doctors in their mercenary demands. So, it was a vicious circle. They got their way, somehow, to crucify this plan.

And the Minister of Mines he says quite frankly, there's no dental plan in the north. It's the same way with the mines; he doesn't know there's any mines in the north. But what I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, turning back — and someone used this in the Throne Speech — you would not turn your back on the people of Manitoba. They turned their backs on those people; people who were at the head of plans, and they were deprived for many many years and at last they got something that was valuable, they put it down the drain.

I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman, don't turn your back on any Conservative, because Walter Weir and the Member for Lakeside, are still bleeding from wounds by turning their backs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WILSON PARASIUKE: Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to have the Minister comment on whether he will release the technical reports done by his Department, presumably by this group, on the health centres that are presently being reviewed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if you can put a proposal, and it's put sincerely, to the Official Opposition critic and his colleagues at this stage of the Estimates, and if it doesn't meet with their approval, that's entirely acceptable, but let me propose it anyway.

Obviously, there is a legitimate and a sincerely held desire to debate, on the part of the opposition, a wide number of programs in place in the Department of Health and Community Services, under this heading of Program Review and Evaluation. I don't quarrel with that; I have raised my side of the argument, and I assume it's entitled to as much consideration as the other side of the argument, but I don't suggest that it's necessarily entitled to any more consideration. I would ask, though, that if we're going to do that, if we're going to debate programs under this Section of Program Review and Evaluation, whether the official Opposition critic and his colleagues would consider deferring this particular item, moving through other sections of the Estimates, coming back to Program Review and Evaluation in a few days' time, or even a week's time, because we are, at the present time — and I want to draw the attention of the Honourable Member for Transcona to this — in the course of meetings with the community health centres and their Boards. I don't know that any particular purpose is to be achieved by our debating the Community Health Centres' question at this point in the Estimates, when I can't provide definitive answers as to the final conclusions.

When I do want to continue and complete the meetings that we're having with the Community Health Centre Boards, I give my honourable friends opposite an undertaking that there will be no decisions made until they've had an opportunity to debate the question in this Committee, and to advise me of what the opposition's approach to community health centres is, and indeed other programs. If they want to debate Pharmacare, the Children's Dental Health program under this heading, then I think we should come back to it, because otherwise I'm not going to be able to give them definitive answers at this juncture on the Community Health Centres' question. We're still meeting with the Community Health Centres, and we will just go through hours and hours of nonproductive debate on questions that I am not in a position to answer today.

As far as the Honourable Member for Transcona's request with respect to that particular material, I repeat what I said before, that it's in-house material, and I would not be tabling it. However, I will say to him, I've taken it under consideration. I will reconsider that decision.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Minister's request, and I don't doubt the sincerity, and I certainly want to co-operate with him, I know how difficult it is if you jump all over the place, especially in a department such as his, but there might be some misunderstanding. There is no doubt that we — and I mean the House — we were out of order. Not only were we not going along with the intent of this, but definitely out of order last Friday when we even discussed the Department of Highways. There's no doubt in my mind. I don't know if you've noticed, though, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister — I'm addressing these remarks to the Minister also — that we are not trying to hold back or get some explanation for every single line. Now what we're doing is, we're interested in some programs and we're not going to delay the work of the committee. But our attitude and our strategy at this point is, we feel that this is one of the most important lines there are, there and so far, although we've repeated — and I'm not going to ask the same question again, I've asked it three times and maybe during the Minister's salary we will come back to it — but, the point we want to know is how they plan, how this government plans? Where they get this information? When do they decide if it's costs first and needs after?

And now my honourable friend, I think, was very, very clear. He did not say that he wanted to discuss the Community Committees. Not more than I originally when I had given an example of the dental program. But we want to know — the question was a good one, and this is where it should be asked — my honourable friend from Transcona wanted to know if this report, if this evaluation, if we can share this with the Minister. The Minister initially said that this is an in-House document, I don't intend to, and he has the right to say that. You know, the public might not think this is good, but he certainly has the right to do it. Now, and I thank him for it, he wants to have another look, and it might be that he will let us have this copy.

But I don't know if my honourable friend understands how difficult it is. If we don't ask that now, when we get to the programs we're going to say, how did you evaluate that? And he says, well, evaluation was under 2(d), and that's finished. We passed that. Or if we ask for a report or an evaluation, a study or the result of an evaluation, and if we get it the same day, if while we're up talking about a certain program, we get a document, it doesn't give us much time to read it.

I think my honourable friend will accept this: let's say that we're going to try as much as possible to refrain from going into any programs that are listed on future pages. But we are still, as far

as I'm concerned, unless something is said that reminds me of something, or that I object to, I'm finished with this clause. But if somebody wants to know more about the evaluation, and my honourable friend from Transcona just said, could we have it? And we feel that it should be under thss. So, I think that I can speak for our group, we will try, and we ask you to bring us back if we go too far, as long as you do it for both sides, and we will discuss this when the line comes in. For instance, the dental program, there's a line on that, that's where we should

discuss it. But we are just talking about the way the evaluations are done, who are doing it? If this isn't done, if we feel that there's not enough evaluation, we might suggest that maybe the Minister should hire more people, and so on. But we're trying to get the policy and see how this is done. This is all we're trying to get under this line. I hope this will satisfy the Minister. I can tell him that we will not go and start talking about community clinics at this time, just about the evaluation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand that. I was concerned with the question raised by the Honourable Member for Transcona. And what I am prepared to say is that I certainly concede the right of the opposition to have that debate before any decision is made. Funding for field services for community health centres comes under 3.(t) on Page 50. That will give us time to go through some more meetings with the community health centres that we're going through. And I assure him again that I have taken his request under advisement, and I will give him an answer on it tomorrow if he's prepared to debate community health centres at that point.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, no, Mr. Chairman, we would not necessarily want to debate that as soon as we get the answer. When we come to (t). But we appreciate that we will get the answer before we come to (t) probably, because I doubt if we'll go that far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (d)—pass.

(e) Vital Statistics: (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (e)—pass.

(f) Library, Film and Publication Services: (1) Salaries— pass. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to clarify, because in comparing these estimates with last year, this is a new description, or a new category, a new heading, referred to as Library, Films and Publications Services, which is different than apparently it was last year. How does this relate — you know, the printed estimates last year didn't have this. There was a much larger amount for perhaps a larger scope of work, and so I'm wondering, will the Minister explain this new breakdown and why it was broken down and how this can be related to the expenditures last year? I'm guessing that on Page 48 (g) Health Education might be part of it, but as I say, I'm just guessing. I ask the Minister to clarify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's assumption is correct that this component, Library, Films and Publication Services was, in the past, grouped together with Health Education. We broke it out this year into a separate, identifiable branch and appropriation. It separates it from the professional resource component of health education as such, and defines a specific delivery system here. But in previous years they were grouped together.

MR. MILLER: I thank the Minister for the explanation. So this provides the reference library, film service, audiovisual resources, and so on. I notice that, in Other Expenditures, there's really the exact same amount, which was computed to last year. The print last year showed \$119,000, but this year it's been corrected to \$104,000, with exactly the same amount shown this year. Now in light of the known significant increases in the cost of these materials, many of which come from the United States, and we know that print material, books, etc., the cost has risen drastically in the last eighteen months, am I correct in assuming that, therefore, the intention is for the government to, therefore, spend considerably less in actual dollars, equivalent dollars, to maintain the libraries and the resources at the level to which they had been built up in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not considerably less, to use the honourable member's term, but it is less by the inflation factor, yes, the inflation factor hasn't been taken into account, but it doesn't reflect itself in any reduction or any constraints with respect to library or library resources. What has happened, is that we are doing less in the field of audio-visual resources in in-house training through audio-visual techniques, and essentially it represents a very tight budget approach in this area. I don't deny that.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Just to follow through, Mr. Chairman, this was a straight direct answer, but I wonder if this is wise, if it is too tight a budget, because the minister often talks about the changing life pattern and talking about the volunteers, and what is the other thing? — the prevention. And it seems to me, that if anything, and of course those are all things that so far, there hasn't been any funds at all, but the least you could do, if you're going to have these people, is give them the information so that they could use it. I know that I've had trouble getting for instance — I would imagine it still exists, there is a diet that the department has, it's probably the best diet there is that explains the value of a good method of the right food to eat and so on, and the quantities and so on, and what is important, and I know that it's very hard to get that now. You know, I've tried to get some and I was told, "Well, we don't have any copies, or we have very, very few." Mind you, it's fairly costly, but this is certainly something I'd like to see every person in Manitoba get that book, if he could; I think it's really good, and I'm a little concerned that if the minister, who agrees that we're going to, you know, because of inflation, because of everything else, and because of the high cost, the escalating cost of printed material and so on, that it's less. I don't think that there was that much in that, especially if there's a push to go to, as I say, to volunteers and to prevention and so on, it seems to me that there's something wrong that that department will not serve the needs of Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Chairman, that there is no reduction in printed material, no reduction in pamphlets. If he's having difficulty obtaining some, I will certainly follow through on that with him. The printed material that we have available, continues to be available in the same volume, but the highly expensive audio-visual operation and development of audio-visual presentations has been reduced somewhat. We are not responding with quite the latitude that we responded in the past to external agencies, who have in the past, made a fairly frequent habit of requesting that kind of material from the department but printed material remains unreduced.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, how does the minister expect external agencies to fulfill their functions, and to pick up more of the load, because the province is stepping back in many areas and leaving it to the private sector or the non-profit public sector. How does he expect them to do it, unless the full resources, expanded resources of the government are thrown behind it. You know, it's really wishful thinking to say, "Well, we're going to draw back in our program generally," hoping that the private sector or the non-profit public sector will pick it up through volunteers in the hope that we develop, we can teach people new life styles, prevention, when in fact, without the kind of resources the audio-visual, in particular, which is a very powerful tool and is used more and more everywhere, both in private and the public sector, how can the external agencies do a job, if they haven't got the access to, through government, of these instruments? Do we simply leave it to the private sector or to the volunteer sector to buy their own — is imposing an impossible load on them, and it's a very inefficient way of doing it. So I share with my colleague in St. Boniface, the concern that although this is not a small amount of money, it's a direction, it's showing you the direction that government's now taking in trying to back away from its responsibilities. We've already claimed that they are pushing it on to the shoulders of somebody else — they can't care who it is, as long as somebody else assumes the responsibility — but they're not even giving the support to this "somebody else" that should be given, if there's any hope at all that they are going to be able to do the job.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I would like to disabuse my honourable friend of any serious fears in that connection, Mr. Chairman. The service is still there, the fact is that the 8 percent inflation factor has not been built in; but the service is still there and it's still being utilized, and it's still being made available to external agencies. I think he would have to agree with me that there is a tendency

or there can be a tendency, let's put it that way, for requests for audio-visual productions in any field to be somewhat less than selective unless there's some budgetary imperatives; it's just a little more selective now, that's all.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want the record to show the reference to an 8 percent increase due to inflation. In fact, because of the nature of these materials, audio-visual in particular, that the rate of inflation of last year has been around 21 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (f)—pass. (g)Medical Supplies and Home Care Equipment, (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is another area, I think, that we could probably make the same remarks. You know, the salary has gone down, there's three less staff man years, and that I don't understand. I can assure that there's no horror story here, that this branch of the department two year's ago, while we were in our last year of office, was really working and working overtime for this work. This is the staff, and there is no doubt, that without the staff you might say, "Well, probably the answer next year will be," and probably that's the answer we give a few year's ago but we're going as fast as we can, but our staff is, you know, our staff is working night and day, and we're doing the best we can. Well, I guess maybe . . . well, I think the two should be taken together, but I'll wait till we get on the other expenditure that they talk about the program, and we'll just try to stick to just the salary and I wonder why there's a reduction. I know that there were vacancies, and maybe that money wasn't spent and I don't know. But it seems to me that if there were vacancies last year, and if there was no need to fill these vacancies, it was probably because there was such a reduction last year. The minister told us then, that all of a sudden that we had enough of everything, even mechanized wheelchairs, and I doubt that very much, because we were just starting the program. We had a couple of years of that.

I know that I'm getting complaints that this is not the case, and people now must have to buy some of their ' equipment themselves or, if they go into different areas, personal care home — I don't know how true that is, but I'm giving you some of the information, some of the information that was given to these constituents of mine. So I wonder, are we cutting, well we definitely are cutting down, but what is the purpose? Is that just tightening a bit, because of cost first? That seemed to indicate all along that the government is consistent, that we're going to cut down a bit, but I will not accept, like last year that definitely we have enough and there is less of a demand. I don't accept that, because I've been told differently.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the reduction in staff is accounted for by the elimination of two vacant positions which had been vacant for some time, more than two years, and the third one was a clerical position. We have, over the past year, had the special studies group with the department, look at this particular branch, do a complete inventory, a complete examination and evaluation. They have produced a better, more effective, more efficient structure for the branch. There is a new director in place, and the sixteen positions, the sixteen SMYs, are considered absolutely sufficient to do the job, and in fact we believe that the result is better productivity and better efficiency.

mm0000

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to let that statement go unchallenged. It might be that it's more efficient. It might be that there are sufficient people to do the work, that's a possibility, but it cannot be that there is more equipment going around and that there's better service, because that is not the case at all, not judging from the criticism. THIS IS ONE OF THE PLACES THAT I've received criticism, that it's a lot tougher to get equipment now, from the government, than it was before, and you know, this is something that wasn't told to me by one person only. This came repeatedly, so there has been a change. There is no doubt that there's been a change in policy, and nobody can tell me otherwise when, you know, we, in '76-77, we had asked for \$937,000, and '77-78, we asked for \$900,000, and then there was some donation also, some of this equipment was donated by the general public, and last year we went from \$900,000 to \$835,700, and now we're going to \$811,000, and if anything, I think that the rate of inflation, the increase on this kind of equipment would be closer to the 22, 25 percent that my honourable friend said, on this kind of equipment, easier than 8 percent. There's no way that the increase on these things was only 8 percent.

So, you know, last year one of the answers was that the suppliers couldn't supply us fast enough. I think that there had been a mix-up, but what's the mix-up this time? It might be that sixteen people can cope with what is there now, if we're reducing it by \$100,000, by more than 10 percent, and that would be the reduction in the funds only. But not in the equipment and not in the supplies

when it costs maybe 25 percent more now than it did last year to buy this equipment. So, I think that the Minister shouldn't be cute at this. They're not doing the same thing, and you can't tell me that with this amount of money you're doing the same thing as you were doing before.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has some specific complaints, I would be pleased to accept them from him and act on them. I can tell him that we have not had a single complaint to my knowledge. We have, in fact, got more equipment, more items of equipment in the field than we've ever had before. We inherited a substantial inventory which was built up when the program was being built up. We had such a substantial inventory that in fact we sold an appreciable number of wheelchairs, something in the neighbourhood of 270, because there was no demand for them. We have, in 1976 we had 15,088 items of equipment in the field. In '77 that went to 15,422, and in '78 it went to 16,581, which was more than an addition of 1,000 pieces of equipment, and that's an actual increase in the last year, of equipment, equipment in the field. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member says some of this equipment in changing, and that's true, but if you look at the equipment we're talking about here, the equipment that's changing is being boosted in terms of volume and in terms of inventory. There is additional money going in, for example, to motorized wheelchairs. There is additional money going into the ostomy program, equipment for ostomies. There is additional money going into the respiratory support system, into the intrauterine device program.

MR. DESJARDINS: If the Minister would permit me, instead of wasting time again, while he's going through that, would he give us the amount of all the programs that you mentioned, please?

MR. SHERMAN: What is down, is general medical equipment purchases, which are down from \$143.2 thousand to \$125,000. —(Interjection)— General medical equipment purchases. Down from \$143.2 thousand to \$125,000.00. Regular wheelchairs - down, from \$91,600 to \$60,000.00. Motorized wheelchairs, up from \$33,300 to \$41,000.00. The ostomy program, up from \$158,000 to \$186,400.00. The respiratory support system fractionally up from \$27,500 to \$29,200.00. The intrauterine device program, IUD program, fractionally up from \$52,400 to \$55,500.00. Warehousing delivery and general office, up from \$77,900 to \$88,700, which gives an overall total that's up, fractionally from \$583,900 to \$585,800.00.

Now, in the field of regular wheelchairs, as I say, we had a huge inventory, and the demand has been met. We get very few requests for wheelchairs. We certainly have enough to meet those requests, and we sold some off because of the fact that we had more than we needed. . the Estimates appropriation of \$60,000 provides us with enough to purchase an additional 200 standard wheelchairs and 20 electric wheelchairs plus their necessary parts and repairs if we need them. In fact, Sir, the service I think is one of the best and most efficiently operated and administered in the department I'd rank it along side the Pharmacare Program for smooth and efficient operation and an operation that does not produce at least visible complaints and shortages. If the honourable member, as I say, has had some cases brought to his attention, I will certainly look into them with him but I have not. We have felt that the needs are being met in this area and that we have more equipment than is being asked for at the present time.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know who's running that business, but under the Conservative who are great free enterprisers and want to produce, they shouldn't be too happy if they say — the Minister has said that they have too many wheelchairs, if I understood him right and that they gave some wheelchairs away. Is that right? Or sold some wheelchairs? Sold some wheelchairs. So, you have too many things, too many of certain items, so you sell them and then you put in — Why are you asking us for \$60,000 to buy some more? You know, it would only prove what I said, that some of these chairs are obsolete; you need more if you want \$60,000. You must be able to buy a few wheelchairs with \$60,000 and besides you made money on those that you sold.

MR. SHERMAN: We can't net it against this side of the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, let's say you can net it against . . . but why are you buying more wheelchairs. You just finished getting rid of some because you had too many. Why do you want \$60,000 for more wheelchairs? It doesn't make much sense to me. Unless they are obsolete like I said that you sold stuff that are not. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: The revenues from the ones that were sold went to the consolidated fund, Mr. Chairman. Now, the technology of wheelchairs changes all the time as technology of other equipment does. There are some 60 to 70 different types of wheelchairs depending on the type of patient; it could be a person with a broken leg, it could be a paraplegic or quadraplegic. There are various refinements of models and we have to meet those specific demands. We inherited - - and I'm not faulting my honourable friend for this, they were building up a program, but we inherited an inventory of wheelchairs, many of which models are now obsolete or there is not the demand for them and he would have done the same thing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, but then I wouldn't — it's only because we dug in it that we're finding this thing out. The Minister said that they have enough that you meet the supply. In fact, he said that he had too many, I think it would have been a better answer if he would have told us some of them are now obsolete so we got rid of them. You know, somebody is buying them, they must be all right. And, if you're getting rid of some and if you want to buy some more, well, then this is the answer. You're probably getting rid of more than you're buying. In this case, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many regular and motorized wheelchairs that they have now. I can tell my honourable friend that — and, I should know this, but I'm not going to argue that because I'm not too sure, this is the first time it's come up — but I've been told that people that go in personal care homes must buy their own wheelchairs. Now, that possibly was done before but I know for a fact that we used to lend some to some of the people in the personal care homes and it might be that if that's the case instead of selling those that are practically obsolete but must be still fairly still be fairly good, if somebody is buying them, maybe they should have been given to people in personal care homes. You know, it might do the trick. But, I wonder if we could have, I'd like to have the patient load in the first item which is — what did the Minister call it? The General Medical Equipment — I would imagine that's the Medical Home Care Equipment Program. I wonder what the patient load is and I'd like to know how many regular wheelchairs, how many motorized wheelchairs and the number of patients in the ostomy program and the same thing in the oxygen delivery and the IUD. I'd like to know what the patient case load, or when it comes to equipment such as wheelchairs, what is the number of wheelchairs that the department now has?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the honourable member's first question, some of these purchases are to replace wheelchairs that just become obsolete, that fall into disrepair, fall apart, can't be repaired, they have to be replaced. As far as the second question about numbers and inventory, I think that we would find the answers on page 153 in the Annual Report, but I can tell him that regular wheelchairs in the field in 1978 numbered 3,283 and motorized wheelchairs numbered 80. The breakdown of patient contacts and items of equipment is contained on page 153 of the Annual Report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass; 2.—pass; (g)—pass; Resolution 63— pass; Resolution 64 Item 3 Social Services and Community Health (a) Administration (1) Salaries—pass; the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the Minister can give us some idea of the reorganization. I can't reconcile where this comes from from last year. Is it the — where' my book of last year? — could it be the administration of last year known as Community Operation Division? I imagine that's part of it. And the other might be — what is it, Office of Social Security. Is that in there? And is there part of it the Chief Medical Consultant or — none of the Chief Medical Consultant? Well, I wonder if it might be easier if the Minister would explain.

MR. SHERMAN: The five staff man years shown under this particular item, Mr. Chairman, include the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Social Services and Community Health side of the department, one executive secretary and three support staff. There was an audit officer attached to that operation which no longer exists. That position is not attached to this operation. The Office of the Chief Medical Consultant is not included here. There is inclusion here of responsibility in the area of the Office of Income Security. What has happened is that where the Assistant Deputy Minister in this case, Mr. Don McLean, was the Administrative Officer in charge of the old Community Operations Division. He now is in charge of the Community Operations Division which has been renamed Regional Services and in charge of two support divisions, support on the Community Health side and support on the Social Services side. The Social Services Support Division includes the Office of Income Security. What we did was realign the department into two basic components

and there are three divisions under this particular Assistant Deputy Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister what is the comparison. I don't think that the document that I was given that there were six staff man years and now that five is requested — that can't be it, if this replaced the Division of Administration. And that's only part of it because then there were 13 last year in that, and that's only part of it so I don't know where the six comes in.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, under the reorganization, Mr. Chairman, we've changed the area in which we reflect the field term staff which used to be reflected in this particular component. They're now reflected under Field Operations which would be 93T on page 50, Regional Personal Services and that's where the field operations are covered. Page 50 Subsection T Regional Personal Services. That's really Community Field Services. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the change is just a change in semantics. Because we were using the term community in the title of the department, Community Health and Community Services, we changed the term community to region or regional in the subheadings.

MR. DESJARDINS: There's something wrong there, because under T Regional Personal Services last year there was 792 ½ staff man years. You're saying that this is reflected — so there should be more and now this year there's only 700. So there's nobody in the field at all then, or I shouldn't say nobody, but there's a big reduction. If the Minister says that there should be more that under Regional Personal Services, under T they should have what they had last year or represent the same work they had last year plus some of these people under this. This was transferred somewhere else and under that item there was 792 staff man years and now their administrator is asking for 700.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, there was a consolidation. Those personnel that I've referred to were consolidated with Community Field Services now known as Regional Personal Services. The difference in staff man year totals is the difference in the size of the department. We have an 11 ½ percent vacancy rate in Community Field Operations and in fact there was a substantial vacancy rate last year. The complement for Regional Personal Services has been established at 700. That reflects a significant number of vacancies which now become disestablished positions and the reduction is a result entirely of attrition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD MCBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this section which includes the resource for training and development of staff and it's the administrative section of the department. Mr. Chairman, the concern that has been expressed by members of this side and members outside of the Legislature, and especially by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, is in regards to the morale within this department and what's happening to services as a result of that. Now, Mr. Chairman, it's not that easy to cut back on services when you have a group of dedicated people attempting to deliver those services without having an effect on the people that are actually doing the delivery or administering the programs of this Minister.

And, Mr. Chairman, what happened within the Civil Service in Manitoba since the election of this government has been the creation of an atmosphere that the civil servants are some type of parasite on society and the Civil Service are the cause of many of the problems in Manitoba's society in this day and age. Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of attitude that has been reflected by the First Minister and a number of the members opposite on the government side of the House. Mr. Chairman, I think that what is happening now, what we see happening now, is that the efficiency and effectiveness of staff, of the administration of this section and of the department as a whole, is declining quite rapidly and quite seriously. There's one of the weaknesses, Mr. Chairman, in government organization, in government generally is that what happens when you have a change in government is the feeling, well, we have to re-organize things; it'll look like we're doing something if we re-organize things. And, Mr. Chairman, that happened in 1969 when the re-organization took place within this particular department. It happened . . . some other re-organizations within our

period in office, and, Mr. Chairman, when a re-organization takes place, it usually takes a year to get back into the same type of delivery that you had before the re-organization takes place.

And, Mr. Chairman, I say this as a general problem, that private industry doesn't have to face as often because they don't go through re-organizations as often, but Mr. Chairman, because of the political system, re-organization is a fact of life and re-organization is often done for political, rather than efficiency or effectiveness reasons. It's my own personal opinion that re-organization usually doesn't make an operation more effective or more efficient. In fact, that it stops production for a period of time. It slows down the efforts for a period of time, as people worry about what has happened to them. A certain state of affairs sets in where the staff is in shock for a while and then begin to acknowledge that in fact there has been a change and they may or may not be keeping their jobs.

But the process to get back to where people were at, in terms of their ability to effectively deliver service, usually takes about a year or so. And, Mr. Chairman, in this particular case, with this government, we have that re-organization, we have the general attack on the Civil Service itself, and then we have the lack of direction being given to the civil servants that are left in the field.

Mr. Chairman, when I visited some civil servants in The Pas in the fall, some of them said the government is not giving us anything to do. They've cut off everything we were doing; they're not giving us anything to do so that they can get rid of us. And Mr. Chairman, those were the people that were affected by the cuts in December and in January, specifically, as a purposeful government ploy to set them up to get rid of them. Those particular civil servants related to the remove northern communities, and were within a different department, but the same sort of atmosphere pervades, the same sort of attitude that is in existence now, and I think it's especially severe within this particular department of government. Because the people within this particular department have borne the brunt of the attack of using civil servants as a scapegoat by this Conservative government, and the civil servants in this particular department have been the most vulnerable, and the more attack is present, the more criticism is present, in my mind, the less effective and less efficient they become.

The longer that the Minister puts off decisions, the more that the Minister monitors studies, procrastinates in terms of decisions, the worse the morale becomes, because people are spending all their time worrying about what's going to happen as they're waiting for some decisions to be taken. And I think that applies to this section we're talking about, certainly to the correctional staffs in places like The Pas, where they have been waiting decision for eighteen months, or a re-decision for eighteen months. And this is the kind of situation that occurs and, Mr. Chairman, the Task Force on Human Needs and Restraints in their news release of March 7 touch upon this matter; they said the task force also wishes to publicly acknowledge that it is aware of the difficult conditions in which many working in the human services are facing in their daily jobs. The pressures to perform their daily activities, often difficult in themselves, are multiplied in a time of restraint, when resources are often inadequate, staff is overworked, and must suffer in silence within a climate where one feels he or she can ill afford to speak openly about resource inadequacies or be critical of problems facing agencies in the delivery of human needs. Now Mr. Chairman, that is a very polite and general way for the task force in human needs to say that civil servants in this department and other departments of government are scared for their jobs. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the plain and simple fact of the situation. In Manitoba at this time, civil servants are afraid to say anything, they're basically afraid to do anything; they do enough to get by, they do enough not to get criticized, but they will not take any initiative, they will not take any positive action, they will not reach out, because they are afraid what will happen to them if they do.

So the prevailing atmosphere right now is what's called "protect your backside, hide away try not to let them notice you, and maybe your job will continue". But for those persons who are dedicated to doing a good job, who are serious and have a belief in a service that they're delivering, that they can do effective things for the people, those people that are serious about that, are leaving or they're hiding, Mr. Chairman, because they're afraid to do anything because of the overall attitude of this government, and as part of that, the overall attitude of this Minister.

So we have a situation of fear to do anything, and that situation is prevailing throughout the system. I'm sure that whatever the Minister does under this particular section, which says Training and Development, Mr. Chairman, you can do all the training of staff you want, you can do all the development of staff you want, but as long as that attitude is there, the attitude is there that there is no firm direction; the attitude is there is that no one appreciates the work that is being done anyway; the attitude is there that people are afraid to speak out. The attitude is there, well, why get this community-based program going that's going to help people, when the answer you're going

to get is that there is no money to help the community-based project get going all project going we have left is enough money for the welfare payments. And that's the situation we're in right now. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why the Minister would bother to have money in here for the training and development, when what needs to be done is a positive approach by this government in terms of this kind of service for the people of Manitoba.

And what has to be done is that the professional and competent people have to be given the opportunity to do their job. Have to be given that opportunity to deliver the service they were supposed to be delivering, and not live in a constant state of fear, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, maybe this Minister isn't aware, but civil servants in the town of Thompson are afraid of the Minister of Northern Affairs in labour. They're afraid to do anything. They're afraid to be seen by him even, because he is so vindictive in his approach to people that if he gets some clue that they're doing something that he might not approve of, then the word will go out to the appropriate Minister of whatever department they happen to be working for.

Mr. Chairman, that element of fear may be more exaggerated in the constituency of that particular Minister, but I say it's a general attitude that exists in the province of Manitoba at this time, and it's an attitude that exists especially in this particular department, where the atmosphere of fear and the atmosphere of degradation, of criticism, of the professionals in that department is increasing the problem to such extents that we have a lot of standstill. A lot of nothing happening, a lot of retreat in the Civil Service. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that this Minister has to be aware of that situation. He must have some clue that it exists, and he must begin to take some positive steps to overcome that situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how he's going to do that. I don't know how he's going to do that with the attitude of the First Minister of the province, who directly, with no doubt lied directly to the civil servants of the province of Manitoba. Deliberately lied to them during the election campaign, when he sent out letters saying that no one would be dismissed, that people would be let go by attrition only. Mr. Chairman, then proceeded to dismiss people, then proceeded to dismiss people on no sort of logical or planned basis, but in a haphazard, accidental, what seems to be happening today kind of approach. Which, Mr. Chairman, is the approach reflected by the Minister whose department we're dealing with right now, is the attitude of "well, try it and see what the public response is", which is the general attitude of this Minister.

Mr. Chairman, it would be better off probably, to have this Minister and this Cabinet replaced with a voting machine in each household in Manitoba. And then every day, when a decision had to be made, should there be any objection to a clinic planned in the City of Winnipeg that's going to deal with abortion, then they could just have a vote, and each person in the morning could get up and press a button as to whether they vote yes or no on that issue. It would save this particular Minister a lot of time, because he, right now, is the voting machine for this government. Because he's the one that throws out the trial balloons and then measures the public reaction, should we proceed with this program, or should we not proceed with this program? And that is his particular role in how this particular government operates. And in light of that, fly by the seat of your pants, test the mood, and if you can get away with it, do it; if you can't get away with it, then reverse your decision.

With that sort of general approach, I don't see much that's going to be done to reassure the people that are actually out in the field, that are actually delivering services, that are actually delivering the programs of this department, much is going to be done to re-establish their morale within the whole atmosphere and mood of this government. And certainly training and development isn't going to do it, and certainly a few PR words by the Minister are not going to solve that problem. They'd need a concentrated effort that in fact the government does want to do something. At least to state clearly what things they do want to do. Providing that they're still going to provide some service, then clearly define what service they're continuing to provide and make sure that service is delivered in the best manner possible, so that those people delivering the service know that that program is going to be there, know that their work is going to be appreciated and that they're not going to be used as scapegoats by this government that needs scapegoats, and so the job can get done.

But, Mr. Chairman, without that kind of clear initiation, and not by words, Mr. Chairman, but by actions of this Minister, is the morale in the Civil Service going to be improved, is the fear of civil servants going to be overcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I simply can't let those wild allegations by the Honourable Member for The Pas go unchallenged or unresponded to, because they simply do not apply to the department of Health and Community Services and he knows they don't. I know that what he has said and

what he will continue to say is good political rhetoric, and I don't blame him for saying it. e's in the Opposition, he represents a northern community, and he has to speak up and generate as much agitation as he can. The fact of the matter is, when he talks about the people within this department, he's talking about the Health and Community Services department, and this is a direct quote from him, "that the people within this department have borne the brunt of the attack on civil servants within this government." that that, table. I put it to you, Sir, that that simply is insupport It simply is so fictional and so far from the truth that it hardly is worthy of argument, or hardly is worthy of reaction.

The department of Health and Community Services employs, in total, something in excess of 5,000 persons, as the honourable member knows, and as of Saturday this week, the end of this week, we will have been in office seventeen months, and I will have had the privilege and the opportunity of working with the people in Health and Community Services for seventeen months, and in that time we still employ approximately 5,000 persons, and for him to suggest that this department has borne any brunt of any attack, is just simply ludicrous. He suggests that civil servants are regarded as some sort of parasite on society by this government. I reject that out of hand too. There is no evidence that that kind of attitude is held by any anyone in this government. It certainly has not been reflected by the Minister of Health and Community Services. I have said, and I repeat, that I know where my support and I know where my strength and I know where my efficiency, such as it is, lies and where it depends. It depends on the civil servants in my department who have come through very loyally and very conscientiously for me. I need them a lot more than they need me and I've made no bones about that. I don't accept for one instant his contention that there —(Interjection)— well, I have certainly attempted to be worthy of them and I will continue to try to be worthy of them. I don't accept for one instant his contention that teere is fear throughout the department, fear throughout civil servants in the Department of Health and Community Services. I haven't spent my time sitting behind my desk on the third floor you know, Mr. Chairman. I would like to spend more time behind it to keep up with the paperwork. I have attempted to get around to as many components of the health system and the department in this province as is humanly possible to do.

I've talked to civil servants and health component workers, both government and non-government, in many, many parts of the province including the honourable member's own home constituency. They have not been backward about coming forward and speaking to me. They have not been reticent about accepting my invitation to sit down with me and put their cards on the table. We've talked realistically, we've talked pragmatically, we've talked responsibly. There has been no indication of any fear or any psychopathic anxiety or any paranoia whatsoever. There may be in the minds of one or two individuals on the other side of the House, a feeling that that kind of fiction can be proclaimed and disseminated throughout the province as a political weapon and once again, I say that's fair ball in politics if its accepted and measured in those terms and in that context. If we're talking political rhetoric, that's one thing. If we're talking truth and the facts of life, those kinds of contentions have no place in that discussion because I have sat down with our civil servants in the Honourable Member for The Pas's own constituency and they have been very direct and very candid about discussing their concerns with me, and their concerns do not embrace, do not embrace paranoia about their jobs. As a matter of fact, our regional operations out of The Pas are probably among the strongest, among the best, and among the highest in terms of moral in the province. We have a very effective and efficient operation going in The Pas region, thanks to the Regional Director and his district officials and his staff. And my discovery in meeting with them and sitting down with them has certainly been a most gratifying one.

The reduction that we are looking at in the area of health and community services is a reduction that was now arbitrary, not unilateral, not done on whim. It was a planned and a controlled reduction that was based entirely on attrition. It has produced an establishment and an complement that now contains some flexibility that wasn't there before.

We're in the position to move vacant positions around from one area to another. We're in a position where our divisional directors and our regional directors know what they've got to work with, what the direct lines of reporting and responsibility are, the complement that they have to live within and the flexibility that's available to them to live within it. The positions that were abolished were all vacant positions. Admittedly there is a smaller, numerical figure for the complement of health and community services today than there was a year ago. But this government has never made any secret about the fact that in the interests of the people of Manitoba, we were attempting to streamline public operations and public expenditures and there is certainly, I would think, considerable merit and considerable morality and considerable justifiat given the challenge that we had . to put the economic house and economic affairs of Manitoba in order, to have proceeded in the way which we have proceeded, and that is to look at an operation, to look at the complement or the establishment, to look at the vacancies and see if those vacant positions could be abolished,

if the complement could be reduced while still remaining capable of delivering the level of quality service that it is essential to deliver.

We took some time in doing it. We didn't rush in in Health and Community Services and do it in November 1977. We did it in November and December ff 1978 because there was a conscientious evaluation and study carried out, aimed at producing a leaner, more efficient service with the least dislocation, the least personal imposition, and the least consumerimposition possible. And I believe we have achieved that. And I believe in his heart of hearts, the Member for The Pas would, if he were a Minister of the Crown today as he was in the past, attempt to carry out his responsibilities in government in precisely the same way. So that I have to reject out of hand the kinds of allegations that he makes in this area which he knows are not supportable by the facts but they do sound good in terms of political debate. I'm sure he'll repeat them in this Chamber, he'll repeat them on the platform in The Pas, he'll repeat them in the next election campaign' he'll repeat them in his pamphlets. I expect that. That's fair. It's not true, it's fair, it's not true because he knows that Health and Community Services has not been a department in which there has been an unthinking, an unreasonable and an insensitive approach to either the consumers of the services that we deliver or those in our department who deliver the services.

We've been very careful and conscientious about maintaining staff as high as we can maintain it but we've also been careful and conscientious in our responsibility to the consumers generally, all the consumers of Health Services in their capacity not only as consumers but as taxpayers, in trying to produce the most efficient the most cost-effective service that we can over the whole spectrum of the deprtment. That has produced a rationalization of the establishment of the total staff complement of the department. It's not very much lower than it was before. But in an area like Community Field Services, it has enabled us to reduce the administrative overlay, reducetthe administrative bureaucracy and put the emphasis on people in the field where the services are delivered.

The same applies in Corrections, precisely. You know the Member for The Pas is very exercised about the situation with respect to the correctional institute at The ppas. Well . . . —(Interjection)— there again, we've got a staffing situation where we are trying to reduce administrative overlay and produce field workers. Produce a situation where the emphasis is on field services and delivery of services to persons in the field. This is precisely what has happened here and if you look at the administrative component in Social Services and Community Health, which is the item before us, that is why there are five staff man years reflected there, because that is where the administrative leadership now is located and that is the number to which it is confined. The rest of the energies and the talents and the abilities are concentrated as much as possible in delivering those program services in the field to the consumers in the field.

So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that although my honourable friend from The Pas makes much of what will be a contrived attempt by the opposition for the next three years to hang this government and hang this Minister in this department for sins we did not commit, for things we did not do; that for the sake of the record in the Committee the other side of the question, aand the truth in respect to the staff complement in Health and Community Services, should be clearly outlined and shoul be clearly placed on the record. Those kinds of allegations simply don't wash. And he knows they don't wash. He can go and sit down with his own people in The Pas and get the same answers as he is getting from me today because they and I have sat together and talked about them. He can look at the complement in Health and Community Services.

If he's concerned about some term workers, some term contracts and term appointments not being renewed, I suggest that that situation was not created by this government or by the previous government or by any other government. Term employees are term employees and they know that. In terms of the total establishment of the department, he knows full well, that what reductions have taken place have to 99 percent of the total, 99 percent of the case, have been the direct results of attrition, the direct results of phasing out positions which have been vacant for some considerable time and which we feel are redundant positions, which don't need to be filled to deliver the kind of service that can be delivered by the dedicated kinds of people that we have on complement and have in the field at the present time.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Private Members' Hour. The first order of business on Monday

is Resolutions. We're dealing with Resolution No. 1. The Honourable Member for Roblin has 13 minutes.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, since I last spoke on this resolution I've taken a few moments to go through some of the speeches of the honourable members from both sides of the House who have made a very important and valuable contribution to the debate. And I find the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster very interesting in the reasons basically why he put this resolution on the Order Paper and it goes to say because I really think it's that society and the citizens of the province were able to ascertain who is for the right to work and who is against the right to work. And I think the more I look at the resolution and the more I look at the debates, I think that that is the subject matter that is before us and I hope that it's one that we can resolve.

I'm also concerned on other points in listening to the speeches of several of the members and I hope there will be many more of the members that will make a contribution to the debate. That in very few cases have any of the members come up with a solution as to how we're going to resolve the problem even though the honourable member's resolution sets out some guidelines. I wonder if, in fact, that what brought the debate to light was the concerns of the Builders Exchange, the statements made by Mr. Aikens in the press and several of the items that he wrote to various jurisdictions and and Union of Municipalities. And I notice in the debates the honourable members also brought out the Chamber of Commerce as being one that they thought was opposed to the right to work.

I also notice, Mr. Speaker, that statements were brought to light the other day, Statistics Canada, by the Honourable John Chretien, the Finance Minister who pointed out very quickly that the time lost due to strikes in 1978 had doubled over the year 1977. I think he said that there was 7.4 million man days lost due to strikes and walkouts in 1978 more than double of what the statistic was in 1977 where there was, I believe, some 3.3 million man days lost. And I daresay that is a matter of considerable concern, not only to the Federal Government but all the governments across Canada at this time, as to why those figures are there in the statistics. There must be a problem, a very serious problems, and I think the Honourable Member for Inkster has put his finger on it; and the others who have spoken in the debate recognize the concerns that are on the lips of most people on the street today, and society, and people from all walks of life all across Canada.

I don't know, as I stand before the Committee in the House today, of any person who disputes the right to work; the problem, of course, as I mentioned earlier, is how do we handle this matter that is before us at this particular time. Should it be drafted into a green paper and start at that level, or should we be urging the Minister of Labour to bring forth legislation? Do we class the jobs as make-work jobs, non-make-work jobs, industrial, blue collar, professional, or should the work be classed as productivity, or productivity producing? Is that type of a formula needed; do we need better training methods; should we review our taxation methods in the province and across Canada at this time, and possibly provide new tax incentives for added productivity from our work force? Those are all key factors and key questions that I don't have the answer for, as I stand before the House today. They are certainly in relationship to the problem that's facing us and the problem that was brought out so forcefully by the statistics of the Honourable Finance Minister of Canada.

I think we also must remember that our labour force must be a competitive one with other jurisdictions across Canada, and our neighbours in the United States, and I daresay in the marketplaces around the world, where we as producers of goods and services are trading. So, are we able to compete in those markets?

I found the statement of the NDP House Leader, in the House of Commons, the other day, rather interesting, when he said that the government must seriously consider ways and means to roll back unfair price increases so we can protect the consumers, and save the country from another round of inflation. A very important and a very timely statement by that dedicated member, and one, I think, that we have to relate and associate ourselves with when we're dealing with this resolution.

The government of Canada's Finance Minister, on the other hand, seems to be saying, if I read the Minister correctly, that they don't want to control only one segment of the economy at this particular time, and as a result they seemingly have decided to get out of controls and put their trust in the marketplace. And yet, Mr. Chairman, we can't walk away from the fact that if we pick up the Winnipeg papers here on the weekend, you'll find maybe two or three pages of people who are looking for somebody to fill positions. They wouldn't naturally be advertising them if they weren't seeking somebody to fill those jobs, and I don't know whether we don't have the right people here to fill those positions, or what the problem is, but how do you deal

It will be one that will be meaningful and full of meat, and give the government of the day direction as to where they should go.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River:

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

WHEREAS the economic system under which we live fails to provide adequate opportunity for citizens in our society to perform productive work, and

WHEREAS the inability of individuals to gain employment is destructive of the individual, and

WHEREAS the non-utilization of the productive capacity of those not able to obtain employment is destructive of the composite wealth and well-being of society.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislature approves of the right of the principle to work, and that all the words thereafter be deleted.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin, An Amendment to the Resolution. Do you want it read again? Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just to a point of order, so that we have this in some comprehensive manner. I'm quite certain that all that the member wants to do is to delete all of the words after the words, "Right to Work" in the resolved section of the resolution. If so, then that's what he has to say. He cannot make the amendment in the form that he has made it. I'm not trying to frustrate the honourable member, I'm merely suggesting that he has to move that all of the words after the words, "Right to Work", in the resolve paragraph be deleted, and I wish he would do so, or at least let's have that as the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Roblin care to put the Resolution in that form?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member, and I will therefore again move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that all the words after the word "Work", in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The second line of the last paragraph.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, it's the last paragraph of the Resolution be deleted.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that meet the approval of the Member for Inkster, as far as the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't meet with my approval, but it would then at least be an acceptable Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: On the Amendment of the Honourable Member for Roblin, are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it's interesting that this resolution is amended leaving in all the, I believe — I haven't made the comparison — well, now that it has had the changes, it certainly does leave in everything except an urging on the government to implement programs in the private and public sector, so that everybody seeking to obtain meaningful employment, will have an opportunity to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons for this amendment, in my view, and I think that they should be clearly indicated; and I suppose that the key to the amendment is what the member said immediately before he made it: "That he hopes this matter will be continued to be debated and debated and debated, during the entire Session of the Legislature," and I think that those

were his words, which, translated into English, Mr. Speaker, means that he hopes that the resolution will never come to a vote, that it will not be resolved by the Legislature, because it is an embarrassment to resolve the question that is contained in this resolution. We found that it was an embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, because we found different Members of the Conservative Party reacting differently to the amendment. That's not unusual, except the reasons that they gave for the reaction.

The Member for Pembina read into the amendment the fact that this is the communist manifesto in disguise; that if this resolution was adopted, it would result in complete government takeovers and complete government spending. I don't wish to be entirely unfair to the honourable member, and if I'm paraphrasing him incorrectly, no doubt he will get up and say so, but my impression was that he said that this amendment meant just more government spending of a socialist variety. I don't know whether he is agreeing with that, or disagreeing with it, but he is remaining uncommunicative, although I can't expect him to communicate by language.

The Minister of Highways, on the other hand, and I wasn't here when he made his speech, he said he would support the resolution because he sees the true purpose of the resolution. He sees the resolution as attempting to get the Conservative Party to vote against the right to work, which he did not intend to fall into that kind of an abyss, and would not accommodate the mover of the resolution, myself, by voting against a resolution which is requiring that the right to work be preserved.

Now, the Member for Roblin is attempting to salvage the Conservative Party from this dilemma. They will vote for the right to work, but they will ignore the whereases. They, in their minds, have now presented their caucus members with the rationale of getting up and voting for the resolves, and when they vote for the resolves, right to work in their minds, they can say, when I voted for the right to work I voted to outlaw union shops and closed shops, which is what the Builder's Exchange wants, and what the Chamber of Commerce would like to want although they too are smart enough to not quite get on that bandwagon, and to go back to the rural municipalities and say, "You see, you've asked for right to work and we've agreed to the principle of the right to work." And you will ignore the whereases in the resolution and we've left off any of the offending parts of the resolution which clearly indicate that right to work is not the right to engage in union busting; the right to engage in undoing free collective bargaining; the right to put crutches under George Aitken, who couldn't handle his labour dispute, and couldn't undo the collective bargaining that his people went into for years and years and arrived at certain agreements, after trying to break these people for six months and finally he had to capitulate. So after he capitulates he runs to the Legislature and says, "Please, help me out. I didn't win the strike; I kept these people out for six months, but I still need what I couldn't get in free collective bargaining, so help me out and pass the right to work."

Now, the Member for Roblin will say, "Well, you see, I voted, as a matter of fact I moved an amendment asking that the Legislature approve of the principle of the right to work." Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how this resolution is going to wind up, but for the very reason that this term has been bastardized, perverted, abused, and Mr. Speaker, applied to concepts which have nothing to do with the right to work, the resolution was moved in such a way as to specify as to what that right to work is. And we're hoping, Mr. Speaker, and I still hope, that we will be able to get the members of the Conservative Party to stand up and be counted on the question as to whether or not they believe that every human being in our society is born with the desire to become a productive individual, that the question of that personality at birth as to whether it is going to be resolved or not, depends on whether he will have the opportunity of fulfilling himself through self-expression, which can only be obtained through creative activity of one kind or another, and each person, or the kind of creative activity will differ in different people, and that that creative activity can only take place in a society which is so organized that people have the opportunity of obtaining useful employment.

People will find that this is a disquieting concept on them. I never said that everybody should have the right to be a doctor. I think somebody over on the other side said everybody has the right to the job that he wants. Where in the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, does it say that everybody will have the right to the job that he picks. For instance, where does it say that my member, the Member for Wolseley, will have the right to say, "I wish the opportunity to be First Minister and Mr. Green's Resolution, the Member for Inkster's Resolution, says that I will have the right to pick that job and I must be given it." That's the kind, Mr. Speaker, of nonsense which is resorted to in argument, when people don't have an answer to the Resolution, or when they are embarrassed by it. And really it's the second that has occurred; that is the embarrassment. Not the fact that they don't have an answer. Although, it is also true that they don't have an answer.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that they don't want to answer. The true position of the Conservative Party is that unemployment is not only a natural phenomenon of Progressive Conservatism, it is

a desirable phenomenon of our society. And that's what they don't wish to acknowledge. Because every single economist who has pursued this so-called Progressive Conservatism capitalism, has indicated that it will result in a pool of unemployment, and that pool of unemployment is necessary to provide the mobility of one business going out of business and another starting up, which is all part of the theory of the invisible hand which puts people out of business when they are uneconomical and starts businesses when they are economical. And you need a pool of unemployment to provide the mobility of labour, and what is more important, Mr. Chairman, to keep wages down. Because if there is no unemployment, the bargaining position of workers goes up. If the bargaining position of workers goes up, wages go up, and then investment becomes unattractive.

That's your theory. I mean, you should read the books which you pursue when you are sitting there, and you will see that that is Progressive Conservatism. But you don't want to admit it. And so, Mr. Speaker, the significant things that they have left off of this Resolution is an assertion that public action is necessary. They agree that there is a right to work, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when they are voting for those words, they are voting for the bastardized version of those words. That's what my honourable friend is putting forward.

Then they say that the public, or government, should have no role in seeing to it that these very desirable objectives are achieved. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know we did, in the Resolution, make a considerable concession to my honourable friends' so that they could find it easier to vote for the Resolution. You know what the concession was. I think that the member is nodding to me. We said that they should implement such programs in the public and private sectors, as would enable this to be achieved. We weren't the doctrinaire ones. We were willing to consider pragmatic suggestions in either place. But so reprehensible to the Conservatives is the notion that the government would do anything, that they didn't even cross out the public sector. They crossed out every sector. They wouldn't even stick to their doctrinairism and say, well, we will amend the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, by crossing out that part of the resolve which says "implement programs in the public and private sector".

It could have been easier. I tell the Member for Roblin that his amendment needn't have crossed out all the words. You could have been "Simon Pure — Progressive Conservative" if you'd just crossed out "implement programs in the public," the words "in the public," so that you would have "implement programs in the private sector." But Mr. Speaker, so doctrinaire are they, that they realized that any suggestion that the elected representatives of the public gather together should take action to see to it that their treasure is done away with, would be unacceptable. And what is the treasure? The treasure, Mr. Speaker, what they will protect at all costs, even to the extent of wiping out the words "public sector" and leaving in the words "private sector" — their treasure is unemployment.

And what this amendment is, Mr. Speaker, — what this amendment is — and you should have worded it differently. He should have said "the words of the Resolution be struck out", and that what we should put into the Resolution is "resolve that this Legislature at all costs protects the existence of unemployment".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has four minutes.

MR. GREEN: Because that is, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution. You could have worded it to make it more clear. What are we left with, Mr. Speaker? We're left with a Resolution which says that people need to express themselves through employment. We're left with a Resolution saying that individuals gain by being employed, and society gains by them being employed and loses by them being unemployed. But what words are struck out? The words that are struck out are that we urge the government, Mr. Speaker, we're not spending any money, we're not declaring that a program must take place, we are sitting here as fifty-seven MLA's, and we are urging the government to implement programs in the public and private sector which will give people an opportunity of obtaining employment.

That's what's being eliminated. So you may as well have written the resolve in this way, to make it more clear. Does anybody have the Resolution?

A MEMBER: Right there.

MR. GREEN: You may as well have said, because this is your amendment — I point to the Member for Roblin — "Resolved that this Legislature urge the government not to implement programs in the public and private sector as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same." That's what you're doing. Those are the words that you are crossing out. Those are the words that you find objectionable. The Conservative Party objects, and let this be clearly defined. They object to urging the implementation of such public

and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same.

Why does the Conservative Party object to urging that the government implement such programs? Because the Conservative Party covets treasures and jewels over the existence of unemployment — that's why. Otherwise, why are these words being crossed out? What is objectionable about these words? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. Nothing objectionable about the words, except in the eyes of Progressive Conservatives who say that at all costs we have to keep unemployment. Because what else has been done to this Resolution?

The other thing that's been done, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt to play a confidence game on the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Now, now, now, now, Sidney.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the poor Conservatives — well, I don't really feel sorry for them. As a matter of fact, I will have to admit that there is some little bit of pleasure in me looking at their discomfiture. That's right. I can't say that I'm sorry for them. That would be just as false as this amendment. The poor Conservatives want to vote for the right to work, which is Mr. Aitken and the Builder's Exchange, and the rural municipalities' statement. They don't dare bring in legislation to that effect. So they use this Resolution, saying that we agree with the principle of the right to work.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, one sentence. I tell the honourable members that we will continue to debate, and we will find a means of putting you back into your discomfiture.

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

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in this amendment that the Honourable Member for Roblin has introduced into the Chamber, he was very careful not, at any time during the time prior to introducing of the amendment, to give his definition of what the principle of the right to work is. So, I am left with the conclusion that the honourable member's definition of the right to work is the one that has been advocated by the Winnipeg Builder's Exchange, by the independent Committee of Businessmen's Association in British Columbia, which when I spoke on this Resolution before, boils down to basically two words, and they're not deceptive in any way, shape or form . . .

MR. ENNS: Watch it, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: They are "union-busting". —(Interjection)— That is exactly what the concept of the right to work is, as proposed by the Winnipeg Builder's Exchange, as proposed by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. It is sweet, short and simple union-busting. That is what it is. —(Interjection)— And the honourable member can try to dress it up as much as he likes. I mean, sure, he says in his Resolve here that he deletes everything, and my honourable colleague, the Member for Inkster, has put it quite succinctly, that the honourable members over there were having difficulty having to vote for a resolution which gave a much better definition of the so-called right to work than what has been presented to them by their friends in the business community. And so I imagine the caucus of the Conservative Party got together and said, even though I know the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, said he was going to vote for the original Resolution . . .

MR. ENNS: That's what I said. I am.

MR. JENKINS: But I know that other members of the backbench, the Honourable Member for Pembina, he stated that he was not going to vote for that Resolution under any circumstances. He believes in the principle of the right to work which is union busting and that has come across quite clear from the honourable member, not just this session, but the session we had last year. All one has to do is to go back in last year's estimates and read some of the statements that were made by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Honourable Member for Pembina and the regard that they held, people in the trade union movement in this country was not in very high esteem.

MR. ORCHARD: Not true. Not true. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. ORCHARD: Point of privilege, I presume it is. I'm not that familiar with the rules. I don't want the record to show that I in any way last year showed any disrespect for members of the trade union movement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all honourable members that differences of opinion can be clarified after the member has completed his remarks. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, then, Mr. Speaker. Then I say that the . honourable member, and I refer him back to the Labour Estimates of last year, that he showed disrespect for the trade union movement. He certainly did. And other members of the backbench of the Conservative Party when we were in Room 254. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister of Hihhways that when he gets a bit of spare time before we complete debate on this Resolution, that he reads some of the remarks that some of his backbenchers made. He should read some of those remarks.

You know, we have come to this Amendment which really suits the Conservative Party to a T, as the Honourable Member for Inkster said. They believe in unemployment, they must, because given even the best intentions that the Honourable Member for Roblin may have had — and I accept he introduced his motion with best intentions — but this Legislature approves the principle of the right to work. Well, you know, that in itself sounds very innocuous. It's almost like motherhood. But, if you're not prepared, and this Legislature are not prepared to do anything about it, we can decry unemployment from now till kingdom come. If nothing is done about it, and all that the Honourable Member for Inkster in his Resolution stated was that this Legislature urges the government to initiate some programs in the public and the private sector so that we would have some work for people. It wasn't even asking the government to spend any money. But, no, they can't buy that either. They are so holy, os pure, and so married to their doctrine, which has been one of making sure that the best way of keeping wages down and keeping wage demands in check is to make sure that there is lots of unemployment.

If we look at the record of the Progressive Conseraative Party, federally, from the turn of the century, Tory times have been hard times. In the time of Borden, prior to World War I we had hard times. We certainly did. Now I don't know if they were just unlucky when they came into political office, and my God, they weren't in political office that much in this century, but the Borden government prior to World War I, there was days of depression in this country. Again, we had a Conservative government not withstanding the main one which didn't last that long, but we had the government of R.B. Bennett. And, you know, for those members of the backbench over there that may not remember hhe days of the Depression, the Great Depression here in Well, we may not be too far fetched. If our oil disappears as fast as — our non renewable resource, we may have to go back to a Bennett buggy. We may have to call it something else But, to get back to what I was discussing, which was the Tory times are hard times and history has shown it all through this present century. Every time the Progressive Conservative Party have got into power, they have exactly brought us into a depression. And I'll tell you something, that if you think that you may be elected federally in this coming election, and I'm not going to be a prognasticator, but one of the things that people are going to take a long and serious hard look at before they cast a vote for Joe Clark and his Conservatives, is going to be the Tory record of the 20th Century and it is not an enviable record.

MR. ENNS: A fine record. A fine record.

MR. JENKINS: We had depression in the days of Borden, high unemployment. In the days of Bennett we had high employment.

In the days of John Diefenbaker we had high employment. In fact, in the days of John Diefenbaker we exhausted, by employment, we exhausted a billion dollar unemployment insurance fund. That was the legacy that the Diefebbaker government left us. We absolutely exhausted the unemployment insurance fund as it was set up at that time and when I hear Conservatives today critizing unemployment and the ease with which people got it, I want you to think back to the days of Diefenbaker when people were taken on to the employment roles, fishermen and farmers who had never contributed a penny to the fund, immigrants who had come from the Hungarian Revolution, these people were put on unemployment and exhausted the funds. And I'm not saying that these people should not have obtained relief of some description but they should have received it from

the public purse, not from the money that was contributed by the employers and the employees of this country.

MR. ORCHARD: You're a racist, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: I am not a racist.

I am telling the honourable member that I do not think that the Unemployment Insurance Fund in the days of Diefenbaker should have been used for social services in the manner that it was. And, that exhausted the Unemployment Insurance Fund. Now we heard them in their piety, in opposition in Ottawa, complaining about the people on unemployment. —(Interjection)— Yes, big bad John. He was big, bad John to a lot of people. He was even so big and bad that you people wouldn't even support him for running again for the leadership. —(Interjection)— Your Dalton Camp Gang got rid of him. And not that I have anything against Mr. Diefenbaker. I think he's a fine gentleman, a good Canadian, but his policies when he was entrusted with the leadership of this country, was certainly not progressive. We had a mini depression in 1961, caused by the Progressive Conservative Party and their policies, or lack of policies.

And so, this seems to be the tact and the object of the Progressive Conservative Party that they favour unemployment. They do not favour employment because if they did favour employment, they would have stated so in this resolution. But, all they're saying is they believe in the principle of the right to work. Well, I think we all do. But, given the proper definition of what the right to work is, and I hope that other members of the Conservative backbench, and some of the frontbench will come up and give us over on this side of the House your definition so we know what the right to work means. —(Interjection)— Do you mean the one that has been advocated by the Winnipeg Builders Exchange, the Union of Municipalities of Manitoba? Is that the one that you believe in? —(Interjection)—

Well, I expect that other members of this Conservative side of the House will get up and tell us because the Member for Roblin certainly never told us. All he told us is, he believes in the principle of the right to work, period. Doesn't want any help, doesn't even want any help from the private sector to ferment and foment some activities so that work activity will be there. So, when the Honourable Member for Roblin states that he's in favour of the right to work, I think that before he made this Amendment, he should have told this House what exactly he meant.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so, before I complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon members of the other side of the House, the government and the backbenchers and especially since, if we're going to have right to work legislation, all we've had is a promise from the First Minister not this year, maybe next year. Who knows? The Minister of Labour has stated he's not in favour of right to work legislation. But, as I stated the other day, we've known that the Minister of Labour before he came to this House, we've known that he's belonged to various unions, various political parties. He's worn various hats. I compared him to the Vicar of Brae the last time I spoke. The Honourable Member for Wolseley wanted to know who the Vicar of Brae was. Well, the Vicar of Brae, I think, now the honourable members on that side of the House know who he is.

I will be surprised and I hope I will be pleasantly surprised that if and when you do attempt to introduce right to work legislation as has been advocated by your friends in the Builders Exchange and Municipal Organization based on the right to work legislation that exists in 19 states in the United States, all of them with a much lower than average weekly or hourly wage than the rest of the country, who have not been able to entice large investments in industry into their states, that when you introduce that the Minister of Labour — I'm sorry that he's not here and I'm sorry that he's in hospital — but it will be interesting to see if that Minister of Labour, given his trade union background can remain on that side of the House. He may have to cross the floor and come over here. —(Interjection)—

But couldn't count on it. I said that I would be surprised and if he did I would be pleasantly surprised, but my own personal opinion — that doesn't count for too much anyway so. . . But, I don't see the Minister of Labour crossing that floor on that issue because I think he cherishes that little spot on the Treasury Bench too much and he has been able to shed himself of principles before, so I guess he'll be able to shed this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I don't in any way, shape or form want to prolong this interesting debate, but —(Interjection)— Well, okay, we'll prolong it at a little then. But I just want to straighten

the record out, Mr. Speaker, as to the remarks of the previous speaker there. He made some references to discussions about trade unions that ensued in the Labour Estimates last year, and in the course of those remarks, his interpretation was that I in particular was suggesting at that point and time, tactics of union busting, and I have to say that that was not the intent of my remarks. He also left the record to show that my intention in my remarks last year, was to discredit union members — that I was anti-union membership.

And, I take particular exception to that, Mr. Speaker, because in no way, shape or form, did I impute the interpretation that the last speaker has given to my remarks. What I think was fairly clear in my remarks last year, was that the union movement, as it exists and as it was working last summer, in large degree was going contrary to the very desires and aspirations of the individual members of the union. Many of those union members in the construction unions, had a deep and honest desire to go back to work. But, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to us, in dealing from a layman's point of view as I had then, and in a lot of regards still have now, it seemed to that last summer, the workers — the rank and file the unions wanted to go back to work, but it was the union leadership that wanted to prolong the strife and the conflict between management and the employees, employers and the union itself. The membership wanted to go back to work. And I think there's no more adequate demonstration of that, Mr. Speaker, than in the Retail Clerks Union strike last summer, where that strike for all intents and purposes failed — failed miserably, Mr. Speaker, because the head of that particular union was completely out of touch with the rank and file of membership. The rank and file of the Retail Clerks' Union were willing to go back to work. They didn't have support for that particular strike and they did go back to work' Mr. Speaker, to the complete turn around of the suggestions and the top-heavy mandate that that particular union's management had.

And, Mr. Speaker, if pointing that out last year in the Labour Estimates, as some of my colleagues did, means that we're anti-union, that we're anti-rank and file in the union; I think the previous speaker has to sit back in his chair and take another look at another interpretation, because that interpretation is totally ridiculous. What has obviously happened, Mr. Speaker, is the very unfortunate circumstance to members of the N.D. Party, is that all of a sudden, members of the Conservative government hold more in store with the rank and file membership of the unions in their aspiration to work than do the N.D. Party, who are claimed to be the great supporters and the great backers and defenders of the union movement. The rank and file is more on our side, Mr. Speaker, in their desires to go back to work, and to have gainful employment. — (Interjection)— Who, the N.D. Party are totally in touch with, Mr. Speaker, I will fully submit and fully agree with is the management of the labour unions, Bernard Christophes, et cetera, are very much in tune with what the members of the N.D. Party mean, but I maintain that that particular gentleman was out of touch with the rank and file membership of his union, he didn't know what they wanted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon . . . Flon on a point of order.

MR. BARROW: The member knows full well if the majority of the rank and file don't want to go on strike, they just have a vote and they go back to work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has not got a point of order. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the remark that I have just made has to cut to the quick of members of the N.D. Party, when all of a sudden, they find out that their supposed position of union solidarity and complete backing by the rank and file of the union movement in this province, and indeed, this country, is just plain not so, has to really hurt them. In fact, it has to hurt them even more when as members of the Conservative party, we tend to better explain the views and the aspiration of the average union membership than what they do, in that we want them to be gainfully employed in this province. And, in all truth, Mr. Speaker, we are indeed, thankful for their support and their continuing support to get us elected in 1977 and again, when the next election is called. Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

So I just want to set the record correct, so that the Member for Logan does not remain on

the record in stating that our remarks last year were anti-union membership. There is no such interpretation follows through, unless you want to impute motives that aren't there for the benefit of spreading your little leaflets to the membership of the union, as we have seen done in the past.

Now, the Member for Inkster was greatly concerned about some of the remarks that I made, in that I interpreted his resolution on Right to Work as being quite heavily flavoured with the motive that government should pick up the slack and all the unemployment figures in the country. And, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the Member for Inkster, if in fact, I led him to believe that that was my major concern. But I think even if the Member for Inkster reads his own speech in introducing this resolution, he will find out that he very much was abhorred by the lay-off of people at INCO; the loss of production, the loss of GNP to the country, et cetera, et cetera. And, to follow that to a normal conclusion, which I fully expect he wanted us to do, would mean would he have had the control, the government control, he would have assured that INCO did not shut down; that they would have continued to produce at the cost to whom? At the cost of every taxpayer in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

So if he is overly concerned that I interpreted that as his intention on Right to Work, then his concern perchance is well-founded, because if you do analyze his speech, that is the natural conclusion that one would draw from his solution to the unemployment problems in Canada, and that would be the next conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the resolution where it urges the government to implement what public programs are necessary to ensure gainful employment.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was a concern to me. I addressed that concern in my original remarks, and it's still is, I think, a legitimate concern, because the Member for Inkster still hasn't adequately even today explained exactly what he would have done in the INCO situation. He certainly hasn't refuted the possibility that under his style of government and his political philosophy, that INCO would, in fact, be required to continue producing, required to continue full employment of their employees, and maybe, just maybe, nationalization might be the only solution to assure the public input for employment in the INCO Company and any similar company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was another area that the Member for Inkster touched on which, as a Conservative, I took a certain amount of displeasure in hearing and I took a great deal of exception to hearing it, yes, that's a better way to put it. I believe, and I know that the Member for Inkster will correct me if I have used the wrong phraseology, but I believe he said, "Unemployment was the Conservative treasure."

A MEMBER: That's what he said.

MR. ORCHARD: Treasure. Then my hearing and my memory was not blotted out by the remarks of the Member for Logan.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has also said that it is the pleasure as well as the treasure of the Conservative government. Well, I take particular exception to that, Mr. Speaker. After all, who is the Member for Inkster trying to kid? Is he trying to indicate that under a Conservative administration, you always have unemployment, it's a perpetual problem, it's a perpetual thing facing Conservative administration. He's obviously trying to say that. Well, Mr. Speaker, who is he trying to kid? When he in the last eight years of N.D. administration in this province never looked at an unemployment rate lower, I believe than 4 percent in this province. And those, Mr. Speaker, those statistics bear out the fact that one of two things is true. Either the Member for Inkster through his reigns of power cannot control unemployment, as was adequately demonstrated in the last eight years they had power. Or that they in fact, are proponents of this Conservative treasure and pleasure of unemployment, that they want to promote it as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the next time this item comes up, the Honourable Member for Pembina will have 10 minutes. I'm leaving the Chair and the House will resume at 8 o'clock in Committee of Supply.