

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 25, 1972

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 37. Resolution 103 (a) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; (3)--passed; The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (3)--passed; (a)--passed; (b) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; (3)--passed; (b)--passed; (c) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; (c)--passed; (d) (1)--passed; The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I wanted to speak briefly on this item, Mr. Chairman, because of some concern that I feel because the architectural industry in this community appears to be -- being heavily eroded. I think mainly because most of the work that is generated originates with the government and it's my understanding that the government now has an architectural staff which is of a very considerable size and that most of the architectural work is done by that staff. Because the private sector has been suffering from some lack of confidence and some depression in the economy, these architectural firms are finding that they are not able to find adequate amounts of work within the province and they are having to go outside of Manitoba in order to keep their industry alive.

I think most members of this House received last December a letter from the architectural profession -- it was a construction survey which they do periodically -- and I'd like to read parts of the results of the survey which they conducted. These results are tabulated as at December 1, 1971 by the Manitoba Association of Architects and they indicated a continuing low level of in-province volume of construction for which architectural consultants are providing professional services. It does appear however that the gross volume of work emanating from architectural practices is now holding its own and should increase in 1972 as a result of a fairly dramatic increase in the exportation of professional skills to other parts of Canada and abroad. The great decline in construction volume from 1970 to 1971, that is from 127.7 million to 82.5 million reflected a 54 percent decline in in-province work while at the same time professional practices increased their out-of-province services by 240 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be quite clear to all of us what the ramifications of this sort of policy are. It means that there will be less work for those people who are traditionally employed in construction, and the construction industry is a prime user of unskilled labour. It's a bellwether of really as to what the numbers of unemployed will be. Now if the architectural profession finds that they have a 240 percent in their out-of-province services, it should be pretty obvious to us too that their head offices are going to move to where their work is and it follows that that's where they're going to pay their taxes. It seems to me that it's very important for the economy of Manitoba to keep this industry viable within Manitoba for the employment that they generate and hopefully someday when the economy has been revitalized they will be here to pick up the architectural work which should then be available in the private sector.

They go on to say that for the first time since the Second World War there was in 1971 a decrease in the number of registered architects in the province. Well the government is always saying to us, you say these things but you can't prove them. I would like to indicate to the Minister some of the outstanding architects who have moved from Manitoba and are now conducting their businesses out of necessity, from other locations. There's Mr. Waisman who left the No. 10 Group and is in Vancouver, David Aitkin, L. Hannah, who has gone to Toronto; Herb Briggs has gone to Toronto. I believe there is a Jack Duncan who has also left the province, and I think an example of what's been happening - as an example we can use the three new centres that were built for Autopac - that work I gather was done completely by the architectural staff of the department and none of that work was diverted to private companies.

The survey report goes on to say that it is evident that the exportation of professional services represents not only an excellent source of prime industry but it produces a high yield spin-off to the construction industry itself. Notwithstanding this however, inherent in the fact of increasing exportation of professional skills is a need to maintain a strong and viable domestic base of work, and the decline in this particular area is a cause for considerable concern.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to express my concern about this exportation of architectural profession, to hear the Minister's comments as to how he thinks directions will be in the future and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if the members could just keep the conversations down to a low hum; it's very difficult for the Chair to hear what the honourable member is saying.

MRS. TRUEMAN: In the last week or two, I did put in an Order for Return asking for the numbers of architects and architectural technicians who were on staff in the department at the present time. Perhaps the Minister will be prepared to give us an answer to that now.

There was one other matter on which I wanted to express some concern and that is in relation to urban housing. I understand that the government invites proposals, perhaps on land that the government has in its possession or it may be that they are inviting proposals on land which the developer may have assembled himself.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd just thought I'd mention to the Honourable Member that I believe her comments in regard to public housing are more appropriately put to the Minister of Municipal Affairs during his Estimates.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I think the Minister is probably correct, although there is an association as of course there is between all departments but I quite agree that probably that should be brought up at another time. I would like to hear the Minister's comments on this particular matter that I've brought up and perhaps give us some reassurances.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has raised the question of the size of our in-house staff. I wish to tell her that we will give a complete answer in reply to her Order for Return but I might tell her at this time that our present staff of architects is 13 and this is an increase over 1969 when we had 9 architects, but I might point out that four of the present staff of architects are engaged in space and planning to attempt to examine and project and analyse the needs of government in the long run, rather than on a day to day crisis basis.

Our architectural staff is primarily concerned with renovation. When we come to massive projects, for example our new office building, or larger projects, we inevitably hire a firm of architects or engineers and let them undertake it. Our people primarily do the smaller work, the renovations, many architectural firms are not interested in projects of the order of five or ten or fifteen thousand dollars.

We are presently making arrangements with the Provincial Association of Architects to meet with them and discuss some of their problems. We have met with them before. I know that at a previous meeting, I believe the Premier was present, myself, and three or four other members of the Cabinet.

Some architects of course are doing work out of the province and I say that is a very healthy thing; they can export their skills. I might say that the member raised the question of Autopac and I believe that most of the architectural work done on Autopac buildings was by a free lance architect, two buildings up to date.

In 1970 and 71 the actual fees paid by our department for architectural and engineering fees was some \$627,000, and in 71/72 actual fees paid some \$529,000. Needless to say there have been boom periods - the construction industry doesn't run at an even keel and during the Centennial years we had a large undertaking of public buildings, like the Centennial Concert Hall, Planetarium, The Theatre Centre and Red River Community College, etc. I believe there has been a sort of general slump reflected in the economy, not only in Manitoba but in Canada, in North America, and I would hope that we are now going into an upturn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d) (1), The Honourable Member from Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Perhaps the Minister could inform the House then as to the new provincial office building that's being planned. I believe it's to be a duplicate of the Norquay Building. Exactly how is that going to be handled by the Department or a firm?

MR. DOERN: Well I think that the response of our department is we hope that it's not going to be another Norquay Building. I don't pose as an architect or a town planner, but I am told that in terms of efficiency that that building is not in the most efficient possible design. Apparently a square or a circle is much more economic and more efficient than the other kinds. The building we are talking about will cost several million dollars less than the Norquay Building, as I announced the other day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d)(1) -- The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I didn't have an answer to my question as to how then and who will be designing the building, will it be private companies or will it be a government project?

MR. DOERN: . . . is being designed by one of the largest firms in Manitoba. Smith, Carter, Parkin, or Smith, Carter and Partners, they've changed their name several times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d)(1) -- The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): There's quite an increase in salaries here. I wonder if the Minister would care to indicate that increase -- how it's arrived at. You're dealing with (d)(1) are you not, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the increase some \$168,000 is for five new positions. For example an engineering aid, three clerk-typists, an accounting clerk, nine term staff that have been approved for 1971-72, general salary increase, some \$61,000 annual increment, some \$25,000 and some reclassifications.

MR. EINARSON: From the general salary increase can you give the percentage on that?

MR. DOERN: Yes, it was a general salary increase to the entire civil service, some 7 1/2 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d)(1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; Resolution (d) -- passed. The Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, with respect to security services and the problem that's been going on during the past year and regards to the keys and security of the building, I was wondering, I think at the time that we had all the problem with the keys there was some such thing come up about a key that had a certain content in the metal that couldn't be copied, and so on like that. I question if this is probably the right thing to do in a building like this. I think that a building of this magnitude possible a straight brass key would be better, and locks be changed from time to time so if there's a key stolen -- I know that I go back to June 69 when this government was elected, we were standing outside as newly elected members while the old Cabinet was discussing something in the Cabinet room and we were waiting to get in there at 10:00 o'clock. And unbeknown to the Cabinet of that day and the Premier, he didn't realize we were standing outside the door and one of the press members come along and opened the door and let us in. So it would make me think that keys do go astray regardless of whether magnetic properties or whatever they have, and I don't want to see you go through the same problems, Mr. Minister, as did the previous Minister of Public Works because he had quite a problem at that time, but I think if you go back to the straight brass key -- (Interjection) -- Yeah he still has a problem, I realize that, but further to that, if you go back to the straight brass key to the standard lock as we would use in our businesses on this side of the House, or your homes on that side of the House, I think that you could take these locks and you change from the back door to the front door and from the Minister of Labour's office on to the Minister of Finance's office and change these locks back and forth just to fool people with. We had this same problem in the Charleswood Municipal offices when one key went astray and with changing of one lock, just an interchange of two locks overcame the problem.

So I think that if you look at that and do away with this certain key that has the several metal qualities that can't be copied, because I think any key in one level or another can be copied.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might just point to the honourable member that this system of keys, and I'll let the honourable member borrow mine just to have a look at the different kind of make-up, but I might point out to him that it was introduced by the previous administration and we have made additions and improvements to it since that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (e)(1) -- passed; (2) -- The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, Resolution (e)(2) -- Other Expenditures, \$147,000 this year compared to \$67,000 last year, which is an increase of more than 100 percent. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could enlighten us as to what kinds of items and activities are covered under that catch-all phrase and that substantial increase in spending.

A MEMBER: Two private secretaries.

MR. SHERMAN: Well that would account for about a tenth of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there were improvements made to the security of a number of government buildings. We have I think a better supervision of our parking lots. Those of you who have received tickets will attest to that. And we of course have since the -- we have of course undertaken to provide security for the new Provincial Library and Archives

(MR. DOERN cont'd) Building, for Land Titles at Fort Osborne complex, and so on. Some of this money is spent for contract services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Fort Garry, pardon me.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister how come those expenses that he has referred to would not be covered under the item for salaries. He talks about increased personnel to maintain security services at different sites, why would they not be covered under (e)(1) -- Salaries?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the (e)(1) refers to people on our staff; (e)(2) refers to contract services that are farmed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (e)(1) -- passed; Resolution (e) -- passed. Resolution 103 in the amount of \$2,595,400.00 -- passed.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, are we on (2)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just going to start on it. 104 (2)(a) -- the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. I notice salaries are up almost a million dollars. Could he give us a breakdown on that, and whilst I'm on my feet the same thing applies to (c), that has a tremendous increase. Probably he could give the House the breakdown on that matter too, which is a million, two.

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

MR. GRAHAM: While we're dealing with the salaries in Item No. 2 could the Minister inform us how much of the salary increase is directly attributable to Autopac, and how much of it is really in the public interest?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that any of that increase is directly attributable to Autopac. In terms of the first item of the increase in salaries there has been an addition of staff to the following buildings to provide better maintenance and operations. For example, the Law Courts, Selkirk Hospital, Brandon Hospital, Provincial Library and Archives, Workshop and Storage Building, Red River Community College, Provincial Office at The Pas, Brandon, so on, and so on. Those were for salary increases and for the addition of new staff for the general salary increase and for the annual increment.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Could the Minister give us a detailed breakdown of those salaries and the position that each member holds?

MR. DOERN: Well I can break this down I suppose as far as members request. I would say in general that there were the following changes: there was the addition of some 68 people for \$390,000; there was a general salary increase of some \$421,000, an annual increment of \$177,000, and then there was an accounting device whereby we had a difference in pay periods and deducted what is called the 27 pay periods. There was a minus of \$140,000 which came out to \$848,000.00. You know I can enumerate, for example the Law Courts there were three people added for \$14,000; Selkirk Hospital 6.3 staff man years for \$38,000, and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, some of the sites, institutions and buildings that the Minister has just referred to in connection with this vote sound remarkably similar to those he just cited with respect to the vote we just passed, and I would appreciate an explanation as to what is the difference in the application of salaries and other expenditures under vote 104 and those in the vote that we just passed, 103 (e)(1) and (2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we were dealing previously with security services. We're now talking about operations and maintenance. Those are separate functions. I might also point out that previously security services to a large extent was lumped under 104 and it has been broken out back to security services per se. So you are dealing with maintenance people, painters and carpenters here and previously we were dealing with security guards.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we have got the information from the Minister that less than 10 of the 68 people are not directly concerned with Autopac, are we to assume that the other 58 are employees of Autopac?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Could the Minister inform us how many of those are not in the employ of Autopac?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: None of them are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): . . . particular resolution, yes. Regarding Autopac, I happened to be in Brandon a week or two ago and I noticed there was a big building going up . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think that the item that the member -- if he's going to deal with Autopac -- Order, please. If the honourable member is going to be dealing with Autopac I would suggest that he raise that question under the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. McKELLAR: I'm only referring to Autopac to identify the particular building. There so happens to be a particular building in Brandon which they say in Brandon is going to house Autopac, part of that building.

I also know that there's a building down here on Portage Avenue about two blocks from where I sleep that now houses Autopac and I'd like to know what kind of a lease you have on that building, and the Bank of Montreal Building on Portage Avenue that you're presently using for Autopac. Is it going to be that you're going to retain the Bank of Montreal, that big plush floor up there in the Bank of Montreal, and also retain that lovely new building that's going up in Brandon? Are you going to retain two offices, two head offices for Autopac? I'd like to know this, Mr. Chairman, because the people in my area are asking it, and the people in Wawanesa are asking this question, and I want an answer for the constituents that I represent. I want an answer from the Honourable Minister. I want to know how many employees are going to remain in Winnipeg in this plush office? How many are going to be in that plush office in Brandon? When are they going to move from the plush on Portage Avenue to Brandon? Are there going to be more people in the office in Brandon than what we think there will be?

A MEMBER: Are they taking air conditioning with them or what's . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I know I'm getting lots of help here, but this is very important, because we in the constituency of Souris-Killarney lost an industry, and I mean lost an industry, and I want to know who's going to get this industry, Brandon or Winnipeg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, we heard about the centralization of industry in this province -- and I'm going to talk a lot when we speak on the Honourable Industry and Commerce's Estimates -- the centralization of industry, but where is it going? It's going back to Winnipeg and Brandon, the very place that we -- (Interjection) -- and we're leary of it. We're trying to fight for industry, Mr. Chairman. We're the ones that are losing it, not gaining it. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister knows of my fight for the industry in Wawanesa. Mr. Chairman, we got buildings in Wawanesa and we haven't got them, we'll build them and rent them to you. Why put them in Winnipeg and Brandon, that's all I'm asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt my honourable friend but there is a rule of the House that the subject matter of debate should be pertinent to the Resolution. The Resolution deals with matters under the control of the Department of Public Works. The regional disposition of industry does not deal with that matter I say in all due respect, Mr. Chairman, and I know my honourable friend is vitally concerned but there are matters to be considered in the Estimates. We are going to deal with the Department of Municipal Affairs; we are going to deal with the matter of Industry and Commerce, and I just want to suggest to my honourable friend through you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the proper place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman it might be well taken but it doesn't answer my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. I think I have made it quite clear to the member before that the item which he wishes to discuss will come under the Department of Municipal

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) Affairs.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . I can't answer you back but I know that there is no other department, I know, because I was Deputy Speaker the same as you are and I know there's no place in the Estimates, whether it's Municipal Affairs, Industry and Commerce, that I can ask a Minister over there, and he can answer me, why we are housed in a certain building, because he can't answer. The Minister is responsible for all the buildings, whether they own the buildings, or whether they lease the buildings, whether they rent the buildings. Mr. Chairman, that's all I'm asking. The policy of centralization is going from the rural areas to the City of Winnipeg, and the City of Brandon, and I want to know how much is going to be in Brandon for the Autopac office, and how much is going to be in Winnipeg after the building in Brandon is built?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I feel like a referee attempting to restrain two fighters because my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Killarney is triggering my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I'm afraid that we will re-enact and relive the autopac debate.

I might say to the Member for Souris-Killarney that in Brandon we have a new office building and some twenty thousand square feet of that building is allocated for autopac purposes, the entire third floor and I believe a claims office on the main floor, or in the basement as well. In terms of the space leased by MPIC that does not come directly under our control, they have degree of autonomy and they are leasing space in Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I simply want to thank the Minister of Public Works for his courtesy in answering the question asked by the Member for Souris-Killarney. A great deal more courtesy than was shown by the Minister of Labour who attempted to prevent the question from being asked. I want to thank the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I regret very much that my friend from Morris takes the line that he did. All I was trying to do, Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection) -- I was attempting, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. If the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to take part in this debate, I will recognize him and he can rise and speak from his place but not from his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I rose on a point of order to indicate that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney was not correct when he was talking of the matter of the relocation of industry, and when the Minister of Public Works did get an opportunity, he did indicate the fact that Autopac Corporation controls its own leases, such as the bank referred to by my honourable friend, that's all.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will not return to the original question I asked of the Minister, of the 68 people who he recognized as being on salary, and he indicated that ten of them were not on the employ of Autopac. Could he indicate where the other 58 were employed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: I can read a change. I can read a list to my honourable friend which he appears to desire, and I suppose that he can draw certain conclusions from it, and I will draw others, but the facts remain the same, that in terms of the increase in staff for operations and maintenance, I mentioned already there that there is an addition in the Law Courts of some three, the Selkirk Hospital 6,3; Brandon Hospital 7,3; Provincial Library and Archives 2; the Workshop and Storage Building 45; and these are all casual employees. The Red River Community College 1, Provincial Office Building, The Pas, 1; Keewatin Community College, The Pas 2; Government Office Building, Brandon, 3; Fort Osborne Complex 5; Agricultural Services Building, University of Manitoba, 4; and then there was a staff man here transferred from Health minus 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I just want to thank the Minister for his information on the building in Brandon. But I'd like to ask him now what costs will the lease be per square foot of the

(MR. MCKELLAR cont'd) space in that new building in Brandon? Per square foot.

MR. DOERN: Well I'll see whether one of my assistants can work that out. but I might point out that we are constructing the building. It is our building, and we are not therefore leasing it. I suppose we could put a dollar value -- our tentative estimate is \$5.00 a square foot.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated a work force of minus 10 in the Health and Welfare Services. Does this mean that 10 of the employees of the Department of Health and Welfare are worth less than nothing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104 (a) -- passed; (b) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, there is an item here of considerable increase. Could the Minister indicate where that increase occurs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 104(b) -- The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, here again I have a long list. Does my honourable friend have the patience to listen? I could give examples, or I could read it entirely, for example reading straight down there's Central Power House, it's a \$40,000 increase, increased service due to the new government; Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases, a \$31,000 increase; partial use of city water and costs due to extension of grounds, re the disposal of farms, and so on and so on; changes in the Portage Home for Boys; Provincial Library and Archives; Workshop and Storage building; Headingley Correctional: Highways Services, office building at 116 Edmonton; the Norquay Building; Government Office Building at Brandon, Fort Osborne and Dauphin.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated \$40,000 expenditure on the Central Power House building which we have been told in the past has been obsolete. Could the Minister justify the expenditure of \$40,000 on an obsolete building?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Basically, Mr. Chairman, it is to service a new boiler which will of course also be connected to our new office building to increase the capacity.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. Will this render the building no longer obsolete?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: I might ask the honourable member who said it was obsolete?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104 (b) -- passed; (c) -- The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: You recall when I was on my feet the last time I mentioned this matter. This item is up almost a million dollars and I would particularly like an answer to what is meant by incidental expenses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I would like to first probably congratulate the Minister for some of these alterations. There is a three-quarters of a million dollars increase as the Member from Swan River said. But the one that is bothering me as one who's fairly regular in this Chamber and does a good deal more listening than talking, and the acoustics this year is lowered that sometimes you just barely can recognize what the honourable members are trying to say on either side of this House, and I feel for the Chairman and the Honourable Speaker, and I don't think the temper or the attitude of this House is any different than other years, even though the rattling of the gavel makes you wonder if you're going into court or somewhere that I used to hear quite often. But the thing is with this type of expenditure, Mr. Speaker, is there an adjustment to this problem because it does seem a shame when you hear it not only from members but from people who are coming into this Chamber to listen to the proceedings and they'll come there, on the stairs, saying they just couldn't make out what was going on, and I know it's hard to follow some of the procedures in here, but if they can't hear the words that I think it's -- and I don't know what we have to do to impress this on the Speaker, but I would maybe just leave this thought, if he doesn't act I might consider talking more and listening less and that might well drive him to act immediately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well Mr. Chairman, I must say that we -- I might explain to the last speaker that we did attempt to improve the acoustics in the Chamber and I'm afraid we're not successful in that regard. We previously had a system whereby a very light material was put up on the walls of the Chamber and behind it some -- on sticks were nailed some acoustical tile and this appeared to do a generally satisfactory job. We were then confronted with duplicating that system, or attempting our present carpeting system, or by getting a drapery material, we had a discussion -- I discussed this very carefully with my department; we made what we thought was the best decision. Acoustics is a pretty tricky art. I don't know that there is any in the City of Winnipeg or the Province who is in effect an expert in acoustical engineering. We therefore went with the present system and I have listened to complaints -- I think a lot depends where one sits in this Chamber. I know I find it much more difficult to hear in the front row than in the second row, but we are at present, we are at present ordering new material and I'm afraid though that it may take another four or five weeks before it appears. By that time of course the session will have ended and we will all be at home but we will certainly have improved the acoustics for the next session.

In response to the Member for Swan River there is a sizeable increase as he noted in this general catchall of 2(c) and I think it is because this is what I referred to as the miscellaneous account in the Department of Public Works. Frequently an amount of money is allocated and then the department asks for a number of special warrants throughout the year. This year we are attempting to circumvent that process by asking for an average bulk figure from which we will take the various monies required for all the projects undertaken by our department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I'm sure the Minister will find a dollar or two in there to hang the portraits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104(c) -- passed; (d) -- The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a request of the Minister. When he's purchasing materials to help control the, or help better the acoustics in this -- I'd like to ask the Chairman or the Minister if he'd be good enough when he's getting materials to better the acoustics of this Chamber that he would get enough extra material to make a jacket for the Member for Crescentwood that would be suitable for the decorum of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 104(c) -- passed; (The remainder of Resolution 104 was read and passed). Resolution 105 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: We have heard argument in this Chamber in the past short while regarding the advisability of doing much of the servicing of government vehicles in the area in which the misfortune to those government vehicles exist and we see a sizeable increase here in the appropriation for the operation of the Central Provincial Garage and even though the First Minister indicated to us that repairs would be made in other areas of the province, the facts that occur in this appropriation seem to belie that fact and I would like to have the assurance of the Minister of Public Works that repairs to government vehicles will be carried out in rural areas wherever the occurrence of misfortune exists.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, it is a fact that previously to our administration that vehicles were in fact brought to Winnipeg for overhauls and minor repair work, and that when our government took office that they changed this policy and wherever possible, and whenever possible, the work is performed locally. Now sometimes of course someone who is operating out of Winnipeg who may have a minor repair if he is returning to Winnipeg will tend to take his vehicle to the Central Provincial Garage but if the honourable member is asking for my assurance then I give him that assurance that we have extended the policy to attempt to use local garages when it makes sense.

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

MR. GRAHAM: I appreciate the comments of the Minister and would he consider reducing the appropriation in this particular instance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in hearing the comments from the Minister in regards to repairing of government vehicles in different garages. I'd like to give him one instance in my constituency where a government vehicle was taken into a garage;

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) there was a problem with the transmission: the garage took it apart, checked it out, said there was a bearing needed at the cost of \$12.50. They were instructed to put that vehicle back together again and it was towed to Brandon where you have your government garage. Now this, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that when we were government if a minor repair such as that was done at a garage in the area in which it was working, and this is an example that I wanted to make to the Minister. I realize that it's impossible for him to keep his finger on all the different problems but this is one that was given to me and I'm just wondering how many more, how many more cases that might be quoted in a similar situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member will supply us with a date and a place and a name if possible, we will look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 105 was read and passed.) That completes the Department of Public Works.

I would refer honourable members to page 27, Resolution 69 (a) -- The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say is I'm sure that all the members in the House know this is my first Estimates of Department of Highways and we have a program that we will be distributing - the Page boys are distributing now to the members of the House which shows the entire program, Highways Program for the Province of Manitoba.

I'm happy to be able to report, Mr. Chairman, that continuing development of Manitoba's road system in all areas of the province during the year 1971/72, and hopefully when the Estimates are approved, further and greater developments should take place in the years 72/73. Road travel in Manitoba increases and changes with every passing year as we are all aware. The province's road system developed to give people in rural areas a better way of getting their products to markets and to provide a link with their nearest communities. Today our roads still play this vital role in our economy. Added to this in recent years is the necessity of transporting vast quantities of non agricultural products to communities within the province and beyond its borders.

The trucking industry for example has placed new demands on our roads and our highways have taken on still another role as Manitobans and visitors alike take advantage of them to reach the many attractions found in this province. The traveller-trailer for example and the camper-trailer have become familiar sights. Roads are many things to many people. Manitoba has more than 3,900 miles of provincial trunk highways and more than 7,500 miles of provincial roads. They help people get to market; they help people transport their goods; and they help conduct their business; and they also help people reach their holiday destinations. Manitoba is developing roads for all these purposes. On the heavily travelled routes of southern Manitoba and into the new frontier of the north,

Mr. Chairman, as today I'm standing before you to discuss a road program for the north only or for the south but for both. And I recall a few days ago the Honourable Member for Pembina wanted to know what I mean by that statement and the program in front of him will certainly indicate that. The program that you have in front of you is the complete program for the coming year and one that the department is extremely proud of. Although you will find that the total budget has increased, I would like to see double the amount so that we could perform all the essential work that is required in each town and each constituency. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that we would like to eliminate the need for a priority system but unfortunately money is a limited factor.

I've been tremendously impressed in the past few months with the Department of Highways by keeping my eyes open as I travel around the province, and by learning from such experts as my Deputy Minister, Mr. Brako, and the department's fine engineering and staff. In preparing a budget it is essential to take into consideration what I feel are four outstanding demands being made by the travelling public and the business world. These demands may be summarized as follows:

1. The ever-increasing automobile and light truck traffic is creating a legitimate demand for the upgrading of existing roads and in some instances the building of new roads.
2. The abandoning of railway lines for example as we have seen in the Province of Manitoba to a certain degree in various parts of this province is forcing more and more of

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) our products to be carried by truck transport. The increasing number and size of transport trucks is again creating a demand for roads with higher carrying capacities having a better service, and also for new roads.

3. The need to develop the potentially rich mineral areas of the north and to create in the north living conditions which will bear a reasonable resemblance to those prevailing in the more settled areas of the province has created an irresistible demand for the upgrading of existing roads and the building of many miles of new roads. And finally, present day demands require highways designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner that a greater degree of safety be achieved in the future than in the past, and that this degree of safety be achieved without sacrificing speed.

The preparation of a budget that will meet with the reasonable needs of all provincial groups and interests and yet maintain a balance with all other government services is not an easy task by any means. This particular budget does, I believe, come as close as is humanly possible to meet the needs of all sectors. It is based on a reasonable balance of funds between development roads, tourist roads, Trans-Canada Highway, and those ordinary provincial roads and provincial trunk highways that seem to be less glamorous but which are so essential to the well-being of a large portion of the province.

I'd like to say a word about the Motor Vehicle Branch. For the Motor Vehicle Branch the year 1971 was a memorable, busy, and at times a trying year. The branch was deeply involved in the development, implementation and administration of an integrated and automated vehicle registration insurance system, and a driver's licence insurance system. To cope with these new and additional responsibilities, the Branch had to undergo a very substantial reorganization, including recruitment of new staff and the training of staff in new procedures. As in all enterprises of such scope and complexity, difficulties and problems are bound to arise. We are confident, however, that the basic principles of the system that has been developed are sound, most of the start-up problems have been identified and corrected, and further improvements and modifications will be made to the system before the next registration year. We are also confident that when the system is fully developed and perfected, it will serve as a model of efficiency and good service to the public and which will be emulated by outside jurisdictions. While much of the resources of the Branch were devoted to the development and implementation of the insurance plan, the Branch was not idle in other areas of activity.

In the field of Driver Education there was further growth and expansion of the very worthwhile program in teaching our young people to drive safely and courteously. The number of high schools involved in this program increased from 97 to 107, and the number of students graduating from these courses increased from 4527 to 4963. The pilot research project undertaken by the Safety Division of the Branch has clearly demonstrated the worthwhileness of this program by showing that drivers who've completed a course in driver education have a significantly lower degree of accidents and traffic violations than young drivers who have not had the benefit of such instruction. We look forward to making these courses available to even greater numbers of our young people in the forthcoming year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being nine o'clock, the last hour of every day is Private Members' hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and have directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members Hour on Tuesday. Our Orders of the Day are Private Bills and Public Bills. On the Proposed Second Reading of Bill 19. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) presented Bill No. 19, An Act to Amend the Development Corporation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to several cries from the Conservative Party to explain, I'll try and keep my explanation brief, and I'll take my time.

When the Schreyer Government came into power, one of the first things said by Premier Schreyer was that he was going to change the Manitoba Development Fund into a Crown Corporation, and also he was going to open up to the public scrutiny the affairs of the corporation in such a way that the taxpayers who were footing the bill, who were putting the money into the corporation, would have a greater knowledge than had been given to them in the past, so the Amendment Bill 19 really means instead of one annual statement, or one annual report from the corporation, there shall be quarterly reports from the corporation. Also that there should be more details supplied as to the nature of loans, the nature of the whole business of the corporation, in other words the corporation would be called upon to explain, through their chairman, in more detail than has been done in the past. So basically this bill calls for quarterly reports with more detail, and also it calls for upon the request of the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Economic Affairs, or any two members of that committee, that the committee would be convened at their request to discuss any matter that was thought to be worth discussing by the members who had asked for the calling of the meeting. So basically this is what the amendment is all about, public corporation lending public funds to open up further than the Premier said at the time when he proposed the changes.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a Voice Vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On proposed motion, or Bill by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SHERMAN: I ask that it stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Motion by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: I hope I do not lose my right to speak next time just to tell you that I'm not ready to present the Resolution at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution will go to the bottom of the Order Paper. Agreed? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Resolution 16.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye,

WHEREAS this House recognizes that people living in northern, or remote areas, face a higher cost of living than those citizens living in urban and southern areas, and that such costs of living increases is not presently taken into account in the tax and wage structure laws in Manitoba;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government give consideration to amending the minimum wage regulations in Manitoba to provide that in northern and remote areas, the minimum wage shall always and automatically be not less than ten percent higher than the minimum wage in general use throughout the Province.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think we've heard enough speeches in this House about the problems of the north from the Member for Churchill and others, especially about the high cost of living because of higher freight rates, and remoteness and so on. As a member of the Northern Task Force I think, and I'm sure that the other members will bear me out, that this was always one of the points made in remote and northern communities that the cost of food, gas, clothing, transportation, everything was anywheres from ten to fifty percent higher than in southern Manitoba. With the more increased usage of the welfare in the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) Province, it has been found that some people consider that the welfare level and the minimum wage level are in some cases so close together that it discourages initiative in taking jobs, especially low paying jobs, in other words, at the minimum wage level. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I present this Resolution which would mean simply that any time there was an increase in the minimum wage north of a certain parallel -- and I would expect the government through their studies to make their decision as to where that should be, that those people north of that line would have a ten percent higher minimum wage than the rest of the Province.

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

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is contrary to everything that this government has been trying to establish by trying to discriminate between the different parts of the province. I think what we should be working for is to establish that type of opportunity in all parts of Manitoba that there should not be consideration of people being remote. I think this government has a record of having moved in that direction through their airstrips which have been built throughout the northern parts of the province. I think this will greatly reduce the cost of living because it will be possible to have that type of service to those communities at a much cheaper rate to provide the goods being brought in and therefore to begin to now move in a retroactive, or rather very negative way is discriminatory. If we begin to state that we should have a differential between the northern and the urban area, or the urban and the southern area, where is the end? I think it has been agreed that the minimum wage is simply meant to be a universal base upon which the people in organized labor could establish a decent type of income for themselves. But to begin to legislate then it would mean that other communities would be asking that the Portage la Prairie, community of Portage la Prairie would be asking well we should have a different rate for our city. I know the Member for Rhineland will say we should have a different rate for our town, for our area, we should have a lower rate than the people in the urban areas. And we can carry on, then they will begin to state that there **should be a differential** between the women working on a certain job than men. I think we have moved a long way to establish a more uniform salary, rather than to begin to move to establish a different rate. I think the whole outlook should be to try to improve conditions that they would not be considered remote or northern communities, and this is our end to which we should be working, therefore I believe this Resolution should be defeated.

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

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise, I guess I have to say something. I would like to adjourn it. I don't know what I would say if I did adjourn it when I came back.

I don't really believe that this is the proper approach to the problem of looking after the higher cost of living in that part of Manitoba which we come from. I, for one thing, I don't think the ten percent would make up the difference in that cost. We have heard at one time or another that one lands on a horns of a dilemma, and I wish I had spoken on Bill 17, or had an opportunity to speak on Bill 17 this afternoon, and I could have best explained the position that I wish to take, but I suppose that will have to wait until tomorrow.

And today I find that I am faced with the proposition of having to do something about the situation that does exist in Northern Manitoba as exists in many other parts of Canada, and that is that many people and many businesses, use the minimum wage as the wage structure in hiring people, and whether we like to face it or not there are many people that work for minimum wages. And whether we like it or not we as legislators are faced every day with that problem, and I don't know whether it is up to government to assist business in deciding what one should pay, or whether it is up to government to try and work along with business to see if there are ways in which they can help those people that have to pay minimum wages. My mind . . . on that problem and I would I would like to speak longer on it, if and when the Minister does come in with changes to the minimum wage this year. But I don't think I would like to expand too far on that at this time because I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, it rather extended to a principle that would include all parts of Manitoba rather than just one part.

But on the other hand I do respect the fact that even in different departments, such as the Department of Welfare, the government do recognize themselves that there is a need for additional monies for people living in Northern Manitoba, and they pay in fact I am sure, they pay larger amounts to welfare recipients in areas in Northern Manitoba than they do in other parts of the Province. So there is a precedent set for this. On the other hand businesses are harnessed with a problem of meeting again a cost factor but I don't think it should be taken

(MR. BEARD Cont'd) . . . out on those people that have to work for them. So up to now and like all politicians I suppose I've stood up a few minutes and said nothing and wishing more and more that I had adjourned it and tried to find a better solution, or better still I should have gone out for coffee and hid in the corner until it had been passed but I guess that's a coward's way out.

I think their additional costs include additional transportation costs, clothing costs, living costs which far exceed those that are living on minimum cost in the rest of the province. If I go any further then I may as well not talk on Bill 17 tomorrow, and I would like to save that for the Minister of Finance.

And I suppose I won't know until I sit down, Mr. Speaker, whether I really am going to support this or not -- (Interjection) -- That's the problem of being an Independent, I really have no one to blame it on and I just hope that we don't make the headlines and I don't want to be reported on this -- (Interjection) -- But anyway I suppose I would -- best way would be to join the Liberals and vote for it and -- (Interjection) -- you should be on the side of the angels as much as possible. So I won't waste any more time, Mr. Speaker. I really can't give you an answer to that kind of a thorny question, I suppose I should have thought of it a lot sooner than I have instead of leaving it to the last minute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I've read this resolution over with some thought and it's a question in my mind as to whether this is the proper way to go about it in giving a little more income to those people in northern Manitoba. But I couldn't sit still and allow the remarks for the Honourable Member of Radisson to go by. So far as I'm concerned I would be the last in the world to divide people on pay scales but from his remarks tonight he obviously didn't give very much thought to the people that are in northern Manitoba, many of whom are still living under frontier ways of life. I don't know whether he realizes it or not but the conditions are such that the government itself in almost every department gives northern pay to its employees. They get the basic pay that everyone else gets throughout the province insofar as civil servants are concerned and added to that is northern pay. And the same can be said with the small hospitals, the nurses, and so on. The same applies to education that the average man that has to go out and work for his daily pay, and on the minimum wage which he is entitled to today, is far below the purchasing power of what you have in southern Manitoba, and the sooner my honourable friend realizes that the better it's going to be. I think it's reasonable to say to him that the only thing we can buy in Northern Manitoba at the same price you can buy it in Winnipeg is a bottle of beer at 50 cents. That's saying a lot for the small man in northern Manitoba that you are forever trying to thrust down people's throats. You're not doing the things that you're preaching you're doing, and you know it, and I think a little more serious consideration might have been given by the government in office to this resolution. The solution may not be in the manner that it's set forth but somehow or other I felt we could have expected better from the Honourable Member of Radisson.

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

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, despite the acoustics, I shall try and make a point. I always feel that I should speak on minimum wage, and I don't want anybody to ever misinterpret me to think that I am speaking, thinking that minimum wage is too high. I have several reasons to think it is too high but I have several reasons to think it's too low and during my 20 years --(Interjection)-- and laugh as he may, he knows exactly what I mean. I've repeated in this House several times and as long as I've been in the construction business and been involved with labour and paying their wages, never have I paid the minimum wage, never have I paid the minimum wage. --(Interjection)-- That's right. You would take that and accept that as gospel I'm sure and as was said by the Member for Swan River, you got up, you made no contribution whatsoever, and I accept that because I didn't expect one from you.

But I have to say tonight that to back a resolution such as has been put forward by the Member from Portage that I think that possibly you would be doing harm to the people in the northern parts of Manitoba. There's nobody, there's nobody in the Province of Manitoba that can accept the minimum wage plus 10, plus 10 percent -- (Interjection)-- Yeah do me a favour, Mr. Speaker, and call him to order, will you, because the acoustics are bad in here.

There's nobody in the Province of Manitoba that can live off the minimum wage even if it's plus 10 and possibly keep their family, pay their rent, and stay off welfare. It's impossible

(MR. MOUG Cont'd) . . . And I say that anybody that's supporting the minimum wage in any way is ridiculous. So for that reason I say the minimum wage is half of what it should be, and yet it's too high. I gave the reason in the House before, I say that there is the physically and mentally handicapped, that the minute that they're deprived of a place of employment by the high of a minimum wage they're back home on their sisters, their brothers, their mothers, their fathers. -- (Interjection)-- And welfare, they come back on the province. That's right. And for that reason I can't - there's no way that I can support that side of the government with what they've done on minimum wage.

I can't support this resolution, plus 10, as asked for by the Member for Portage la Prairie for northern parts of Manitoba, because if you're up there 10 percent on top of \$1.65 won't help you. One dollar and eighty cents at 40 hours a week - bring that back to \$72.00, or whatever it works out to, there's no way that you can live in northern Manitoba, southern Manitoba, any part of Canada, United States on that kind of money. You can't buy rice for that never mind live the way you're supposed to live and raise a family. I know in my own home what it costs me to live and I pay the same price for groceries at the grocery store as the man that's working for the minimum wage.

So when I was in a business where I couldn't see fit to pay a decent wage for a man that was in the concrete business I moved out of it, I went into the sewer and water business. I can afford to pay men a decent wage on there. I've had men that's worked with me, some for 18 years, some for 15 years, and never have they had to come and ask me for a raise.

So I say that if you want men to work and produce for you and give them a decent wage. I don't think that we can make any reference to \$1.65, or even what the government has in store for us as much as the Minister of Labour said when he was on this side of the House, every time I picked up the daily paper he continually said "when we form the government in Manitoba there'll be no problems." Well I'll say then that everybody today that's receiving the minimum wage or 10 percent above it, has got a problem. Anybody that's receiving \$2.00 an hour today has got a problem. --(Interjection)-- That's right let them starve that's exactly --(Interjection)-- No, that's what you said. Now I would like - that's Mr. Speaker, I would just like the agreement of the House, the House to agree that he stands up again and says "let them starve" those that have to work for \$2.00 and under. --(Interjection)-- No, I never did. Never in my life have I said let anybody starve because I have paid, I have paid -- (Interjection) -- He can't get me in trouble with unions - I'm in lots of trouble with them now. But I paid my men enough money that there's no way that they have to come back to me and say they can't pay their grocery bill. If they can't, it's their own fault. But on \$1.65 you show me a way in today's economy in Manitoba that anybody working 40 hours as you suggest, as that side of the House suggest, and at \$1.65 or \$2.00, that they can possibly as a single man pay their own way, it's impossible, they need help from somebody.

And this is why the welfare is up - welfare and education spending two dollars out of every three out of our budget, and I think welfare is \$1.50. So you just take that and there's why your welfare is where it is, and that's why it's going to stay there.

So what the Minister of Labour says at \$1.65 with great hopes of moving it up another 10 cents in the future, that's absolute nonsense and ridiculous because nobody can live off it. So I say to my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie that I can't support his plus 10 to the north because if anything it should be double at least of \$1.65 that we're getting here for the minimum wage, and still the man will scrape on it at \$2.00 and \$3.30, they can't go. There's just no way they can pay their own way.

So I would definitely have to register my objection to this resolution along with registering my objection to what the Minister of Labour puts forward as a minimum wage today. It's absolutely ridiculous. Buy your groceries and there's nothing left out of the \$80.00, absolutely nothing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words in closing the debate on my motion. I was rather surprised at my friendly neighbour across the House the Member for Radisson with what he had said. I can understand that in their caucus they said well we can't go along with this sort of thing so we're appointing the Member from Radisson to give the party reasons and the government reasons as to why they couldn't do it. But when he compares Portage la Prairie and Altona to Shamattawa, Ilford, Thompson, Lynn Lake,

(MR. G. JOHNSTON Cont'd) . . . Churchill, and on and on, and equating the cost of living as being the same, although he didn't say it that way, he said, "well the next thing you know we're going to have the Member for Rhineland speak for his constituency and say they want a special arrangement," or myself will want a special arrangement because we feel it's the political thing to do I suppose. But really, I hark back, Mr. Speaker, to when the Northern Task Force was being formed and the Premier, or someone on that side, some Minister, proposed a resolution and named all northern members to the Northern Task Force. And here is the answer really. The Member for Radisson has given us the answer as to why you shouldn't appoint only northern members for northern problems, because in his part of the world obviously he hasn't run into the problems that the people have in the north. He hasn't run into the fact that you have to pay \$1.00 or \$1.50 for a gallon of gas because it has to be flown in. He hasn't run into the problem where there's one trader, or one store, in a community and he can charge what he wants, where a bag of flour is \$7.00 down here and up there it's \$11.00. He hasn't encountered this. So I'm surprised that the government didn't get someone who had a little more knowledge of the north to give their position on this matter, Mr. Speaker.

As has been mentioned by the Member for Swan River, the government, the Provincial Government, also the Federal Government, also the Armed Forces, give northern allowances to their employees because they know the cost of living is higher. They know it; otherwise they couldn't get their employees to go there and work for the same salaries --(Interjection)-- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Would my honourable friend - is my honourable friend aware that the minimum wage, federal minimum wage applies equally from Newfoundland to British Columbia, of \$1.75; it applies equally from Emerson to Churchill as far as the minimum wage of the federal administration there's no differentiation there at all.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well I don't know what the Minister of Labour's point was but I know that, yes, certainly I know it. --(Interjection)-- Yes, but I don't know what his point is when he rises to ask me the question if I know or not. Certainly I know it. I know it, and I'm not in agreement with it I might say. You know for too many years provincial and federal governments have looked at Canada as a band 75 miles wide along the American border so we're talking now about putting our lines into the north, roads, rail, air, and everything else to develop the north. So to say because the Federal Government has a similar policy doesn't make it right. It doesn't make it right at all.

Now what are the people who are receiving the minimum wage, who are they? They're obviously the low wage people. They don't have the training or the skills that others have. They have to take the low end jobs. On the Northern Task Force we ran into people, experienced guides, going out for 10 hours a day - they're only supposed to be out for six hours a day at the minimum wage - but they're getting \$10.00 for a ten hour day because it was some kind of a friendly arrangement with the tourist camp operator and the tourist, the guide only got \$10.00 although he spent 10 hours on the job. We're talking about the waitresses, the cooks, the student help, and while we're talking about the low wage people, let's not forget it isn't only the Indian and Metis people that are in these positions. In the City of Thompson there's many housewives working to make ends meet because there's no more overtime, there's been a slight recession there. And they're working many of them for the minimum wage in the hotels and restaurants. Lets not kid ourselves about this. So I just want these few points made, Mr. Speaker. Well the Member for Charleswood, if we had employers like him all over the province there wouldn't be a problem. The reason we have a minimum wage is because there are unscrupulous employers who will get someone for the least amount they can give. Now it's unfortunate, but in Manitoba now for many employers this has become a standard that that's all they're going to pay and for the people in these low end jobs, the people with not that much education, mainly because they didn't have the chance I might say, they're in these type of jobs and this is what this resolution is pointed at. It isn't pointed at Inco; it isn't pointed at the Member for Charleswood if they pay good wages; it isn't pointed at this civil service, or government, or other employers who are making money. This resolution is pointed at the people who are forced to go to work for what they can get and if all they can get is the minimum wage, I say that the minimum wage in Northern Manitoba is not the same as the minimum wage in Winnipeg, or Portage, or Altona, or wherever, and for that reason the resolution is here.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable members have support? Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Resolution before the House is No. 16 by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Allard, Barkman, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Graham, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), McKellar, Moug, Sherman, Watt.

NAYES: Messrs: Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniak, Doern, Evans, Ferguson, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), McBryde, McGill, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley (Transcona), Pawley (Selkirk), Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 13; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it and I declare the Motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I was fortunately paired with the Minister of Recreation. If I had voted I would have voted for the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Resolution the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The next two are in his name. Being absent - the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Riel, No. 1. Members that have spoken on that Motion, just to refresh their memory are the Honourable Member for Riel, the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable Member for Thompson.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it is not all that often, Mr. Speaker, that I take the necessary time to carefully draft and prepare a speech on my part, speeches that I make in the House are usually a little less formal, but the subject matter that is raised by this Resolution by my colleague, the Member for Riel is of that importance that indeed I took the time necessary to deal with this, one of the reasons why I wasn't in the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I want to outline to the Members of this House what is happening to one of the proudest institutions of this province, and to give each of you something to think about, something that might even wake up the members of the government long enough to do something about a problem they created, and are now unable to control.

I want to inform each member of the House that he may expect a bill from Manitoba Hydro, perhaps more correctly from the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Cass-Beggs, because he appears to be the person responsible for the virtual destruction of a once respected and efficient public agency. It is just possible, it is just possible, just possible, that even the government members may be able to appreciate the effect of allowing the principles of public power supply to be twisted by a charlatan-like approach to the management of a utility which should and must be operated on the basis of sound economic principles.

All of us cannot fully appreciate the implications of the sound technical arguments given to this House by my colleague, the Member for Riel. Arguments that tell us that there is a lot wrong with Manitoba Hydro; that power rates are being forced unnecessarily; and that the public is being misinformed; and that the public and technical opinions are being disregarded. We all know that something is wrong at Manitoba Hydro, government members included, but we may not have examined the cost to us personally, as householders, as the colleague from Riel has informed us, the power rates will go up 25 percent to 50 percent in the near future, depending upon how many mistakes Manitoba Hydro is allowed to make.

I have examined my colleague's the Honourable Member for Riel's statements from a point of view of cost to the householder, the average householder in Manitoba using and depending on a reliable source of electric energy. I have made only one assumption in my examination and that is that Manitoba Hydro will be allowed to make mistake after mistake, and base that assumption on the established performance of the utility under this government who cannot or will not, pay sufficient attention to what is going on in the largest Crown Corporation of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only assumption on my part, that is you will insist on making mistakes, or allowing mistakes to be made, and made repeatedly with respect to the development of our hydro resources. Having made that assumption and using, and using material

(MR. ENNS Cont'd) . . . prepared by all the economists and engineers employed by Manitoba Hydro and presented in public documents, it is clear that the average householder can expect to pay at least 150 to \$200 per year more for electrical energy in the very near future, 150 to \$200 more per year per householder, Mr. Speaker. Two hundred each year added to the already crushing utilities and householding costs and taxation rates. Two hundred more to find in a stagnating economy falling more and more behind other provinces. Two hundred more for what? For nothing. For no gain, no purpose, no benefit. Mr. Speaker, 150 to \$200 after all taxes and expenses have been paid. A hundred and fifty to two hundred dollars more for services from a utility which only three short years ago was pursuing a program which would have filled one of the great economic benefits available to this province, and abundant supply of low-cost energy.

Mr. Speaker, when the householders of this Province receive their annual bill of 150 to \$200 from Mr. Cass-Beggs they might relate this new form of taxation to many things. They may say, and by the way, you know that just about negates the Medicare shift, that negates completely the Medicare shift that this government so often likes to talk about. They may say that this \$200 is not too much to pay for the privilege of having Mr. Cass-Beggs as Chairman of Manitoba Hydro at a salary of \$64,000 per year. They may say that an average promised saving of \$22.50 per year on auto insurance which would have hardly offset their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and my point of order is this. We had some discussion on this point of order on previous occasions as to when an honourable member expresses an opinion, then obviously disagreement as to the opinion does not constitute an order, that is understood, Sir. When a member rises in his place, and names a specific name or cites a specific figure, that becomes a matter of fact or a quotation. The honourable member that the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro's salary is \$64,000 per year, that is grossly, grossly inaccurate, error of factor of about one hundred percent. The Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, it must be said, receives a salary that is within line of all other Hydro chairmen across the country.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member should verify his facts. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I seem to recall having undertaken an exercise in arithmetic sometime ago, indeed when the honourable, or the venerable Mr. Cass-Beggs first arrived in this province, that I came very close to that figure and as I recall it was not disputed in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark in the interests of accuracy. I would ask the Minister in return to file the agreement - I think that's what we call, that's what we have with Mr. Cass-Beggs, including the no cuts in it, you know, the football player type of agreement that we had with the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, plus fringe benefits, plus travelling benefits, and whatever else. File the agreement, and I'll want to see this, withdraw this thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman if the Honourable Member is challenging me to reveal a piece of information that he insinuates has not been made public, I would advise him that it is an Order-in-Council, has been on the public record for months, if not more than a year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware, and I really begin now to object to the First Minister's tactic of using my time on Private Members' Resolution to prevent me from making my speech. The subject matter that the Honourable First Minister says yes, the Order-in-Council is on the public record, and on that Order-in-Council Mr. Cass-Beggs receives nothing. Absolutely nothing is related on that Order-in-Council. Mr. Cass-Beggs' salary arrangements are arrived at by the Manitoba Hydro Board. The special privileges granted to Mr. Cass-Beggs are arrived at by Manitoba Hydro Board. We have asked for the minutes, we've asked for the minutes of some of these Manitoba Hydro Board's meetings, and we're not getting them, Mr. Speaker. And now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will desist and not let the First Minister interject in my speeches any longer unless he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of my interjecting, I rise on a point of order again, Sir. I submit to your judgment as to whether it is a valid point of order. The honourable member again has stated not an opinion but presumes to state a matter of

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) . . . fact, and he states that the Order-in-Council makes no reference to the actual salary that is paid to the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, and I say, Sir, without any equivocation that the Order-in-Council stipulates the salary, and so I suggest that that statement by the honourable member does constitute a point of order in that it is a misstatement of fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken again. I should like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that he should give some thought before he lets his words run away. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what we were discussing prior to the interruption was that the \$200 that we are paying, are going to have to ask Manitobans to pay for the privilege of having the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro run our affairs, and they may say that that is acceptable in Manitoba. They may say that for instance as they say that the average promised savings \$22.50 per year on auto insurance would have partly offset this added \$200 cost. If the saving on auto insurance had materialized and had not turned into a cost as well, they may have said that the \$200 per year every year is not too much to pay for the privilege of allowing Manitoba Hydro to proceed with less economic diversion of the Churchill River of having equivalent environmental effects but first to waste the 50 to \$100 million on an unwanted, uneconomic, regulation scheme on Lake Winnipeg which will have effect recreational on the farm lands important to tens of thousands of people not just to the few hundred that will produce, and produce so little or no power benefits. Mr. Speaker, these are privileges offered for the \$200 for each household. These privileges and opportunities to hear occasional twisted and irrelevant propaganda statements from Manitoba Hydro, I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that even members of the government will as householders say that these things, or consider the payment of \$200 as a privilege in due course of time. They will grumble, they will grumble and pay the bills; they won't turn off the lights; they won't stop using electricity to dry clothes, or to power appliances, to heat homes, or to keep their cars running. They can't, Mr. Speaker. Electrical energy is almost essential to survival in this climate. It also helps make our winters more bearable than they would if it were possible to retrogress to an era of candlelight and wood or coal stoves. It is clearer to me now that I have seen what it means to the average householder to have essential utility run off the rails. It is even more startling to realize that the increased cost of power while representing some three percent of the gross income of the average householder will absorb six to seven percent, or better, of the income of those persons that this government claims such a particular concern for, namely the persons on fixed incomes, the old age pensioners and others. Six to seven percent of income that we are possibly affecting as a result of this power scheme. All of this from a government which claims to be interested in people.

This government is interested only in holding power; it is only interested in people in government and in the hangers-on who are being supported and trained for the cause of socialism. Of course, the government members say that my figures are inaccurate. They don't have to admit to them yet, but they will, they will when they pay them out of their own pockets. The government is fully aware that \$100 million is being wasted on Lake Winnipeg. They are aware that the transmission of energy is being delayed and meddled with, with contracts resulting in heavy and irrevocable debt charges with the Federal Government. They are aware that confusion in dealing with the environmental matters and arbitrary political engineering has interfered with the still viable alternative diversions of the Churchill River, causing delays, further lost revenues. They are aware that they have no policy for disposing of energy surplus to this policy, to this province's need at a reasonable price, nor have they considered the revenues from outside energy sales in planning development. I submit that this government knows of all these mistakes, and other mistakes that will contribute unnecessarily to the unprecedented rise in power rates that now face this province. They know these things are going on, Mr. Speaker, and yet they are unable to sum them up and equate the sum to increased costs. They suggest that a large proportion of costs will after all be passed on to industry knowing that increased production costs will ultimately be passed on to the consumer. The government members and their helpers equate these problems, depends on the light bill, and they are helped by a few very stupid and irresponsible members of the academic community who like to foster these concepts at cocktail parties and dinner parties and in the public press. Just a few of the academic community think this way, Mr. Speaker. They think that dollars don't matter, they are a noisy few and fortunately would be no loss.

(MR. ENNS Cont'd) . . . The pennies added up become dollars, and dollars added up become hundreds of dollars. It's all there, Mr. Speaker, it's all written down, just add it up if your're interested to see the size of the bill that is coming to you; I'm certain that a lot of the bill is going to have to be paid.

I think it's too late to recover our losses on a lot of items but I want to help the government, the members in a common cause, the common cause of how to keep our power costs to a minimum, to keep down our personal expenses, and invest these funds in useful enterprises and programs. I don't think the best planning, or the best engineering or the best management, can avoid at least a good portion of the costs. But there are some costs and some projects which can be saved if we understand the root causes of the problem and view them in perspective and return to a sane development policy.

Mr. Speaker, without going back too far into history, Mr. Speaker, just to the beginning of the dark ages of this province, 1969, it appears to me that a viable compromise development plan was placed before this government, a plan which would have been acceptable to all parties in this House, and would have maintained the basic sound economic planning inherent in the original Nelson River Development Plan. The natural maximum level, that was the only change suggested, the only change necessary, Mr. Speaker. The plan was not radical or destructive. Other northern lakes across Canada have been raised that amount without the world coming to an end 12.5 feet, -- (Interjection)-- 12-1/2 feet. This is why I'm presenting it to you now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is accordingly adjourned.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd just like to indicate the procedure for tomorrow. I believe it's agreed upon. I will call Bill No. 17, Bill No. 21 and then go back into Committee of Supply to consider capital. I think this was agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.