

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 12 students of Grade 11 Standing from the Powerview High School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Larson, this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

We also have 43 students of Grade 11 Standing from the Diocesan High School, under the direction of Mr. Insull. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a matter before Oral Questions dealing with the matter of urgency.

Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns; That pursuant to Rule 27(1), I move to set aside the ordinary business of the House to consider a matter of urgent public importance to wit; that the government has misled this House and the people of Manitoba by failing to make adequate budgetary provisions as outlined in the Throne Speech for substantial increases in the amounts provided for the operation of post secondary institutions in the public school system. Therefore, the government has not prevented dramatic increases in the mill rates within Manitoba school divisions, and has allowed reductions in the educational programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have five minutes in order to put forward the urgency for this debate.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in presenting this matter for debate, the urgency of the matter, I first would like to point out a contradiction which has occurred between the announcement by the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 that it will be meeting with the Minister of Education on March 21st, in order to present to the Minister of Education a request for an additional \$8 million. And the statement yesterday by the Minister of Education in this House, which reads as follows: "It has never been the practice of government to depart from the funding schedule applicable to all school divisions of the province. I can't see in this particular instance that we will be departing from that particular practice".

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a deadline by the School Division No. 1 and for other school divisions within Manitoba to present to the City of Winnipeg and to other municipalities their Estimates for school spending by March 15th. We know, Mr. Speaker, that already it's clear, in view of the increase by the Minister of Education in the foundation levy which will affect all Manitoba ratepayers, commercial, farm, residential; we know that due to the increases that are taking place this year insofar as spending, that there will be considerable mill rate increases, sharp mill rate increases, and that's very very clear from what is occurring now in the City of Winnipeg; we know as well, Mr. Speaker, that there will be cuts in educational programs this year as a result of what is taking place under the leadership of the Minister of Education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for us to delay this motion to a date beyond March 15th, will mean that it will be too late. It will be too late if we await the Estimates of the Minister of Education. It will be too late if we await the meeting of March 21st, in which the Minister of Education is meeting with school trustees from

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

Winnipeg School Division No. 1. The deadline is March 15th, in which the Estimates are to be provided to the various municipalities. Mr. Speaker, that meeting of March 21st will be little better but a farce. Little can come out of such a meeting. It will be already too late on March 21st in order to make the type of changes that are necessary to ensure that there will not be a sharp increase in the mill rate, any cut in the educational programs within the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we say that we must act today, we must have debate today, we must have supplementary estimates today, so that we can deal with the neglect and the delay that is being foisted by this government upon the Province of Manitoba and the grave affect which it is having upon the ratepayers and educationalists of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now allow a member of a recognized political party to reply and give their argument on this matter.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the only other recognized political party in the Legislature, if I may respond to the motion by the Leader of the Opposition and indicate that his motion and his comments are based on some assumptions which are not accurate. Basically he referred to cuts in the Estimates of the Department of Education. Those Estimates have been tabled before this Legislature and in fact have indicated substantial increases in that particular department.

With respect to the urgency of this matter which is a subject before the House, Mr. Speaker, and the only subject which is before this House, the Minister of Education has indicated that he and other members of this government will be meeting with representatives of the Winnipeg School Board next week.

The Budget of the government has not yet been presented to this Legislature. The Minister of Education has not yet presented it and dealt with his Estimates in the Legislature. He indicated yesterday in response to a number of questions that there were many matters which he would like an opportunity to discuss with the Committee of Supply and members of the other side during his Estimates where they are most appropriately dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge members of this Legislature to defeat the motion as it is not a matter of urgent public importance. There are many matters yet to be dealt with in the Legislature with respect to this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened carefully to the argument put forward by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and I must say he made an excellent effort to urge the urgency of debate on this particular matter.

I have listened to the remarks of the Honourable Government House Leader and I refer members to our Rule 27, and under Rule 27(1), the Leader of the Opposition did provide me with sufficient notice, as required. I have given him the opportunity, under 27(2) to make his submission. The purpose of subsection 5, and I read this out to the members:

"The right to move to set aside the ordinary business of the House for the purpose mentioned in subrule 1 is subject to the following instructions".

And I refer to Sub (d):

"The motion shall not anticipate a matter that has previously been appointed for consideration by the House; or with reference to which a notice of motion has previously been given and not withdrawn".

That's from the Rules of our own House here.

We have referred on numerous occasions to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. The House of Commons has a somewhat different system in that they use Standing Order 26 for Matters of Urgent Public Importance. But while they use a different procedure, the subject matter and the ruling on the subject matter is very similar to ours and I would refer members to Citation 287:

"Urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means urgency of debate. When the ordinary opportunities provided by the Rules of the House, do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately".

The argument put forward by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would, in my opinion, probably meet that citation.

However, we go on to Citation 291, and I read from the motion that he has put forward that the government has misled this House and the people of Manitoba by failing to make adequate budgetary provisions.

Citation 291 reads: "A general question of the maladministration of a department cannot be considered a genuine emergency".

Having listened to the arguments and having read numerous speakers' rulings over the last ten years, I have to rule the subject matter out of order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, much as I appreciate your ruling, and though you have gone into some depth, there is a matter of interpretation in respect to the rules and I respectfully challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? Aye. All those opposed, please say nay? In my opinion, the ayes have it.

MR. FOX: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.
The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS

ANDERSON	ENNS	JORGENSON	MERCIER
BANMAN	FERGUSON	KOVNATS	MINAKER
BLAKE	FILMON	LYON	ORCHARD
COSENS	GALBRAITH	MacMASTER	PRICE
DOMINO	GOURLAY	McGILL	RANSOM
DOWNEY	HYDE	McGREGOR	SHERMAN
DRIEDGER	JOHNSTON	McKENZIE	

NAYS

ADAM	COWAN	HANUSCHAK	SCHROEDER
BARROW	DESJARDINS	JENKINS	URUSKI
BOSTROM	DOERN	McBRYDE	USKIW
BOYCE	EVANS	MALINOWSKI	WALDING
CHERNIACK	FOX	MILLER	WESTBURY
CORRIN	GREEN	PAWLEY	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 27. Nays 23.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair is sustained.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Will the Minister of Education detail for the Chamber by what power or authority he enjoys so that he may deal effectively with the proposals that will be presented to him by the Winnipeg School Division on March 21st?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, as I believe everyone in this House is well aware, we'll be meeting with the Winnipeg School Division on March

21st. At that time, we will hear their concerns and give those same concerns our due considerations.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister. In hearing their concerns, can the Minister advise the people of Manitoba how that will affect their mill rates?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, that's a little difficult to prophesy at this point before we hear what those particular concerns may be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further to the Minister, can he advise what can be done now that the School Board has already sent in its budget; what can be done after March 15th, pertaining to meeting the request that the school division had indicated they will make to the Minister?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen those particular requests. Until I've had an opportunity to see them and to consider them, I would not hazard a particular answer as to what can be in regard to that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Education, since March 15th is the deadline, can the Minister advise the House how he can deal with this matter after the termination of the deadline March 15th for the presentation of the budget to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. COSENS: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the budget has a deadline and our meeting is on March 21st. Any decisions that we would make at that time, I suppose, would apply to the school division's budget but, as the Leader of the Opposition says, would have no particular impact on the mill rate for this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs. In view of the fact that the Chairman of the School Board has been wrongly blaming her difficulties on the equalization system in greater Winnipeg, in view of the fact that the Conservative government has maintained this system for three sessions of the Legislature, would the Minister now consider making greater Winnipeg one school division, for taxation purposes in any event, so that there will be no further argument as to who is subsidizing who?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the assumption contained in the Member for Inkster's comment with respect to the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy. I believe that matter is under consideration and review by the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, if there is to be any action along the lines suggested by the Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that it would be done in close consultation with the various school boards, in order to satisfactorily determine their views and not in the method used by the previous government in their imposition of Unicity concept upon the citizens of this city. It is not an example that we would follow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable Minister to clarify what is wrong with my assumption that the Conservative administration has through three sessions of the Legislature indicated no change in that system. And I want to know whether the Minister has done any studies as to whether or not making Greater Winnipeg one taxation unit for school division purposes would result in equity to the citizens of Winnipeg.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy is a matter under consideration under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education, and I wouldn't presume to enter into a subject matter which he is involved in and over which he has authority.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's suggestion that the Province of Manitoba would not take any unilateral steps, such as the imposition of a metropolitan form of government which was done by the Roblin administration and the unification of Greater Winnipeg which was done by the New Democratic Party administration, is the Minister saying that, regardless of whether or not the present system of taxation is inequitable, his government will not do anything if the municipalities say don't do it?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education in regard to the possible introduction of user fees in the Winnipeg School Division caused or forced upon them by a shortfall of provincial funding. Would the Minister oppose the introduction of such fees or would he approve or sanction them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I can't accept the honourable member's premise either and of course the funding in something that is certainly within the jurisdiction of the school board. They will make the decisions as to how different courses are funded within their division.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister feel an equal responsibility toward the public school system and private and parochial schools?

MR. COSENS: Quite obviously not, Mr. Speaker, or we would be funding them at equal levels. As I pointed out yesterday, we fund the public school system at approximate level between \$1,000 and \$1,100 per pupil. The private schools, that do meet the requirements to receive funding, receive something in the neighbourhood of \$380 or \$390 per student.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether he has any concern that the present course of action being pursued by the Winnipeg School Board will result in a transfer of a number of students from the public schools into the private and parochial schools, which could result in further declining enrolments, a further deterioration of quality, in a vicious circle. And I would ask the Minister whether he would be prepared to monitor the number of students, in the public school system and in the private and parochial school system, to see whether there is any shifts caused by a deterioration in the public school system.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question from the Member for Elmwood because it gives me an opportunity to perhaps relay to him some figures that have to do with quality in Winnipeg No. 1.

In 1976, Mr. Speaker, there were 36,833 students in the public schools in Winnipeg No. 1 and some 2,276 teachers, for a pupil-teacher ratio of 16.3; 16.3, Mr. Speaker. In 1979, the average pupil enrolment in Winnipeg No. 1 was some 32,601 students, a drop of 4,232 pupils from 1976. The number of teachers employed in 1979 in Winnipeg No. 1 was 2,269. I remind the Member for Elmwood that in 1976 the number of teachers employed was 2,276. The teacher-pupil ratio in 1979 was 14.4.

Now I say to the Member for Elmwood, in answering his question and his concern for quality, in 1976, when the teacher-pupil ratio was 16.3 and his party was in

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

power in this province, was the quality of education poorer than it was in 1979, under our administration, when the teacher-pupil ratio was 14.4?

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

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took a question as notice from the Member for Fort Rouge, when I was asked whether or not there was any significant change in the number of agents that would be involved in the selling of lottery tickets. I had the Manitoba Lottery Commission check with the Western Lottery Manitoba Distributor, which is the distributor in the Province of Manitoba. They informed me that the staffing levels have been the same for about a year now and that they don't anticipate any changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Does the Minister agree that governments have responsibility for rehabilitation and revitalization of core areas of inner cities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. WESTBURY: Since projections reveal that between 21,000 and 50,000 people, including 3,500 elementary school children, have left or will leave the inner city of Winnipeg, adversely affecting School Division No. 1, does the Minister intend to introduce any proposal to make downtown core area of Winnipeg more attractive economically and physically for families to live in?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Ministers on this side of the government who are involved in projects in the inner core area of the city in order to attempt to revitalize it and to improve the core area of this city.

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

MRS. WESTBURY: To the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Specifically what steps will the Honourable Minister be taking to alleviate the disproportionate amount of school property tax paid by School Division No. 1 taxpayers, because of, (1), the fact that more than one-third of the foundation levy is raised in Winnipeg; (2), Winnipeg No. 1 taxpayers subsidize school division by \$5.9 million, the 1978 figure through redistribute of effects of Greater Winnipeg education levy; and (3), because the Winnipeg No. 1 receives the lowest level of net provincial support through the Foundation Grants Program?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that, in posing a question, it should not be argumentative. If you're asking for specific information, it's quite all right.

Did the honourable member complete her question?.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education. I appreciate his history lesson. I'm just wondering whether he also has, for the House today, the ratio in 1969 between pupils and teachers in Winnipeg No. 1, and could he also tell us whether there is any previous year, in the last 15 years, where the pupil to teacher ratio increased from one year to the next?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest to the honourable member he file an Order for Return, asking for detailed information of that nature.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education gave some specific figures with respect to pupil to teacher ratios for the years 1976 and 1979; they were unsolicited. I am now asking for an additional figure for 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly felt that the figures were essential to answer the Member for Elmwood's question, which certainly seemed to equate quality with student-teacher ratios, and that is why I supplied them. As far as supplying them for other years, I can go back, I suppose, to the origin of the public school system in this province and supply those figures for the Member for Rossmere. I will take the question as notice and get him those particular figures.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Education, I would then also ask for his undertaking to provide information as to whether, in the previous 15 years, the pupil to teacher ratio has increased in any other year from one year to another, as it appears to be in 1980-81 from 1979-80.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, in supplying the member with the information that he has asked for, that will certainly be obvious and I'll take that aspect of the question as notice also.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. The Minister has said, in answer to questions in this House before, that the Winnipeg School Division has given assurances there will be no reduction in the quality of education. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he can give an assurance to this House that there will be no reduction in the quality of education in School Division No. 1?

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some problem with that question. First of all, I would like to know what the Member for St. Vital is suggesting as the measurement of quality of education. Is he suggesting that it comes from measuring the success of the graduates of that particular system? Does he suggest that it can be measured by the teacher-pupil ratio? If he does, I've already suggested to him that in 1976 obviously the quality was much lower than it was in '79. So if he would like to suggest the measurement that we should use in deciding what the level of quality is, I'd certainly be prepared to use that measurement at this time?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the same Minister. Since the Minister doesn't seem to have any policy or any idea of what quality of education means, and since the Minister has said to this House yesterday that he assumes no responsibility for the level of education that is for the school board, will the Minister tell this House just what he is responsible for?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. It appears to me as though we may be getting into a debate that previously today was ruled out of order. However, I hope that the questions should not be facetious, nor should they be argumentative. I would hope the Member would probably want to rephrase his question. Would the Honourable Member for St. Vital care to rephrase his question?

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another question. I would like to ask the Minister of Education whether he is prepared to recommend to his colleague for St. Matthews that he, the Member for St. Matthews who is a teacher and a representative from Winnipeg No. 1, be prepared to withdraw his proposed resolution on the Greater Winnipeg education levy in that that member has just voted against the opportunity to debate such a thing?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that, by his government's practising restraint in the provincial funding of school divisions, he's merely forcing the school divisions to increase the taxes imposed on homeowners, which is universally recognized as one of the most regressive forms of taxation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Again, may I suggest that the honourable member's questions not be argumentative. Again, he's asking for a discussion and we're going to, I'm afraid, get into a debate during the question period. The question period is available to all members. If you want to use it for debating time, that is your privilege.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to attempt to enlighten my honourable friend from Rupertsland as to the education financing system. It may take me some time, however, to drive home a few points.

No. one, we're well aware of the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba with respect to foundation and other funding programs for the public education system in Manitoba and have been fulfilling those responsibilities within the financial means of the people of Manitoba for the last two-and-a-half years, very successfully I would say, Mr. Speaker.

No. two, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends quite conveniently overlook the fact that in the Estimates which are before them at the present time there is an increase in the Tax Rebate Program and in the other program on income tax, the Property Tax Rebate Program, and the other allied program, of approximately \$11 million to \$12 million which will be going directly to the ratepayers in Manitoba as an ameliorating fact against, not only increasing school costs, but the sales tax imposition as well, Mr. Speaker.

No. three, as the Minister of Education has indicated to the House . . . Mr. Speaker, I know my honourable friends don't want to hear the facts. They didn't want to hear them when the Minister of Education told them about the pupil-teacher ratio in Winnipeg, but they're going to hear those and they're going to hear a lot more before this debate's over.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends know that there is an increase in the Estimates for public education grants this year from the Province of Manitoba, and those education Estimates are appointed for debate and my honourable friends will be able to see how those grants apply, when the education Estimates are before the House.

So I say to my honourable friends, that they can have all the fun they want at question period with their elephant tears, with their mock - if I may say so, Mr. Speaker - with their mock, mock concern about the ratepayers in the City of Winnipeg, about whom they didn't care very much when they were in office, when they imposed the highest provincial taxation in this province's history.

So if my honourable friend wants me to continue reading him a lesson . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I hope that we're not getting into a real debate at this particular time.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a supplementary question.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to make my question short and to the point, which is unlike the speech we just got from the First Minister.

I would ask the First Minister if his answer to us today is just another example of his attempting to mislead the people of Manitoba by his practice of inadequately funding the education system in Manitoba, whereby his government is transferring taxation from the provincial revenues of this province, which are more progressively collected than the property tax system, whereby the people of Manitoba now have to pay higher property tax, higher education tax on their property, a much more regressive form of taxation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to continue what I was saying. There are a number of areas -- (Interjection)-- I'll answer his question with a great deal of joy.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

There are a number of areas, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- My honourable friends obviously, Mr. Speaker, want to continue their rudeness.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, now that we have a modicum of order restored again, could I continue what I was saying?

This government, as we indicated and as the Minister of Education has indicated on a number of occasions and is apparent to anyone who can read figures - and I make that assumption that that can be done across the way - has indicated that the school grants are up this year and the debate has been appointed for that matter in the Estimates, as it is done every year, and my honourable friends will be informed then.

I had mentioned the \$12 million increase in the Rebate Program for the taxpayers of Manitoba.

My honourable friends conveniently overlooked that 75 percent of the senior citizens in Manitoba living in their own homes no longer pay in the education tax in the Province of Manitoba, thanks to this administration.

So if my honourable friend, the Member for Rupertsland, wants to stand up in this House or on any other platform in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and try to make out that this government does not understand or it does not relate to its responsibilities in the field of education, then I'd say he's on a winning and a very sticky wicket.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary I'd like to ask the First Minister if he can confirm, and in a very brief way rather than giving us a full speech, that the Property Tax Credit plan has not been increased since his government has come into power? In the same span of time, Mr. Speaker, the taxes that have been imposed on property owners and home owners are a result of his government's inadequate funding of the education system in Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, obviously my honourable friend overlooked what I was just saying. Does he want me to repeat it? With respect to the different groups of citizens in this province who are now benefitting by virtue of policies that this government has brought in to relieve senior citizens of Manitoba, 75 percent of them, of the cost of taxation? If my honourable friend is opposed to that, Mr. Speaker, let him stand in his place and say so.

But I merely want to say that we are carrying out our mandate to the people of Manitoba with respect to education costs. Unlike my honourable friends opposite, we are prepared, and quite reasonably prepared, to meet with the members of the School Division No. 1 to hear their case, to hear the kinds of arguments that they wish to put forward with respect to their budgeting process. And we will not impose, as my honourable friends did, a kind of encumbered form of system of city administration on the people of Winnipeg, which accounts in large measure for the increased ratepayer costs that city taxpayers are paying today, more so than education. And, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns was one of the principle architects and perpetrators of that system.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Surely, Mr. Speaker, you're going to call the Speaker to order when he's not even referring to the question which I asked.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health.

To keep up with the inflation, the doctors and the medical profession were given fees for the last two years. Why then are the chiropractors, who have been recognized by the Conservative government who brought them in Medicare, why has

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

their fees been frozen the last . . . well, ever since my honourable friend took office? Don't they have to fight inflation also?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): They do indeed have to fight inflation also, Mr. Speaker, but we have undertaken a study of chiropractic and are measuring and evaluating it in terms of the increase in the budgetary appropriation for chiropractic services in the budget of the Health Services Commission over the past two years, which has been significant. And the subcommittee studying the practice was delayed in getting its work underway by the inability of the Chiropractic Association to supply the necessary documentation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Minister says, yes, that they have to fight inflation but their increase has been frozen.

Isn't it a fact that this study started more than a year ago? And why isn't it finished now? And why is it, if you're studying a profession, why aren't they called in to have a chance to present something, which they haven't been up to now?

MR. SHERMAN: It's true, Mr. Speaker, the study was launched by us a year ago. It was approximately February of 1979, but information that was requested by the committee of the Chiropractic Association was not made available to the committee until December of 1979.

I cast no criticism or offer no reasons for that. It simply is a fact. So that delayed the committee in getting to the nub of the matter.

Secondly, in looking at fees, one always has to look at comparative and competitive situations vis-a-vis the rest of society and vis-a-vis the rates and the levels of remuneration for their counterparts in other provinces. And I think the honourable member would concede, Mr. Speaker, that the practice of chiropractic is a well remunerated practice in Manitoba today.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister is saying then that the medical profession were not getting proper fees but the chiropractors are too well paid and this is why there hasn't been any increase.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is there are many factors to be taken into consideration. One is the competition for medical practitioners, the competition for doctors, the attractions of other jurisdictions. And there is no question and I never denied that Manitoba doctors had fallen in the scale of comparative earning opportunities, net incomes in Canada, in the past several years, and needed to be responsibly addressed in that area. This is not true of chiropractors in Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister study the medical profession before the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface have a question?

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Education, and ask him, in view of the escalating costs in providing transportation for school pupils in Manitoba, and generally that the provincial transportation grants only cover about half of the costs of providing transportation, can the Minister indicate what assistance rural school divisions might receive from this government in meeting their transportation costs in the upcoming year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, to the Member for St. George, obviously he missed the announcement that I made somewhat earlier in the year to the school boards announcing the largest increase towards transportation grants that we've seen in

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

this province for many years. This will, in large part, go towards taking care of those increased costs that they are experiencing in the transportation of students in this province.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the escalating transportation costs, irrespective of the announcement that the Minister has made the school divisions are still finding it difficult to meet the escalating costs, can the Minister indicate whether there will be any additional assistance to school divisions in the transportation area?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, having provided, as I have just mentioned to the Member for St. George, the largest increase I believe that has ever been provided in this province towards transportation of students this year, we feel that we have gone a long way towards solving that particular problem. It has enabled a larger number of school divisions to have a greater percentage of their costs covered by provincial money than ever before. If he is saying, what are we going to do in the future, certainly we will recognize escalating costs in the future as well. I would expect that it will be necessary to take that into consideration next year in the grants that we provide. We will have to look carefully at what happens to gasoline costs and other costs when we look at our budget next year, as we did this year.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister and he indicated that assistance was provided to the pensioners of this province in the \$100 tax credit program. Is it not a fact that the assistance that the Conservative government provided to the pensioners of Manitoba covers only the most wealthy pensioners in this province who own homes, whose assessment is in excess of \$6,000, and those are the only ones who have benefited by that pensioner assistance program for school taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it would be obvious to everyone except the honourable member, who just asked that rather convoluted question, that you have to be paying taxes in order to get some rebate, in order to get some relief from it. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that 75 percent of the senior citizens in Manitoba living in their own accommodation are paying no education tax today on account of the programs that have been going on in this province for many years, one of which we added in the last two years when, according to my honourable friends opposite, nothing has been done for the ratepayers.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, as well, that I find it passing strange for a group of NDP members in this Legislature to be complaining to this government about the lack of funding for education or, for that matter, anything else in this province, when they perpetrated the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer's dollars on hydro, which could have been used for education, hospitals, and many other things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Member of Labour. In view of the fact that the food prices are rising almost weekly and, for instance, in the last month of February the prices rose eight percent, will the Minister increase the minimum wage during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

HON. KEN MacMASTER: I have no intention of proposing that at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In view of the latest statistics showing Manitoba with the fastest increase in the employment rate of many provinces in Canada and in view of the rapidly increasing cost of living, will the Minister instruct his friends in the private sector to create more jobs or does he prefer that more people go on welfare?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may not be any consolation to the member but we do have the third highest minimum wage in Canada. The members the other day were talking about statistics, unemployed and employed, and that's a game some of them like to play. Seeing as the members talk about employed people, he should talk about exactly three years ago February of 1977 when there was 421,000 employed people in Manitoba, and as of this month, which is a pretty good comparison - three years ago this month there were 421,000 people employed in Manitoba; this month there are 453,000, an increase of 32,000.

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

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same Minister, I would like to thank him kindly for his lecture about the history. I am not asking you what happened ten or four years ago. You are responsible now. I'm looking about the future and the present time.

Mr. Speaker, if and when the Minister should decide to increase the minimum wage - it is warranted - will the Minister confirm to the Legislature and the workers that he will increase the minimum wage by 60 percent, Mr. Speaker, as he and his Cabinet colleagues. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The question is hypothetical. Would the Honourable Member for Point Douglas care to rephrase his question?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling but I believe that the certain situation right now on the market is more hypothetical than the question. Well, simply, I would like to ask the Minister if they are contemplating a raise for 60 percent I think that my people from Point Douglas, who are just working for minimum wage are also entitled to have a 60 percent raise as a minimum wage.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order. We're on Resolution 19.5(d)(1).
The Member for Wolseley.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. WILSON: Previously I had wanted to know under this section, what are the present requirements for the cost of transcripts of trials? I had talked about with modern technology - several years ago, they used to charge 25 cents a copy, and now I believe that Xerox, 3M and other copying people have got the cost down to somewhere under 4 cents a copy and I wondered, has the cost of transcripts decreased along with the savings of technology? I wonder if the Minister can give me some indication as to the transcript cost for the original and then for copies.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to obtain that information for the member and provide it to him just as soon as we have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: On this item, Mr. Chairman, I'd want to know whether or not there have been any new staff persons retained to type or take transcripts in the department.

MR. MERCIER: Court reporters?

MR. CORRIN: Yes.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Estimates summary sheet that I handed out indicates an increase of six new court reporters.

MR. CORRIN: I'm wondering, on both sides though, the big problem as I'm sure the Minister is aware, is apparently a lack of people to type the tapes. Apparently there are seemingly a goodly number of reporters; the problem is that the secretarial staff which supports them has been suggested to be inadequate. And I'm wondering whether there are going to be any more secretarial assistants retained to the department.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the court reporters hire their own typists.

MR. CORRIN: Here perhaps I need some clarification. I had heard a rumour that there was a move afoot to stop the court reporters from doing private work, that they were no longer going to be able to do private work outside the system and that it was going to be a full service sub-department or agency, with all the secretarial staff within the department. I understand this has been the practice, Mr. Chairman, for several years, perhaps going back well beyond this government. Court reporters are allowed, in their off hours - although I don't know how many off hours they could have if we're supplementing the staff by six - to take private matters. An example would be preliminary procedures prior to a trial, such an Examination for Discovery in a lawyer's office. I understand they are allowed to bill for that procedure on a private basis, and what they do is they let that work out to private secretarial staff and pay those people, presumably out of the moneys they receive from the lawyers involved in their proceedings.

What I'm wondering, with all these shortages and the need for more staff, and apparently the anticipation of some that there's going to be a full service staff . . . I know that there are a few private court reporters that have discussed this with me, people who are in private business of court reporting - and there are several firms in Winnipeg - who thought this might be the case; they felt that the government possibly was moving in accord with its general policy to support the private sector and thereby would be limiting the right of the public sector reporters to compete with them. And that's the question. I'm wondering whether or not . . . I guess there may be two or three questions. Are we going to be denying the public sector reporters access to private sector business? Secondly, if that's the case, are we going to be providing a full service department with secretarial staff in house?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first question from the Member for Wellington, the answer is, firstly, that priority must be given to the

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

work of the department, to the trials that take place, and the taking of an Examination for Discovery privately cannot not interfere with that.

I'm sure he will be aware that a new chief court reporter was appointed this past fall to replace Mr. Phillips. Mrs. MacGregor assumed that position in the fall. --(Interjection)-- Mrs. MacGregor became the chief court reporter in the fall. I'm anticipating receiving a review of that whole area, since we do have a new chief court reporter, with respect to a number of concerns that have been raised with me during the past year or so.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering in that regard whether any members of the private court reporting firms have approached the Minister and asked him to look into this matter. He said that there had been concerns expressed about it; I'm wondering if that were from the private sector.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, there have been concerns expressed within and from outside of the department.

MR. CORRIN: On the same general item, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether or not any steps are going to be taken to redress the situation that was mentioned in the Juvenile Justice Committee's Report, lack of reporting staff in many of the Juvenile Courts of the province. There was specific mention by the Justice Committee that they felt that there should be recorders in all courts of record in order to insure the same rights to juveniles as to adults, and perhaps that's why the six new reporters, but I'm wondering, could he deal with that?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, two of the six will be for the new building on Broadway Avenue and the extra courtrooms there, one in the Winnipeg Law Courts Building, two in Family and Juvenile Court, and one in Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)--pass; 5.(d)(2)--pass; 5.(e)(1)--pass - the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Yes under this section I recall last year having fought for a reclassification of what appeared to be . . . At least a couple of years ago their salary structure seemed rather low and I am pleased to see that the classification seems to have brought these fellows who are guarding prisoners, etc., up to higher salary level.

I did want to sincerely hope today that, in discussing a thought of mine which I hope to put on the record, that the Tribune will be more objective and report what I am objecting to rather than just the vague term Crown lawyers because I would like to suggest that under the Sheriffs and Bailiffs there may have been a large increase in staff but I wondered, if trained people such as the Winnipeg Police and if trained people such as the RCMP do not feel inclined in crimes of nonviolence to handcuff people, why it is incumbent upon the province of Manitoba to spend all that money and all that time having these people, who are basically not experienced in police work - there may be the odd case where you get somebody that's an expoliceman - to go around and handcuff individuals to be paraded around for the benefit of the general public.

It would seem to me that if there is a cost and priority section - it certainly doesn't affect me because it's already past history, but I'm thinking of people from this day forward - that any particular person, whether it be male or female, who is put to that indignity to be handcuffed and thrown into a paddywagon, where up until that time the system saw fit that the individual could sit in the back of the police car, the individual could sit in the back of an unmarked passenger vehicle operated by the RCMP, yet as soon as they arrive, a hoard of these particular sherriff's men - and there always seems to be seven or eight of them sitting around; maybe they're hoping for a busy day. I would hope that under the Sheriff's section that these men would be given a more public relations job. They seem to take a great deal of pride in their authority and in some cases they have alluded to the fact that there has not been any exceptions to the policy. There has been cases where members of the legal profession have not been handcuffed, but I would think really that the handcuffing policy of the government should be . . . really, when you get into people accused being brought down to be detained and

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

arrested, and a bail hearing, it would seem to me that the handcuffing policy of the government leaves something to be desired.

And I would think that the . . . well, the Deputy Sheriff told me that it was a government policy that all persons, regardless of the charge, were to be handcuffed. Now, that was from the Deputy Sheriff. I'm simply saying, there's a cost factor to all this staging and presentation, and if the Minister can give me some justified reason why people that have been trusted by the city police and by the RCMP, and by members of the legal profession who walk with them, and walk in and out of court with them, that these people should all of a sudden become dangerous to the public as soon as they are put into the hands of the sheriff's men.

I would think that after bail is set and there's an indication that it's just a matter of time before that is accomplished, I think the accused should be allowed to go with their lawyer and make the necessary arrangements and phone call. The salting of this person, male or female, into a tank, is to me another questionable aspect, but I think possibly the main one that I would like to deal with is the hope that our government would review the handcuffing policy.

It seems also, after a bail hearing, that until the dots are dotted and the t's are crossed, that as people come out of the witness docket, they are again pounced on by several individuals from the sheriff's office and handcuffed in front of all the witnesses, all the people who may be there for different reasons. I would think there has to be a categorization here so that this policy is looked at and possibly some changes take place.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the policy to which the Member for Wolseley refers was that all prisoners were to be handcuffed, and to be handcuffed behind their backs except for certain exceptions. We have reviewed that policy and have revised that policy now. Handcuffing is not to be mandatory, but discretion is to be given to the escort officer not to handcuff under certain circumstances, where, for example, by reason of age, infirmity, or information supplied to the escorting officer, sufficient to enable him to satisfy himself that the person in custody is unlikely to attempt to escape or to act in a disorderly or violent manner with respect to himself, the escorting officer, to members of the public.

We are in the process of preparing a training manual for sheriff's officers involved in escorting prisoners. The policy is subject to the provision of the necessary information to the sheriff's officer. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the previous policy and have revised it in accordance with what I have indicated.

MR. WILSON: I think that's wonderful news for future generations. I certainly applaud the Minister for looking into it. I think another aspect, it's probably very frivolous, but they have another policy where there's absolutely no coffee for any, if I can use the word, prisoners or accused people, and I wondered if that aspect of it could be discretionary as well.

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, in this regard I only have one very short question, that is whether or not the problem that was reported in the newspapers about the court reporters in Portage la Prairie has been resolved. This is with respect, for those members who perhaps aren't familiar with it, this is with respect to the retention of, I think, two court reporters, I'm not sure of the numbers, whose hiring was thought to be inappropriate by some people associated with the court because they couldn't speak certain native tongues, which are apparently widely used in that particular judicial catchment area.

Mr. Chairman, we would ask whether or not these people have been transferred and others transferred in, or what manner of resolution this has now come to?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I met with representatives of the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council earlier this week, at which they expressed some concern with respect to this matter. I have passed on that concern to Chief Judge Gyles, and I believe to Mr. Chartrand, to review the concern that has been expressed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(f)(1)--pass; 5.(f)(2)--pass; 5.(g)(1)--pass - the Member for Burrows.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: You will note, Mr. Chairman, that there is quite a significant increase in salaries, an increase of over \$50,000, from \$33,600 to \$84,500; could the Minister offer some explanation of that increase?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the increase in salaries is an estimate of what will be required to replace the former Chief Medical Examiner, Dr. Parker, who passed away last fall. The province I think was very fortunate in not only having such a skilled person and hard working person occupy that position but were also fortunate in that Dr. Parker worked out of the Deer Lodge Hospital and I believe the province was able to obtain his services as Chief Medical Examiner for something in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 per year. We have formed a committee of doctors, some of whom are pathologists, to consult with in finding a replacement for Dr. Parker. Dr. Henry Dirks is presently the Acting Chief Medical Examiner. It is somewhat involved in that there has been a fair amount of consultation with the Health Services Commission and the medical institutions. To date we have not yet filled the position but it has been actively pursued. We don't know what we are going to have to pay a new Chief Medical Examiner. It all depends on the kinds of arrangements we can make with perhaps the Medical School, perhaps a hospital.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk about matters that arose during the course of the controversy surrounding the death of a young man by the name of Lyle Dean Enns. You recollect, Mr. Chairman, late last summer this unfortunate young man met a tragic death. He was the victim of a shooting and as a result of that there was a good deal of controversy surrounding whether or not an inquest pursuant to the Fatality Inquiries Act should be held in anticipation of the trial proceedings in which his brother and I think possibly his father were involved. It was represented at the time by his family's solicitor that the facts upon which the case for the defense rested could not be adequately secured unless recourse was had to a prior inquest proceeding. I think that the point that the solicitor made was that there would be a denial of a certain fundamental right if the accused persons, since the accused family members charged with criminal offenses arising out of that event, or peripheral to that event I suppose, were forced to take the stand in order to disclose what transpired relative to the death of their son and brother at the hands of the RCMP Police.

It seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, without perhaps dealing with the merits of the case, that on fundamental principal they had made a good point; that it was a dicey business for the accused persons to, on the one hand, defend themselves without the information; on the other hand, it was a dicey business for them to be able to both waive their rights and give testimony and, at the same time, defend themselves.

I am wondering whether the Attorney-General is considering any revision of the legislation, namely the Fatality Inquiries Act, in order to assure that there would be some sort of mandatory inquest examinations of all police related fatalities. It seems apparent to me that this, presumably, would never happen very frequently, it may happen very occasionally, and in order to avoid a similar repetition of circumstances such as this I was wondering whether the Attorney-General would consider an amendment to the act that would first of all make such inquiries mandatory.

Right now I understand they are simply discretionary, and really it's a bit of a conflict of interest because it seems to me that effectively the same agent makes a decision as to whether to have the inquest as has to make the decision whether or not to file the prosecution; at least that person is responsible to the same authority, namely the Attorney-General. I've consulted with the former Leader of the Opposition and he tells me that, although he didn't have final authority in the inquest, with respect to inquests he was invariably consulted on the subject by the, I believe it's the Chief Medical Examiner. So because of this apparent conflict of interest or seeming conflict of interest, I am wondering whether there is going to be any revision of the law.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, just on a small point on the last matter raised by the Member for Wellington. Under the Act the Attorney-General, whoever he is, has the authority to order an inquest at any time. I think I have indicated to the Member for Wellington in the past, certainly to others, that we are reviewing the provisions of the Fatality Inquiries Act as it is in Manitoba and comparing the provisions of our legislation with legislation and practices and procedures in other provinces and I anticipate that, as a result of that review, there will be amendments to this Act of this Session of the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)--pass; (g)(2)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,244,700 for Attorney-General, Law Courts--pass.

Resolution No. 20, 6.(a)--pass; 6.(b)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$214,400 for Attorney-General, Legislative Counsel--pass.

Resolution No. 21, 7. Law Enforcement. The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I wonder with interest . . . I have a couple of areas here. One is the summer resort areas are policed in a - for years they have been attempting to resolve a particular problem and they can't seem to get any senior police personnel to want to work the summer resorts and, as a result, there's been a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst not only cottage owners from Manitoba but possibly one of the gravest concerns is our tourism image, and the amount of recreational vehicles that leave Manitoba and go south and when recreational vehicles, during the summer months the flow comes north, these people have less than a quiet enjoyment, and I wondered if this is a provincial responsibility or if it's divided. Because it seems to me that it's under the RCMP contract and some other forms and I wondered if the Minister might enlighten me: Do we foot the bill for this entirely and what are the plans for the 80's for protecting the people from, just literally, rebels without a cause, as the Member for St. Boniface says, bullies and people that seem to take a great deal of pleasure in taking pegs out of tents and doing all sorts of things within the camp grounds? I think it's something that we get a lot of fresh new dollars from tourists that come up here and I would like to see Manitoba have a friendly Manitoba image rather than one of rowdyisms in the recreational vehicle parks. I wondered if the Minister could comment.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, just briefly, the province polices the provincial parks. Under the provincial policing agreement with the RCMP, the province assumes all of the cost. It's a difficult concern to deal with without some specific incidents. There was reference in the Chief Inspector's Report filed under The Liquor Control Act to a program that was initiated, I think, in Grand Beach with respect to turning over liquor. That appears to have met with some success in that area.

MR. WILSON: Then maybe I'll have to be a little more frank. What the complaint seems to be is that some of the people that are the special constables, touring these recreational vehicle parks and others, some of them are barely old enough to shave and what I'm suggesting is that the people seem to want to demand a more senior personnel. If there's a fact that we are trying to save money, that is one thing, but if they're all getting the same salary it would seem to me that if it's that important to the province that maybe some of the constables . . . I appreciate that they don't want to be away from their families and I guess that has to be taken into consideration, but it seems there's a lot more respect for a more senior police constable. What basically they're saying is, the people that the government is hiring do not appear physically capable to be able to stop any rowdyism and break up gangs of bullies who may be beating up on one or two people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the member is somewhat mixed up. I don't think that he's referring to the RCMP, but in all the provincial parks, you have a limited number of RCMP who are patrolling their district,

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

and the parks are in there, and you also have the rangers, or special police that are hired by the province in the parks. I don't think it's a question. . . there might be the odd one that are fairly young, it might be students during the summer because it's not a full-time job, and I don't think that it would change very much if you had somebody a little older when you are dealing with a gang, and so on. I think it has been a problem and it always will be a problem of the department. I know there was a problem when I was the Minister of Tourism responsible for the parks, and I can only see one thing, and I think there is probably less than there has been. Every year of course we read something - I remember this last summer somebody was terrorizing and they were demanding money, they slit the tents and so on, and it's quite difficult when you're in a place and it's pretty dark and isolated and you have people like that, it's not very much fun.

But I would suggest, I don't think it's the personnel at all. One or two can't do anything if they're going to have to face a group, they call the RCMP in that case, but I think that maybe the Minister responsible for the provincial parks should look to see if the penalty could be more severe, if they could be kicked out of parks for a couple of years. And that effect, when that happens, if we throw the book at them, because the member certainly has a point, that there's nothing worse than that when you can't leave your family, you have your young kids and so on, and they all come out there for a wild party and they'll go in the parking area, maybe in a trailer, or in a truck, this does happen, there is no doubt about it. But I don't think that we could fault the personnel. If anything, maybe they should hire more in special areas. But I think that maybe the Minister, it would be the Attorney-General, would look to see if we could be a little tougher on them and throw the book at them to stop them once and for all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister what formulas or agreements are existing now between the, say, villages and towns, what cost-sharing formula is involved, as say, 450 population or 500, whatever? What share is the province picking up?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, under 500, we assume full policing costs; the province assumes full policing costs. I would indicate to the member that we are reviewing that 500 population requirement and considering raising that to 750.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, one other thing, on this report we received the other day from the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control, I find again this year that rural related convictions are 8,865, for total fines imposed of \$400,059.55, as against 307 convictions and \$16,012 for the city of Winnipeg. I would wonder what the discrepancy is here, or the harrassment, or is it the people in rural Manitoba are not as good livers.

MR. MERCIER: That was the Chief Inspector's report?

MR. FERGUSON: This is prosecutions under The Liquor Control Act.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, statistics speak for themselves. I can't . . .

MR. FERGUSON: As MLAs we're picking up a considerable amount of complaints, feeling that there is some harrassment and when you compare the two, it's obvious that when 56 percent of the population lives in Winnipeg that there's something out of balance here.

MR. MERCIER: One thing the report did indicate this year was that the RCMP report indicated virtually a 13 percent decrease in the number of impaired driving charges and refusal to take breathalyzer . . .

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I still don't think this answers my question, because people are starting to think that there's a bit of harrassment going on, that they're being over-policed. Whether or not they are, I don't know, but the figures seem to indicate that they are.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: Take the police out of there and put them in the parks.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, one has to agree there's an obvious discrepancy. The Member for Gladstone raises a concern which we could certainly attempt to review with both police authorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm always concerned about the revenue aspect to government as well as the expenditures, and I wondered if the Minister might enlighten me, maybe there's been some change, but is there any way that law enforcement bodies, whether they be students or RCMP or municipal police forces, is there any way that we could warehouse and sell, either at public auction or give to charity or something, the confiscated liquor, because it seems to bring a tear to the eye of many a taxpayer to see all of this liquor allegedly destroyed. One who appreciates the odd drink of Napoleon Brandy or Grand Marnier, or something, and even the working man's champagne, Labatt's Blue, I would be very very interested in the Minister's comments if there is still a policy of destruction of confiscated spirits, or is there some move afoot to put this to either medicinal or charity, or probably resale?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Chief Inspector under The Liquor Control Act on Page 6 indicates that seized liquor is, in some cases, donated to various hospitals and homes for the aged. No guarantee or warranty is given that the liquor is potable, and the individual authorities decide in what manner and for what purpose the liquor may be used. So I assume it's used for either medicinal or recreation purposes.

MR. WILSON: On another subject, I was sort of interested in a particular case that happened some months ago. At that time it was alleged that Manitoba was sort of headquarters for export of munitions, and in one particular case there was 5,000 M-16 rifles, 50,000 hand grenades, 10 million rounds of ammunition, 1,000 anti-tank missiles and 2,000 plastic explosives, and I wondered if the Manitoba law had been modernized to make the province of Manitoba sort of a place where, I call them merchants of death, but people that sell explosives to different countries and different political factions in those countries, and using Manitoba as a base of operations. There seemed to be, having read the case, something as to whether Manitoba laws could deal with this particular problem. I'm just wondering, is it still against the law to export munitions from Manitoba?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that would come under federal laws, federal jurisdiction, the export of arms.

If the member has a concern that those laws are not sufficient, we could perhaps review that matter in the particular case he refers to and answer the member's concerns.

MR. WILSON: I'm not particularly concerned about any case that is past history. I am concerned that if the province of Manitoba had a reputation for being able to have this type of activity going on within its boundaries, what safeguards do the citizens of Manitoba have that, say, well, in other words, maybe there's a concern. I know in St. Pierre they were concerned about cyanide, I would be concerned if it was basically illegal and not being enforced, that throughout the city of Winnipeg there were certain warehouses that contained munitions that were for sale to different political factions and different countries around the world. That's my concern, is this a federal concern, that the citizens of Manitoba alert the federal authorities, is this the way the route goes, or is it a concern of all police enforcement bodies?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would think that all police authorities would be concerned about that, although the law involved is one involving the federal government.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.--pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, in the area of law enforcement, there's not that much time left, but I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication in terms of what new initiatives or what is happening with previous initiatives in terms of policing of remote areas and native communities, Indian Metis communities. There were some special programs under way and I know the Minister is aware of those, and if he could give us an update on what's happening and if there's anything new in that field.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, which program was the member referring to?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm referring to training of community constables, training of band constables and training of special constables who are native people and incorporating those into the RCMP.

Mr. Chairperson, there was also a proposal at one time from the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council in terms of band policing, and I wonder if the Minister could give us an update on that law enforcement in remote communities?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we do provide, and I appreciate the member probably doesn't have the summary we passed out. We indicate in there that we are providing for 20 staff man years for the 3B Constable Program. We're providing for \$80,000 again for the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council Program. The Community Constable Program, I believe is funded through Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if there has been an evaluation done so far on these programs, and if he could give us an update on that.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council Program, that was started in, I believe 1977. In 1977-78 there was an agreement to fund the program for three years at a cost of \$80,000 per year. Because of understandable delays in recruiting constables and in training constables, the program at the present time has only been under way in actual operation for about a year and a half. We have met twice in the past month with the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council about the continuation of that program. There is under way a review of the success of that program which is anticipated to be completed by mid-1980. We're hopeful that that will give us some understanding of its success and prospects for its continuation.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the 3B program, there has been an evaluation report completed on that program, which is now in the hands of the department. With respect to the Community Constable Program, I think the questions of the member would have to be addressed to the Minister of Northern Affairs, where that program is funded, as to its success in its objectives.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we may have time to continue this later on, we just received this morning some comments from the RCMP related to RCMP personnel serving in detachment areas which include Indian reservations which we didn't have an opportunity to review earlier this morning. Perhaps by 8:00 o'clock I will have had an opportunity to review this material and perhaps can comment further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 has arrived. I am now leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 69 of the Main Estimates, Department of Labour and Manpower. Resolution No. 91, Item 3, Manpower Division, (a) Research, (1) Salaries--pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, in last year's Estimates Book - and I'm sorry I couldn't find mine just before I came in - I believe in last

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

year's Estimates Book under this section or under Employment Services Section, Item (4), there was an item called Grant Assistance and I wonder if the Minister could tell us where that item would appear in this year's Estimates and whether it's within his department still or in a different department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

Mr. MacMASTER: That's in the Department of Education, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Honourable Member for The Pas, by way of a speech on the last afternoon we considered these estimates, raised a number of issues which have still not been responded to by the Honourable Minister. I wonder if he would have any response to the comments and questions raised by the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. MacMASTER: I didn't notice too many reasons to answer. It's similar statements that we debated last year, there is no reason at this time to answer those particular allegations.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, that obviously provides us with some indication of the Minister's attitude towards the issues which my colleague from The Pas raised and those issues related to the kind of things which are happening in northern Manitoba or rather, I should say, the kinds of things that are not happening in northern Manitoba, and I believe that his department, which he now heads and which has a research capacity, is not addressing itself to that problem and the many problems that are faced by the people living in northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman.

And he is doing no better a job at that in this new capacity as Minister of Labour as he was in his capacity as Minister of Northern Affairs and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that he has the responsibility, as a Minister of the Crown, as a Minister in the provincial government of Manitoba, to address himself to the unemployment problem in northern Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, it's a very serious problem. It's one which is scandalous. If one looks at the numbers of people that are unemployed, young people 18 to 25, 30, who are in northern Manitoba that have no opportunity to work and, Mr. Chairman, this Minister, while he was Minister of Northern Affairs, cut back on programs that were assisting those people to find work in the community and outside the community.

We have heard nothing yet from this Minister in terms of these Estimates, in terms of manpower research, as to what his government intends to do about this problem. In fact, Mr. Chairman, they seem to want to ignore it completely.

In our capacity as opposition, Mr. Chairman, we've been looking at some of the people that are unemployed in northern Manitoba and if I could just refer to a single community where there are about 450 residents, about 75 percent of those residents are unemployed, Mr. Chairman, and most of them, as a result of two years of conservative government, are not even able to collect unemployment insurance because they have absolutely had no opportunity to work even on the short-term work projects, which we used to provide as a government, through winter works and the PEP program and the special northern employment program and so on. I can give you, without giving the names of individuals, some indication of the amount of welfare that's paid out in these communities because these people are now forced onto the welfare roles, which all Manitobans and all Canadians must pay for.

Mr. Chairman, it's a scandalous situation and it's one in which the people in these communities do not want to be in this position. They would much rather have gainful employment. There is no one from his department who is looking at this problem to . . . at least no people have been indicated or no approach or policy has been indicated within the Estimates process whereby there are people in his department addressing themselves to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, just going through a short example here where we have people ranging in age from 18 years old to 55, 60 years old, that are employable people, that have dependents and who are forced onto the welfare roles, if you just look at some of the rates of welfare that are paid. Mr. Chairman, an individual in

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

this community who's health is good, who is interested in working, is collecting \$758 a month in welfare, who has seven dependents.

Mr. Chairman, why doesn't the government take that kind of funding and make it available for some kind of retraining program so that a person like that would have the opportunity to be gainfully employed either in that community or outside that community?

We had a program, Mr. Chairman, of educating people to be teachers, to be nurses, to be personnel who could operate services that are presently servicing the communities in northern Manitoba; services, Mr. Chairman, which people now from outside most of these communities are providing. People are imported in all the way from the Maritimes to work in some of the northern communities to be teachers. Why isn't this government using the funds which they are already paying out, \$758 a month to one family in welfare, why aren't they using those funds to help a family like that at least train one of its members to be a useful productive member of that community? And one of the ways they could do that is to increase the amount of funding that's available for programs like teacher training, like nursing training, like the programs we had in Northern Affairs and other departments to train people to take jobs that are now being provided by government personnel, government personnel who are recruited from outside the community.

Mr. Chairman, why isn't the government using funds like this, which would be no further expense to the taxpayer - if any, marginally more expensive to the taxpayer - and in the long run, Mr. Speaker, the problem would at least be on its way to solution. Because the implications of continuing along the direction that this government is following, and that is abandoning people to the welfare rolls, Mr. Speaker, is creating a monster, because in the long run, it creates more people on welfare. The children who are growing up in welfare homes are learning a particular style of life and when they go out, Mr. Chairman, to be members of society, they have learned a particular way of living, and it's a life of welfare. So that rather than having one family on welfare, Mr. Chairman, in the next generation, in this case for example, you may have eight families on welfare; the existing family that is now on welfare, and the seven dependants who will have families of their own.

So this problem, Mr. Speaker, has horrendous implications. And it's a problem that must be addressed now. It must be seriously addressed now. His department should be doing research into this problem, should be determining the people available for training, the people available for projects that would be useful to the communities, people available for recruitment and selection for jobs that are outside the communities, those who are willing to relocate. But, Mr. Chairman, to date we have seen nothing, very little and, at best, inadequate response and programs on behalf of this government to address itself to this problem.

I'd like the Minister to respond to these issues, Mr. Chairman, rather than say that we discussed this last year and we debated it last year, therefore we don't have to debate it this year. Well, Mr. Chairman, they did nothing the first year they were in government; they did nothing the second year they were in government, and they're doing nothing now.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the trends, this government is reducing, over time, its efforts in this area. If the facts were known, Mr. Chairman, the monthly welfare rolls are getting bigger and bigger as time goes on, as people fall further and further behind, and get more and more desperate and unable to find any form of employment.

There was a time when people used to move from the remote communities into the city of Winnipeg looking for work. Well, Mr. Chairman, by the actions of this government we can see that that is something which they are no longer doing either, because there are no opportunities in Winnipeg either for them. I'd like to know what activities this Minister plans to follow to prepare people who are moving into the city of Winnipeg, or any other urban centre, to be able to assist them to gain useful employment and to assist them to relocate into a new situation, a new style of life; what if anything, his department is doing by way of studying the situation of migration from remote communities into centres in Manitoba, whether it's Winnipeg, Brandon, The Pas, or Thompson, or wherever; what his department is doing by way of researching the movement of peoples, potential manpower, potential workers; and what he is doing by way of instructing his research staff to come up with proposed policies and programs to deal with the situation.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. MacMASTER: I've said before, Mr. Chairman, and I'll say it once more, as the Manpower Division Estimates unravel it will be pretty obvious that there's been a variety of different things attempted, some successfully, and others that we propose to attempt. It's interesting that the member talks about people coming out of communities; he full well knows that there are a large number of people coming out of the communities and getting successfully employed in a variety of programs that the government has.

Several departments are very actively involved in training people out of communities and he knows that, but he also likes to throw around supposed facts and figures without having the facts, which is sort of typical. Maybe he should check the welfare rolls of the province of Manitoba when he very adamantly states that there are more people on welfare, there are more people on welfare. It's easy to say that, and he may get some press for it. But the facts of the matter are, there is approximately 4,000 less people on welfare in the province of Manitoba today than there was in the fall of 1977.

Now, I don't say that's good. We'd all like to say that it's 14,000 less, but as the Manpower Division unravels and as Northern Affairs unravels and as Education unravels, he'll see that there are things being done. The teacher programs he's talking about, the nursing programs, those things are in effect, and I think he really knows it. His argument may be that they're not enough, and that's valid, that's valid from the opposition that you're not doing enough; that's part of the exercise we're going through. But he full well does know that there's a large variety of programs in place, and if he'll wait as we go through the Manpower Division, he will find some new initiatives this year, some brand new initiatives that we're taking, and he'll get some of the numbers of the people that are involved in some programs that we're already into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The one community that I'm talking about has 130 heads of families on welfare, and Mr. Chairman, the monthly welfare bill for these people range from approximately \$350 to a high of \$894, and these are provincial welfare rates, Mr. Chairman. These are 130 heads of households in a community of about 450 people, where approximately two-thirds of the residents are children under the normal working age. --(Interjection)-- I don't wish to reveal the names of the people and/or the community in this case because, Mr. Chairman, we have a confidential situation here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. MacMASTER: I'd like to pose a question which I think the member will find acceptable and I hope he accepts it as a reasonable one. I'd like him then, privately, to give me that community and I will privately tell him what we have specifically tried to do, and if nothing sufficient is being done I will endeavour to try and find out what is going on in that particular community. I'm prepared to deal with him on that one-to-one basis. We have done this before with that particular member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's acceptable to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland? The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, that's acceptable to me if it's acceptable to the community. I would have to consult with them on this case. The matter is however, Mr. Chairman, that we have a situation where a good number of the people of working age in the community are unemployed and have very little opportunity during the year to find employment. Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is that the programs and policies of this government have proven inadequate and continue to be inadequate and if I look through the estimates here, the Minister says he is going to tell us that there are major new programs and major new initiatives. Well, Mr. Chairman, looking at these estimates and comparing them to other years, I know that there are no major new initiatives by this department or any other department to deal with this problem. This is only one community and there are probably 100

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

others like it in northern Manitoba both non-treaty and treaty communities which are every bit as much a responsibility of this government as they are of any government, Mr. Chairman.

All of the people in Manitoba are the responsibility of the government of Manitoba whether treaty or non-treaty. The Minister may say that he's not responsible for those who are on welfare in Indian reserves. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that he should be looking at Indian reserves in the same light as he is looking at non-treaty communities in northern Manitoba or wherever they are. So that the policies of his government would address itself to problems of people in Manitoba and the problems of people in Manitoba in this case is severe unemployment with a lack of opportunity for them to find any kind of meaningful employment and/or to see any hope for the future in terms of obtaining any useful occupation or income from employment. They subsist on minimal opportunities that have been there for the last century, a little bit of fishing, a little bit of trapping, a little bit of odd jobs here and there but no permanent opportunities for employment.

Many of these communities, Mr. Chairman, live in areas where there are resources and because of the lack of action on the part of this government there has been virtually no attempt to relate those people to that resource and to give them the opportunity to develop that resource through providing them with the technical and financial assistance to develop the resource. And beyond that, Mr. Chairman, we have to recognize that these communities can't exist entirely on that resource base. That's only one way that we could address ourselves to the problem.

The other parts of the problem must be solved in other ways. There must be ways of finding alternative employment opportunities for people outside of the communities where they exist and the government should be addressing itself to that problem because there is an entire population within the city of Winnipeg that are on the welfare rolls and that are on unemployment insurance and in the case of treaty Indian people, Mr. Chairman, when they move into the city of Winnipeg they become the charge of the municipal or provincial authorities. They become something which the government then has a direct financial involvement in.

And in the case of the non-treaty communities in northern Manitoba, they are a charge on the provincial government directly and even the treaty communities, I believe, that the Minister and his government have a responsibility to in terms of assisting them to find opportunities to obtain useful employment for their people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Firstly if I might, when we were discussing - if I could go back a few days - when we were discussing the Women's Bureau on the past Friday, we had a bit of a procedural wrangle over the extent of the debate on one of the items at which point I stood up and had suggested that we would not be threatened by people who would attempt to restrict the debate and I know having had conversations with you, Mr. Chairperson, that there was some question as to whether or not I was directing my remarks about people attempting to restrict debate to yourself or not.

I have had the opportunity to go over the Hansard and in it there was not intent but as it was not as specific as it could have been at the time and people might from reading that assume that I was directing my remarks at the Chairperson for attempting to restrict the debate, I thought I would take this opportunity and put it on the record, if I can, that I have no objections with the performance of the Chairperson and when I was referring to members threatening to restrict debate during the procedures, I was not and had not intended to refer specifically to the Chairperson. I feel that you have done a capable job and am quite pleased with your performance as Chairperson, so I wanted to get that on the record just to make certain that there was no misunderstanding as to your abilities as a chairperson. I think your record stands you in good stead throughout the proceedings that I have been a part of.

Last year during this discussion on these Estimates, we talked about a number of programs which were being reviewed and research was being done on, Mr. Chairperson. One of them was the evaluation of the New Careers Program. The Member from The Pas had asked if there was an evaluation on the New Careers Program being completed by the research department and the Minister at that time indicated that

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

there was, that it had been started and it was an ongoing evaluation. Perhaps we can ask the Minister now, if that evaluation has been completed and if so, is he willing to share it with members on this side of the House who have a particular interest in that specific program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: It is, as I said, an ongoing evaluation. We hope to at some particular point cut it off and I'll be prepared at that time - which certainly isn't today or tomorrow or the next week or two - I can assure the member that we are going to evaluate the present system of the New Careers Program, the way it's being administered and I'd like to further advise him that when we get under New Careers, I'll be talking to him about some slightly different direction that we propose to go with New Careers.

So once we have, he can understand from that, if we are proposing some new directions then somewhere in the near future we'll be reaching some very positive conclusions on the efforts of the past New Careers programming which hasn't been all that unsuccessful but we think we can improve it somewhat.

So in the very near future I can assure him that I'll give the Member from Churchill an evaluation of the New Careers Program and when we get into it in our Estimates here, we are prepared to talk to him and others about some slightly different direction we want to take with that program keeping in mind we intend to continue it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. We are aware of shift in direction that is taking place now from our conversations with our constituents and of course that is why I bring it up and look forward to discussing it in some detail during that item of the Estimates.

Also last year the Minister indicated that a review of the Apprenticeship Program would take place in the next few months and I would ask the Minister if that review has been completed and if he would be kind enough to share it with the members on this side if it has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: The only total review that we have completed is the one that I forwarded to the member. The others I hope to have in the very near future along the same format with the general sorts of information that I gave him - the one I should say we upped, our evaluation program quicker to get it in place - so I could in fact give the members of the opposition a sample of the kinds of things that we plan on doing. Again when we get into Apprenticeship I am quite prepared to talk about some of the difficulties that we have had and how we think we've corrected them at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: So then I would be correct in assuming from what we received both the Member for The Pas and myself yesterday, I believe, that these are the four or five studies that the Minister did give us are in fact the total number of studies that are ready for publication that have arisen out of the department in the past since the Minister has been responsible for this particular aspect of his department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: That's the ones that are prepared in that particular form at this time, Mr. Chairman. As I said we are prepared to forward copies as they come on. We expect in the next couple of months to have a large number, six, eight, ten, of various program reviews completed.

We've had a change in staff during the course of the year and some new direction and consequently some of the booklets and the forms that you see coming

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

out now are really a first of their particular type and we think it's vindicative of the openness that I certainly want to be with the members opposite, in laying out just how we see things are working and it certainly gives them a good position which is maybe a first to totally, absolutely, at their leisure, review them, come back through the form of a letter or a phone call, or a coffee, whatever they want, in the House, whatever is their wish, and discuss what they think is missing in there, what could better improve the evaluation, how we could better serve the constituents in all of Manitoba. I think the ones that he does have he will have to agree are pretty complete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'll continue on just for a few moments more.

The Minister yesterday passed over a book called, Major Provisions in Negotiated Working Conditions and Manitoba Collective Agreements In Effect December 31, 1978. Can the Minister inform me as to how this book is being distributed throughout the province? What the procedures are to ensure that it is getting into the hands of people who might be able to make the best use of it? Because it is a very complete book.

It's an example of research that's been done by other provinces and I know in other provinces that they make these books freely available to unions, freely available to employer groups and people who are interested in the negotiating process, and that's important because it tends to give you an overview of what's happening and allows you to develop your own proposals in light of what seems to be occurring in your specific industry and in your province as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: We've sent out 40 or 50 as a starting point to see if interest would be generated and we now understand that requests are coming in for others. So it's another example of the medium point we're at where (a) were producing the material, (b) we still haven't got what we consider, an ideal system of getting it out, and the Member for Churchill and I talked about that type of thing; that we are establishing systems of getting all the literature out that we can possibly get out to people so that they can make good use of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough - and he doesn't have to do it during the proceedings today but at some point in the near future before his Estimates are over - forward me a list of who this particular book has gone to - there'd be 40 names or so, I would imagine - so we can discuss that perhaps under the Minister's Salary, if there is any need to discuss that and I'm not certain, not knowing who it has gone out to.

Also, the Minister during the question period today provided us with some figures that I assume were provided to him by his research department on employment levels. I'm a bit confused. I wasn't able to catch the figures as he was giving them to us during the question period. I wonder if the Minister would have those figures available and be able to repeat them to me at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: They were February over February 1977-80, unemployed in both particular months of each respective year was 28,000. Employed in February 1977 was 421,000. Employed in 1980 was 453,000. Now the example that the member and I were hassling about yesterday - and I guess you can call it a hassle, you can throw statistics back and forth and I consider at times to be a total waste of time - but it's an example of what can happen if you pick a month over a month, or a year by year.

I don't suspect that there's actually 32,000 more people working. I don't really accept that because if you took March over March, next month over 1977 you may find that figure is down to 31,000. If you went May over May a year or two

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

back you may find it's back up to 41,000. Really what you do and what I was attempting to explain to the Member for Churchill is at the end of the year you average out your month over month or year or year and then you establish the real true employment growth within your workforce during the course of the year.

He was talking, just to enlarge on how things get out of perspective in relationship to month over month or year over year, he mentioned in February over February, it looked like a 1,000 increase last year to this year. Well, January over January looked like a 5,000 increase. So you see the figures might have been exceptionally low in January of 1979, exceptionally high in January 1980. Those things fluctuate up and down, and that's what the indication that I gave him was.

MR. COWAN: Those of course were, for the record, seasonally adjusted levels, and when using a month over month from year to year, one can just as accurately and probably effectively use the unadjusted levels.

I thank the Minister for making my point, in not only my reply to the Throne Speech, but also my comments yesterday that you have take a global picture, that you have to look at trends and you have to look at what happens over a certain period of time and use the averages and use the adjustments. But I think that point has been belaboured enough during the course of these debates and the course of the Throne debate and will be, of course, belaboured more during the Budget debate. --(Interjection)-- Next month, the Minister says, of course next month, one of us will be throwing statistics back and forth; and he's right, to just throw statistics back and forth is a waste of time. But to try to use statistics to define circumstances, to define situations, to discover trends and be able to deal with those trends is not a waste of time, and that's why we have this very important department before us today for discussion and debate, because that's one of the jobs of this department.

So I just wanted to make certain that I had heard the Minister correctly during the Question Period; that's the reason for asking that question, not wishing to get caught up in another battle as to whose statistics are better than whose other statistics.

The Minister last year, during the time of this particular discussion on this research department, indicated that a review of the private sector youth employment program was ongoing and "will be completed shortly", was his words. I would ask the Minister now if he has that review of the Private Sector Youth Employment Program, and in that case we were talking about the year previous, I would also wish to know if he has a review for this last year, in other words the year before, which he had indicated was being completed shortly during last year's Estimates and also, the review of the last year immediately preceding these Estimates?

MR. MacMASTER: I expect to be able to forward that review to the Member for Churchill before the end of March.

MR. COWAN: Just a point of clarification, that would be for both years, the reviews for both year: The private sector youth employment program in its first year, and the private sector youth employment program in its second year?

MR. MacMASTER: The only one I've been working on is the '79, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Now because we use different years in a way that I'm not quite accustomed to yet, even having been here for three years, by '79 does he mean this last year? Well then, I would ask the Minister what happened to the review that he had said was ongoing and would be completed in a short period of time for that program in the year previous? He had indicated during the Estimates that it was an ongoing review that his department was looking at. It was a very important issue at the time. I remember we stayed here late in the night on that particular night, probably largely because of that discussion. I'm certain that you, Mr. Chairperson, may well remember that night also. And at that time we were assured that it was going to be completed shortly, and I have been looking forward to it ever since, Mr. Chairperson, and would wonder now if it would be possible to at long last have an opportunity to see if our allegations at the time, which were quite strong, were as correct as we believed them to be.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know whether we used ongoing or complete, or forwarded, or what. It's a year ago; I'm sure Hansard will dictate what I said. I can undertake now a review of the 1978, along the same format as the one that I hope to have available, as I said, before the end of March of 1979.

MR. COWAN: Hansard is quite explicit and detailed as to the Minister's answers, and the answers were that it was an ongoing research program, that it would be, his exact words, excuse me, "will be completed shortly", and that's a quote from the Hansard; I can find the proper notation and date and the time. It was Thursday, May 17th, I can find the page number of Hansard if the Minister would care, although I don't think it's necessary. I'm certain that he knows there was some sort of a commitment to have it completed. There was never a commitment to give it to us. That commitment was never made. As a matter of fact, we had urged the Minister to make that commitment at the time and never did receive that commitment. So I'm not saying that he said he would give us such a review; I'm just saying he said that it was ongoing and would be completed in a short period of time. As to whether or not it has been, I would hope that the Minister can provide us with it as soon as it is. I'm making that request again this year, as well as the one on the previous year.

The Minister indicated also last year that they would be reviewing the Apprenticeship Program? --(Interjection)-- Well I would like to continue on with that just a bit, if I can, and at the same time, the Minister indicated that they would be starting an out-migration study; in other words, a study to determine where the interprovincial flow of population was going. I assumed at the time the Minister was going to try to determine why and try to determine what could be done to either change it, if it was necessary, or to support those forces which tended to keep trained personnel here, and that's why I mention the Apprenticeship area.

I would ask the Minister if he has had that study completed. I know he hired personnel specifically for doing it, and if the Minister would make that study available to us also, upon completion, if it has not been completed.

MR. MacMASTER: The demographic review of what's happening within the province, and those going out and those coming in, both emigration and immigration, is an ongoing thing, and I don't, at this particular time, see any particular study being handed down.

The member is correct that we did hire a personnel as a demographer. Subsequent to that we lost the person who was heading up the Immigration Department, so there has been a change of personnel within that particular department. There is a great deal of work going on in this particular area. We do know that the numbers of people leaving Manitoba are quite similar, in fact less than, if you averaged - and here we get into statistics again, but if you average it out - to be kind to some of the criticism from opposite, and I probably shouldn't be with some of the nonsense they've raised with those particular figures, but the fact of the matter is, if you went back ten years, you'd find it averaged out that there is very little change, except for the last couple of years, it has been somewhat less. And that particular figure is established. We do know that people crossing our country are not stopping as quickly in Manitoba as they might have a few years ago because the boom, of course, is in Alberta and I think everybody shares with me the fact that a lot of good tradesmen are getting out there, and what is taking place as far as the oil recovery industry, what's happening there is very acceptable to all Canadians.

The immigration of the federal government has dropped off, and those types of figures are available, if the member would like that. But those three kind of things certainly have been looked at, but a total demographic study of what's happening within Manitoba is an ongoing thing and that type of thing might not be available for a year or two. There's a tremendous amount of work to do in that field. You don't do those kind of things with a person or two or three. You do a lot of things that relate to it in the course of a year. So there's no particular document that's going to be tabled in this House at this time, or in the foreseeable future, as relates to that.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister very specifically whether this section, this Research Section, has done any research into the structural unemployment problem that my colleague for Rupertsland and I have been talking about and which we really haven't got a response from the Minister on. Is this section specifically doing some research into that structural unemployment problem in northern Manitoba and in native communities and in Metis communities in Manitoba? Is there any specific research or studies being done in order to assist the Minister and this government to develop any programs or policies to overcome that serious problem?

MR. MacMASTER: They don't specifically go out and do those things, Mr. Chairman, but we are a gathering source at this particular time, and when we get into the Manpower Needs committee area and on into the Estimates you will find that some of the findings that have been pulled together from a variety of departments indicate a desire by my own ministry to do a variety of different things, which again we'll get into. And I'm not trying to mince words with the Member for The Pas. We don't specifically go out and study the situation; it's a gathering source at this particular point.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, what we probably need as well as a Manpower Needs committee, which does form an important function, is sort of a need of people for employment committee, because that's the kind of structural problem we're dealing with in northern Manitoba and in the remote communities, and indeed in some pockets of unemployment in southern and rural Manitoba, even within the city of Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister, I assume from somewhere, got the statistics for provincial welfare rolls, but Mr. Chairman, what I was talking about when I made my comments was the situation of unemployed employables in northern Manitoba. The number of unemployed employables in receipt of welfare has gone up; and if you take that figure and look at the remote communities, it has gone up quite considerably; and if you take that figure and apply it to Indian reserves, then it's gone up even further.

So I don't know if the Minister is pretending in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, that we don't have a serious unemployment problem within the remote communities in Manitoba. I would hope that the Minister would not try - he's tried to pretend, he and his government, many things, but I'm assuming that even he wouldn't try and pretend that there's not a serious unemployment problem within the remote communities.

Mr. Chairperson, the Minister indicated to my colleague, who had some specific figures in terms of communities, that he would be willing to say what has been done in certain communities and what the present situation is in terms of government programs, in terms of his department what efforts have been made.

So maybe, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would like to provide that information to us, and it would probably be very useful, Mr. Chairperson, if he could take a community and say, in 1977 at this same time in the year, the following things were happening. In 1981, the following things are happening in that community. Excuse me, 1980, what is happening in those communities. And if he could do it for all the remote communities, if he could specifically tell us what is happening in Cormorant these days; if he could specifically tell us what is happening in Easterville these days; if he could specifically tell us what is happening in Moose Lake, or Wanless, or Sheridan, or Brochet, or Lac Brochet, and go through the whole list of communities, if he has that information available.

Mr. Chairperson, all that you have to do is to go into some of these communities, to have been going into them for a number of years, to see that the situation is in fact, deteriorating. Things are getting worse. People are unable to get work. People are unable to support their families. And Mr. Chairperson, I don't want to repeat my speech that I made the last time we met on this subject, because, Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)-- and the Minister says, "Good", and it's well he should. It's well he should, because that has been his biggest failing as Minister. That particular Minister campaigned in 1977 on employment. He went to remote communities and said, "When a Conservative government is in office there will be more jobs available," and Mr. Chairperson, there are now less jobs available. The promise was not kept in any way, shape or form, Mr. Chairman.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

So well the Minister should say, good, that I don't keep reminding him of this serious failure, of the drastic failure of him and his government in regard to employment creation because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister just has to go into some of the remote communities and talk to the people there, to see what's happening. It is depressing to talk to them and see that in fact the people that worked before don't have work now, that a community that had things going for it doesn't have things going for it now.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have a problem of getting angry when I see that situation, when I see people suffering in the remote communities in northern Manitoba, when I see people suffering in rural areas, some of which fall in my constituency, and, Mr. Chairman, I can relate that suffering directly to programs that have been cut out by this government, to things that should have been done by this government that weren't done, Mr. Chairman. So I am not going to apologize for getting angry with the Minister or getting annoyed with the Minister, because, Mr. Chairman, there are people in my constituency, there are people of northern Manitoba that are worse off, that are suffering, that are in bad straits because of the action and the inaction of this Minister and this government, and I won't apologize for keeping reminding the Minister of that deplorable situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. As the Member for The Pas has stated this is the area, as we talked yesterday, of the greatest failing or one of the greatest failings of the government. There are areas of greater failings in other areas and I can only hope without going on in some detail, because we had discussed this item in great detail just the other day when we went through the statistics, when all of us on this side, especially those of us from northern Manitoba, because that is where the situation is at its worst, that is where the contradictions are so apparent. The Minister came forward promising jobs, the Minister came forward when he was elected promising a better economic community in the north, a more viable economic community, and in every instance, in every single specific instance there are fewer jobs than before.

In the mining industry, and I am not going to talk about specific towns because some towns have more jobs than they did before, some towns have less jobs than they did before, but in the mining sector as a whole, the Minister knows, there are fewer employees today than there were in 1977. There are fewer people working in the mining industry today than there were in 1977. There is fewer production, that makes sense also, but that is an aside and a topic for the Mines Estimates. But in the remote communities also, and far too often being off the main roads, being out of the traveller's eyesight, we tend to not direct our attention as fully to them as we do to a place that captures our attention such as Thompson, or The Pas or Flin Flon. When the conditions in Thompson were exasperated by the cutbacks at Inco, when people were unemployed and we had great vacancy rates, and a whole list of social and economic problems that go with that sort of economic dislocation, everybody did studies on it, everybody rushed out, it was a story of great concern to the press, it was a story of great concern to northerners. That is still ongoing, Mr. Chairperson. The condition is turning itself around a bit and on the upswing as one would expect it to be, but it still hasn't reached the level of activity that it was in October of 1977.

But in the remote communities, in the South Indian Lakes and the Pukatawagans, and in the Brochets and Lac Brochets and Tadoule Lake, where nothing has been done of any significance, where we still see the type of conditions that existed for hundreds of years currently ongoing and the tragedy is that nothing is being done. The tragedy is that because we are doing nothing the conditions are getting worse, and there are fewer people working, and there are more people on welfare in the north.

We can go through the specific figures, and we will go through the specific figures, because it is important that the public know what is happening in northern Manitoba. You know, people when they shoot through from Toronto to Edmonton they miss northern Manitoba. If they go through Winnipeg they can see the For Sale signs here, they can see that there are problems here in Winnipeg, and that is of great interest to them that is why they don't stop, but they miss northern Manitoba completely. Even the people who go up to northern Manitoba miss

the smaller communities and so we don't have as a province the type of information that is necessary to make a proper analysis. But I can tell you, having travelled through many of those communities in just the past couple of months, continually travelling through those communities, going to be on the winter roads in a couple of weeks, if they are still there, travelling through those communities.

I have talked to people, they call me on the phone, I talk to them in their homes, I talk to them in their communities, and they tell me things are getting worse, they are not getting better. In one instance, there was some employment, there was a road being built out of Norway House, and I think the Member for Rupertsland can probably describe the situation in more detail than I can. There was a road being built but the people from Norway House weren't in any sort of significant way enjoying the employment that was being created by the construction of that road.

Why do I bring that up under research? The Chairperson shakes his head, and I appreciate the latitude that you have allowed me. Why do I bring that up under research? I bring that up under research because it is pertinent, that that is the type of research, as the Members for the The Pas and Rupertsland said, that must be ongoing if we are going to get grips on what is happening in northern Manitoba. That is the type of research that can play a very substantial part in trying to correct some inequities that have been around for a very long time. I say that not to blame any particular Minister or any particular government, not to say that I have any specific answers or solutions that tomorrow we could just go in a change it and turn it all about, and make the north blossom, but to say that there is a need for the type of research that will enable us to identify the problems and only by identifying the problems will we be able to come up with some solutions, not all the solutions but some solutions.

So I stand today under this Department to encourage the Minister to direct his Department to do some of that sort of research, so that when someone comes in here and says, "The welfare rates are higher now in the north than they were a couple of years ago", the Minister doesn't tell us about 4,000 fewer people being on welfare in the province. We know that, we have the Annual Report. But that the Minister tells us, "Yes, we have studied the communities and we see that there is more welfare in the communities now than there was four years ago in the north generally and we see that it is in these specified areas, locations, and pockets of poverty, and here is what we are going to do about it." Because the Minister is from the north, he knows it exists and he knows that something has to be done about it, and he knows that the situation will never correct itself until such a time as people are willing to make a strong commitment to progress. That commitment has been lacking from his government, that commitment has been lacking from his department, otherwise, we would have seen that sort of research being done and we would have been able to, when I am talking to my constituents, we would have been able to talk about the things that have occurred, and not talk about the things that have not occurred.

MR. KOVNATS: (1)--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Just a couple of quick things. The road I am sure the Member for Churchill is talking about is the road to Cross Lake, not the one to Norway House, and there are people in Cross Lake that are being employed in that particular project and the contractors have been talked to, particularly right in my office with the Minister of Northern Affairs and myself. They assured us that they would go to Cross Lake and speak to the Chief and they did. They were going to go to Cross Lake and speak to the Mayor and they did on their own initiative, and then the second time on my insistence, and they are dealing with the people in Cross Lake, and the people in Cross Lake are employed to, what I understand, the greatest extent on that particular project. I was talking to the Mayor of Norway House today and he is interested and so are we in employing as many people in Norway House, getting back to the community that the Member was confused on. The people in Norway House are going to be employed to the greatest extent on the building of the school that takes place there. So we are doing some of those very things.

The Member for The Pas is absent, but just to him, our relocation officers that do go into communities are now talking to people within the communities trying to

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

get a profile on the qualifications and the desires of the people within that community to seek other types of employment.

MR. KOVNATS: The hour is not 4:30 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m., this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item on the Order Paper for today, Resolution No. 8. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 - THE NATIONAL OIL SUPPLY AND PRICING POLICY

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that;

WHEREAS it is essential that Canada attain energy self-sufficiency based on Canadian control and development; and

WHEREAS petroleum price increases in Canada during the past few years have been related to world oil price changes and not to changes in the cost of production in Canada; and

WHEREAS this pricing policy is both inflationary and inequitable and is allowing the multinational oil corporations to earn enormous profits which are being used to purchase and control other Canadian businesses;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly opposes an oil supply policy based on pricing to achieve world levels; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly favours a policy whereby Canadian crude oil prices are established in Canada, by Canadians and not by the O.P.E.C. Cartel.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess this resolution, like the resolution we discussed yesterday on PetroCan, has been put in somewhat of a different light in view of the changing political circumstances that have occurred over the past few weeks, but nevertheless, it is a very vital issue in Canada, And while I was very concerned with it prior to the election time, at which time, Mr. Speaker, I drafted this particular resolution and the one on PetroCan before the election and tabled it before the election, nevertheless I believe these resolutions are worthy of our consideration and debate.

There is no question in my mind and I am sure honourable members will agree that the price of oil is probably, and the changing price of oil, is probably one of the most critical factors in the rate of inflation that we experience in Canada today. Indeed there is no question in my mind that price changes in oil and the ever increasing changes in the price of oil, upward changes, based on actions of O.P.E.C., without question are one of the major sources of inflation in the Western World today, and as such it has a bearing on our standard of living.

There is no question in my mind that increasing prices of oil also have an effect on the rate of economic growth. Studies have been done by the Government of Ontario which indicate a negative impact on the rate of economic growth. The Government of Ontario research has reported that the price increases that we have witnessed in Canada in the last couple of years and perhaps will witness in the future will have a detrimental impact on our rate of economic performance. And without question, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Manitoba this matter is very vital because we are a net importer of oil. True, we have some oil production in

the Virden area, the southwestern corner of the province. Unfortunately, it nowhere near meets our needs and there is no argument whatsoever but that we are very dependent on oil produced outside of the provincial borders of Manitoba.

If I may be permitted to talk about the Canadian oil and gas pricing situation as I have observed it, the situation that has occurred in the past few years, I think we can note that the federal government and the producing provinces, primarily Alberta, together capture about 60 percent of the revenue from oil price increases, that's the producing provinces and the federal government. So any increase that occurs, 60 percent goes to those governments. And we must continue to bear in mind that oil, as a very essential form of energy, is to a great extent a public asset and therefore, an item, a commodity that must continue to be priced in the public arena.

I believe that this nation must manage the domestic price of oil to reflect objectives of the Canadian people. I believe that the federal government, supported by the provinces, have all stated that crude oil self-sufficiency is a stated policy objective. But, Mr. Speaker, if Canada, if the nation is to bear the cost of oil independence then it is only consistent that our consumers enjoy the right to participate in setting independent Canadian crude oil prices.

As I said, rapid increases in oil prices have adverse effects on our employment situation and on our inflation performance and, indeed, they have detrimental effects on balanced regional economic development and a primary concern has to be the limited extent to which the revenues flowing from these price increases have been directed towards increasing Canadian oil supplies. Only by increasing Canadian oil independence, Mr. Speaker, can Canadians be shielded, in my view, from the political and economic power of the OPEC oil cartel.

So I, therefore, am a firm believer of a national policy of achieving a made in Canada oil price, a national price of respecting crude oil and I believe, in this way, along with other policies we can achieve energy self-sufficiency, or oil self-sufficiency, which I think is an objective that everyone should share.

Whatever pricing increases we do have, Mr. Speaker, in Canada in the foreseeable future, I think there are some basic principles that should be followed. First and foremost, any changes should minimize both the adverse short and long-run economic impacts. In my view, the world price should not be regarded as the target benchmark for pricing Canadian crude oil and furthermore, in my view, Canadian prices should be definitely below the average United States oil price at Chicago, which has been mentioned by some speakers in the past.

Another important principle is that the pricing that we do have or that we do arrive at should be gauged to encourage new supply and, in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I am a firm advocate of the blended oil-pricing policy. I don't think that it is adequate to simply have an across the board increase in crude oil prices because we have not seen positive results come from that type of price increase. In my view, domestic crude oil price should be cost related and I would suggest that a blended oil price is a method by which we can have a cost related pricing formula.

If I might talk for a moment on the blended price proposal, Mr. Speaker, the blended price mechanism that I suggest would automatically relate the price Canadian refineries pay for the crude oil they refine to the prices paid for domestically produced and imported crude oil because, as we can appreciate, we import a good percentage of the oil we use. This is particularly true in eastern Canada but we also, of course, are blessed with a substantial amount of domestically produced oil.

In essence the blended price would be a weighted average of the prices for old oil. Old oil is really oil that has already been developed, producing wells that have existed for some years and are producing regardless of increases in world oil prices. So it would be a weighted average of this old oil and new oil, which is oil that has been recently brought on stream in our oil fields, plus - that is true, or oil that is yet to be developed - plus the price of imported oil. So you have three factors: old oil, new oil, and imported oil. The price for old oil, crude oil that is already discovered and in production at costs significantly lower than prevail today, would be fixed at today's level. The old price of oil, Mr. Speaker, would be subject to review and negotiations should cost circumstances change.

So I am not suggesting for one moment that if the costs to produce the old oil

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

does rise that we shouldn't recognize that and provide for that cost increase. The price for new oil would be at a different and presumably higher level because we have to recognize, Mr. Speaker, the higher costs of the new oil coming usually from deeper zones in oil producing areas and from secondary and tertiary enhanced recovery schemes or from frontier regions where the cost is certainly a lot higher. And of course the third element, the imported oil, the price of that of course is outside of the control of Canadians.

So if we had this blended price, Mr. Speaker, I think there would be a number of advantages to Canadians. First of all, it would slow the rate of price increase. There's no question that we would have a lower rate of price increase by this method than, I believe, the method that we've used to date, which has been arbitrary to say the least. We would reduce the need for short-term economic stabilization programs to offset both the inflationary and the employment impact of price increases and we would slow the growth in fiscal imbalances among provinces. There is no question that this, too, is an adverse side effect of so many revenues flowing into the province of Alberta that we have a fiscal imbalance in the country. And it could eliminate the need for the federal government's oil compensation program, as currently operated, and remove an important connection between crude oil pricing and the federal governments overall budgetary position.

There is another advantage, Mr. Speaker, and one that perhaps should be highlighted and that is it would remove the need for a specific levy on Syncrude. It would not be necessary to have a special subsidy, a special provision for Syncrude because the formula would include paying the price that is required to bring oil out of the tar sands. Another advantage of the blended price option is that it would directly relate the price incentive to new oil production; that is the incentives of knowing that a higher price would be available for new oil would have a marked impact on development. I think the producing companies realize that they would be paid the going price for this new oil, that they would have every incentive to bring forth additional supply. And the last advantage is that it provides an automatic adjustment mechanism to changing world oil prices because it takes that into account as well, Mr. Speaker.

So I think there are a number of merits in a blended oil price system and I think that is one that can be implemented by the federal government in co-operation with the producing provinces.

Unfortunately, we've seen the price of oil jump too rapidly. In 1974 alone Canadian oil prices increased by 71 percent. Since then prices have risen steadily from \$6.50 per barrel to \$13.75, as of a year ago, and of course in January we had another \$1.00 per barrel increase in crude oil. Since December 1978 alone, the imported price of crude oil to Canada has jumped again by more than 50 percent, over \$25.00 per barrel, that's as of about six, seven months ago. The current gap at that point between Canadian oil prices and the average U.S. price in Chicago exceeded \$5.00 per barrel - well and that gap may rise.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, there is every prospect of continued rising prices of foreign oil and of course this is going to continue to put pressure on our domestic price situation. But, Mr. Speaker, I say again that it's important that we have a pricing mechanism that is rational and that will not impose an exorbitant penalty on consumers; by rational, I say it should provide every incentive for new production and at the same time it should not provide for ripp-off profits for the large oil companies.

As a matter of fact there is evidence now that the oil companies have not been able to utilize all the additional revenues for reinvestment in petroleum exploration and development. There is evidence that these companies have been utilizing their profits for the purchase of other Canadian businesses not related to the petroleum industry and I say, Mr. Speaker, that has to be a perversion and therefore, to me, it indicates that this across the board, upward, ever-increasing price of crude oil is not achieving the desired objective of bringing forth the required supply.

I was particularly dismayed, Mr. Speaker, at some of the statements made by the Premier of this province regarding oil price increases. I have a number of newspaper clippings wherein our Premier says that, and I'll quote from one, from the Tribune of the late last year, the 20th of October 1979, and I'll just quote a couple of sentences and this is an interview with the Premier on oil prices and gas prices, "Manitoba accepts the need to raise domestic oil prices to \$18 or \$20

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

per barrel, enough to make replacement oil projects such as the Alberta Tar Sands financially viable", the Premier said. The rumoured 30 cent gasoline hike is, "probably a pretty reasonable speculation as an interim increase" in gas prices he said.

So the Premier is accepting, unfortunately in a very passive way, this fantastic price increase that we were looking at last fall and in another statement, really on the same day, I guess this is perhaps the same interview but it's reported in the Free Press, "The Premier stood by his previous position on oil pricing that the price of domestic oil has to rise to a self-sufficiency price which will allow oil companies to develop new fossil fuel sources and enable the country to be petroleum self-sufficient. Alberta's conventional oil sources will be depleted by 1985, Lyon said, and six billion is needed to develop Tar Sands. To meet the capital cost the price of Canadian oil will have to rise between \$18 and \$20 a barrel, he said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's regrettable because, as I said, there is evidence that this across-the-board price increase has not resulted in the increase in production that one expected, and also we have to note that we are a net-consuming province and it does hurt Manitobans. I contrast the position of our Premier with the Premier of Ontario, Mr. William Davis, who is fighting very vigorously for Ontario, because it too is a net-consuming province, and it's in the same position as Manitoba. And I take my hat off to Mr. Davis of Ontario, and I say, why doesn't our Premier follow the lead of the Premier of Ontario? And I believe he belongs to the right political party.

Clark said, this was a Free Press story again in October, Mr. Speaker, of last year, Mr. Davis said, the Premier of Ontario said, "A rush to world energy prices in Canada could raise Canada's inflation rate by two percent. My government will not support a system that is some foreign oil cartel, directly or indirectly, holding the people of this country to ransom", he said; and Davis said "that the challenge of oil prices presents Clark," the former Prime Minister," with an opportunity of great dimension.

And then there's another article, Mr. Speaker, again, appearing in the Free Press, on October 27th, where the Premier of Ontario is saying, "Higher oil prices would be nothing more than fabulous tax increases for Alberta and the federal government." In a tough speech countering statements by Alberta Premier Lougheed, Davis said that, "raising oil prices and interest rates at the same time would be playing chicken with the economy." The Premier said, "the proposed \$4.00 a barrel oil price increase would cost Canadian consumers \$2.5 billion next year, without contemplating any additional federal excise tax, a possibility that has also been rumoured." Davis said he is angry about the subtle and not-so-subtle allegations of Ontario's greed in opposing price increases and so on. But he says it's totally unacceptable and unfair, the suggestions by Lougheed that Ontario would happily impose world prices if it owned the oil. He disagreed with him.

But the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that this government, this Premier, should get up and fight for Manitobans as the Premier of Ontario is fighting for the people of Ontario. The least we can do, Mr. Speaker, as an Assembly, is to stand up and be counted and say, we believe in a Made-in-Canada oil policy that will benefit Canadians and definitely benefit Manitobans. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this particular resolution deserves the support of every member of this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FIIMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution which is before us contains a number of points which I'm sure we can all support. Energy pricing and the energy question in Canada, as indeed in all the world, is one of utmost importance. The manner in which we deal with it may in fact decide on the future of our country. So I think, Mr. Speaker, it's well that we consider wisely all aspects of it and do not tend to zero in in an attempt to solve part of the problem, to zero in only on cheap oil for the future of our country as being the saviour and the salvation of all of our intents.

Any energy pricing policy, Mr. Speaker, I think must have as a cornerstone assurance of supply for future generations of our province and our country. It must not, and it should not, be tied into world levels. Indeed, I agree with both of those assumptions and those tenets in the resolution before us.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

On the other hand, any pricing policy, Mr. Speaker, must also ensure an incentive to the producer to develop more oil resources. If the producer can achieve adequate returns he will indeed invest in future exploration to find additional oil reserves. Every barrel of oil we get today from every new source, as the Member for Brandon East has documented, costs us more to produce, the exploration and development costs are greater, the transportation costs are greater. There is no question that we cannot just look upon the pricing policy for oil in this country, for energy in this country, based on what it costs us to produce the barrel of oil that we're using today, because the next barrel that we use will cost more to replace it with.

If we insist on keeping the price down at all costs, Mr. Speaker, we will stifle exploration and development of the new and more expensive sources that we have available to us in Canada. An example of that, of course, is something we were discussing yesterday, the fact that PetroCan has to be involved in the exploration and development of oil in our country, taxpayers' money has to go in to do what industry can and is doing throughout the world today, because our pricing policy works against the development of new and more plentiful energy resources in Canada today.

To say that the price of energy today must be kept at the same level, or even to say, Mr. Speaker, that you can't change the price because it's more expensive for you to develop the newer sources, the more abundant sources that we know are available, is like telling a manufacturer that the widget that he produces today he can only charge so much for, even if his costs of raw material go up and tomorrow it costs him more to produce, he can't charge any more for it if he has some in stock.

If we persist in attempting to keep the price of oil down at all costs, Mr. Speaker, we will be faced with a situation that involves limitation of supply and ration. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the public wants that situation. I think that the public, above all, wants to have the assurance of supply. If we do not have the assurance of supply then industry, trade and commerce will grind to a halt. All transportation in this country will grind to a halt without the assurance of supply. It's not enough for our domestic needs and for industry and our future development of this country to just say that we're going to keep the price down, we also have to assure them of the supply.

Mr. Speaker, it's like the Myron Cohen story that many members opposite may not have heard, about the gentlemen who goes into the butcher shop and asks for a couple of pounds of lamb chops. He is served the lamb chops and he's told that it's \$2.50 a pound. He says, just a minute I can get it across the street for \$2.00 a pound. The butcher says, well, why don't you go across the street. He says, well, they're out of lamb chops across the street. He says, if I were out of lamb chops I'd sell them to you for \$1.50 a pound. That's the same situation that we're faced with in attempting to keep the price of oil down.

We may well have the price kept at \$14.65 at barrel, but we may have no barrels of oil to use in the future. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, Canada - and I got this out of the latest MacLean's Magazine - is importing oil at the rate of 600,000 barrels a day. The subsidy, Mr. Speaker, that we're paying on those 600,000 barrels a day is in excess of \$20.00 per barrel. If you want to work that out it comes out to \$5 billion in subsidy that we're already paying at today's prices and today's rates in Canada to subsidize the cost of oil.

We're exporting a net of about 300,000 barrels a day, so there's a net difference of about 300,000. But we're not exporting at the rate that we're paying for the import of oil at the present time. The tar sands, Mr. Speaker, to develop the tar sands plant with a potential of producing 120,000 barrels a day, costs \$5 billion. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we'd be better off taking the \$5 billion and developing the tar sands plants, rather than taking the \$5 billion and simply using it to keep down the price of oil in Canada, because in future we would then be assured of supplies, of these more expensive supplies that we know we have available, but it doesn't pay us to develop at the present time.

The federal government started this policy of subsidy of oil prices in Canada as a short-term measure. In the beginning it was only a matter of a few dollars a barrel; in the beginning it was only a matter of a few barrels. Now the subsidy is over \$20 a barrel, and our imports are expected to be four times what they are today by 1985. I suggest to you that in artificially keeping this price down it's

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

causing wastefulness and it's destructive to our goal of energy self-sufficiency, and I suggest to you that the public is not in favour of this policy.

The current policy of subsidizing these imports with all taxpayers' money does nothing to encourage conservation, and it does not mean that the user pays his fair share; we all pay for these imports. The federal government intended to stop this subsidy, in fact Alastair Gillespie, in 1977, suggested that the former federal government was going to move towards world prices. You'll note that I have not suggested that we move toward world prices. --(Interjection)-- No, my colleague did not, and I'll answer that later, to the Member for Ste. Rose.

Now, it's a campaign promise that they've given to eastern Canada during this recently fought campaign, and I think it's going to be a little difficult for them to get out of. And I think in fact it's going to be a retrograde step and not one that we should support.

If the price of a made-in-Canada pricing is greater dependence on foreign oil imports, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in favour of it. If the price of a made-in-Canada energy pricing policy is to put off conservation of our previous non-renewable energy sources I'm not in favour of it, Mr. Speaker. If the price of a made-in-Canada energy policy is subsidizing our non-renewable energy sources at the expense of the development of our renewable sources I'm not in favour of it, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that that is, in fact what does happen, what is happening, and what will happen if we look at it only from the viewpoint of cheap oil and gas in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East suggested that we ought to have a blended price arrangement, that we ought to bring on stream new sources and charge for them at the rate that it costs us to produce them. That has some merit, Mr. Speaker, but in fact, it is detrimental to Manitoba interests, because one of the aspects of a total comprehensive energy policy, and I think that looking at it in very narrow terms that just concentrates on price is not a comprehensive enough policy; but one of the aspects of a total comprehensive energy policy must be that we have to spend some of the funds that we are taking in from our energy sources at the present time and re-invest them into the development of alternate renewable energy sources. And we, in Manitoba, as I mentioned in my debate in the Speech from the Throne, have one of the greatest opportunities there in renewable, totally renewable energy sources in our Hydro, in solar energy, in gasohol, and wind and many of the other things that will be very important to Manitoba's future.

So if we accept the blended policy we're still not redirecting any funds to the uses that we need them in Manitoba, and I do not think that that's the way to go, Mr. Speaker. Surely pricing, although important, can be realistically based on more than just cheap gas and oil. Surely our future supply for all Canadians comes first and we will price realistically to consider the achievement of all of our goals.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by members opposite that our Premier, in his speeches in November of this year, said various things. Yesterday I attempted to correct the Member for Ste. Rose, and I think I was rightly ruled out of order because I started to read from his speech at the First Ministers Energy Conference in which he detailed exactly what his position was on all of these various matters. And I quote, "In our view, it is unfortunately necessary that prices be increased on a phased basis toward a level which is adequate to ensure the achievement of self-sufficiency by the 1990 target date which has been established by the government of Canada, or sooner if possible. The level of this self-sufficiency price cannot now be defined by us with precision, but in simple terms, it means the price necessary to ensure optimum development and utilization of our domestic supply sources." I think that is something we can all support, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing that he said that might be of interest to the members opposite, "Specifically, we should monitor the returns of the oil companies to ensure that they are being utilized in the national interest, in support of our self-sufficiency objective." Again, something I think we should all be in a position to support.

Another thing he said, "Unless we achieve increased production from reserves every estimate we have seen indicates that we will face an escalating increase in our dependence on offshore oil, with all the supply and price vagaries attached to it. One need only contemplate the current situation in Iran to understand the

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

undesirability of increasing our dependence on offshore oil." All of these things, I think, Mr. Speaker, are things that we can and should support in a comprehensive energy policy.

Another thing that the Premier said at the First Minister's conference, "I want to turn now to the question of adjustment to higher prices", because that is important if we assume that energy pricing policy that is based on what it costs us to produce our new sources of oil, our new and more expensive sources of energy, are going to cause some ill effects and we are going to have to be careful that the ill effects are not shared by the middle and low income people, and he said, "I want to turn now to the question of adjustment to higher prices and the possibility of so-called cushioning measures by the Federal Government, such as tax relief in the form of credits to offset at least some of the negative consequences for provincial economies and for the individual and commercial consumers." Obviously this is a critical part of the overall strategy. "May we suggest that there is no better time than now to acknowledge the inequitable burden in the overall costs of living which is borne by Canadian citizens living in northern regions of our country." He suggested that they too should be considered in any comprehensive energy policy, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is an example of looking at the total picture, not zeroing in on a very narrow blinkered viewpoint, Mr. Speaker, of the whole problem.

Another thing that the First Minister mentioned was the necessity for us to get out of the lock-step approach in pricing for natural gas. We currently have the estimated excess for the next ten to twenty years of approximately 40 percent of our natural gas production in this country, and I am sure that members opposite realize that natural gas occurs in formation with oil, and for every barrel of oil we take out we take out natural gas without converting it to liquid form natural gas, and that would cost us in terms of energy and expense to do that, natural gas comes out, cannot be stored and must be used. Obviously we have to make sure that we can take away the lock-step approach so that we can utilize our additional capacity in natural gas and not have to raise that at the same rate as we do the price of oil.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the current policy of subsidizing oil imports, providing incentives to non-renewal petroleum development, such as rapid write-offs, depletion allowances, etc., are at the expense of the research and development for renewable sources, such as Hydro. There I think we should be asking for similar . . .

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

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There I think we should be asking for similar benefits so that we can, in Manitoba, take advantage of a similar situation. If the Federal Government insists on giving advantages to the non-renewable petroleum energy sources, similar advantages should be given to the renewable sources which can be our salvation and our security in the future. In terms of Hydro, perhaps we should be asking for low cost loans, perhaps we should be asking for elimination of the sales taxes that apply to the various components that go into our Hydro development, or into gasohol or solar or all those other alternative energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East referred to the fact that we couldn't afford, in our economic development, to take into effect increases in whatever order and whatever magnitude in our energy prices. I think that there has been more than some little evidence to indicate that the effect of measured price increases would not necessarily do serious harm to our industry and our economic development. Other industrial countries are making the adjustment today, West Germany, Japan, many of these countries that are amongst our strongest most heavily industrialized western nations, are dealing with petroleum energy prices that are more than double ours and I don't think any of the members opposite would say that they do not have extremely strong economies today.

A study by a University of Toronto economist recently reported that a 50 percent increase in energy costs would raise the production costs in industry by approximately 5 percent. I think that is something that they could adjust to, particularly if the alternative, Mr. Speaker, were an absence of energy in the future and a non-assurance of supply.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are being asked, by zeroing in only on the pricing of energy, only on cheap oil, we are being asked to fall into the trap, the trap that was laid for us, I think laid out for us a little while ago by members opposite, that trap of one oil company, rationed supply under government control, and cheap prices, cheap price, but, of course, a made-in-Canada policy.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I suggest that we ought to consider this more fully, that we ought to take the policy in a much more comprehensive manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, seconded by the Member for Roblin;

THAT the Motion be amended by striking out all words after the second "and" in the third line of the first WHEREAS and preceding the word "that" in the first line of the first "THEREFORE" and substituting the following:

WHEREAS the government of Manitoba has proposed a comprehensive national energy strategy to achieve that goal; and

WHEREAS that strategy outlined in a statement presented by the Premier to the November 12th, 1979 First Minister's Conference on Energy includes:

- 1) support for a goal of energy self-sufficiency by 1990 or sooner if possible;
- 2) recognition of the importance of Hydro development, including a western power grid;
- 3) self-sufficiency pricing for oil to encourage increased domestic production and decreased reliance on imports;
- 4) special cushioning programs such as tax credits for northern residents and senior citizens to help offset the negative effect of higher oil prices;
- 5) consideration of a new pricing system for natural gas reflecting our favourable supply situation, which would keep gas prices from rising in lock-step with oil; and
- 6) a major new set of Federal-Provincial conservation programs including measures to encourage public transit and better use of available energy forms;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly endorses the comprehensive energy strategy proposals put forward on November 12th, 1979, on behalf of the Manitoba Government by the First Minister; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly favours a policy whereby Canadian crude oil prices are established in Canada by Canadians and not by the O.P.E.C. Cartel.

That is my proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MOTION put on the amendment.

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

MR. FOX: Yes, as a matter of procedure and courtesy, I wonder if when amendments are made there couldn't be four or five extra copies made so that members on this side of the House could peruse the amendment while the Speaker is making it, so that we would be conversant whether it is in order and of course what the contents of the amendment are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan has raised a very good point. It is very difficult for members to talk on the amendment unless they have sufficient copies of the amendment and I would hope in the future that any member who is proposing to bring forward amendments has several copies so that members do know what the actual wording of the amendment is.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the amendment that you read to us, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me that although it does mention oil at some point or other, it really goes far and above and beyond the intent of this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on my point of order, this resolution dealt with one aspect of energy, namely oil and indeed only one dimension of oil as a form of energy, namely, the pricing of oil. Mr. Speaker, I, like all of us in this Chamber, are very concerned about Hydro electricity, conservation and many many other items,

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

but, Mr. Speaker, my point is that the amendment distorts the resolution, and completely wipes out the original intent of the resolution and that was to have a specific debate and resolution of a particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, this goes way beyond it, and I would think therefore it is deserving of your consideration as to whether or not it is in order..

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

HON. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I am constantly amazed at the short memories of my honourable friends opposite. Maybe he wasn't in the House often enough to have known what was going on, but when resolutions were introduced on that side of the House the amendment almost invariably on this side of the House was completely wiped out and all that remained was a resolution to praise the Minister for what he was doing. Sir, if that isn't an abortion of a resolution, I don't know what is, and it was always in order. So I don't see where this one is out of order because it at least deals with the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest to the Honourable Member that amendments from time to time have, in effect, drastically reduced the intent and changed the intent of a Motion. However, the member does have the opportunity when the debate is completed to express that and if he successful in gaining enough support he can have the amendment defeated, at which time it goes back to the original resolution.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member for Brandon East for presenting a series of motions to this House that are based on Liberal federal policy and therefore it becomes very easy for me to support them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would hope all members would afford the honourable member the opportunity to make her speech and be heard by the rest of the members.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to shout them down if I had to since I had the mike.

In the recent Federal Election, of course, the made in Canada price was a Liberal promises, which was, it seems to me, very vociferously attacked by the other parties at that time, but I find it refreshing that this New Democratic Party sitting next to me in the House is supporting it now and I hope that this is indicative of the support the Liberal Party in the federal House can expect to receive from the New Democratic Party as well.

What does make me nervous about that, Mr. Speaker, is that so often when the New Democratic Party has supported and encouraged Liberal positions, Liberal policies, a few years later we find them taking credit for those policies as if they had in fact initiated them and I could go into detail but I think I'd be found out of order in that it would be going off the subject, Mr. Speaker, so obviously I will support the motion.

The Member for River Heights has talked very sensibly about the need for alternate and renewable sources of energy, solar energy, wind and so forth, but I wonder if he is aware that the federal government has made an offer of shared costs in energy conservation research and that his government, this provincial government, has not signed the federal/provincial agreement which would make funds available for that cost-shared research.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for River Heights on a point of order.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that agreement has been signed by our provincial government and has not been signed by the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for River Heights did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Thursday, 13 March, 1980

MRS. WESTBURY: I was told a few days ago that the provincial government had not signed the agreement; if I'm wrong then I apologize, Mr. Speaker, and it should be easy to verify that.

Now I would like to know then, and perhaps at some time the speaker on the opposite side could tell us just what the provincial government is doing in these areas of alternate energy research, because my understanding and my observation is that in the two and a half years that they have been in office they have done nothing to promote solar energy and alternate and renewable sources of energy. So I'm indeed gratified if the information I have was incorrect or if it has recently been changed, the past couple of days.

I would like to point out that experts generally agree that the cost of oil production within Canada must inevitably rise, so I think any suggestion that costs are not going to rise are a little unrealistic. Of course that is not a switch but what one does not do on top of rising costs is impose an extra tax on the rising costs, and that is what the conservative government was proposing to do in the federal election. That's very different from allowing the costs to rise.

And I also wanted to suggest that, and most experts seem to agree, that most of the low-cost wells in Canada have been identified. It's generally felt that the new wells are going to be of a more expensive type to open and to operate and so this is all going to contribute towards a gradually increasing price, Mr. Speaker.

I'm trying to present an alternative and a moderate view, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I've been able to do that.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It will be quite difficult, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the amendment because I have just been handed the document and it is quite lengthy, and I suppose that we'll have an opportunity to peruse it at a later date and perhaps some of my colleagues may want to get in when we put that . . .

MR. FOX: On a point of order: I wonder if you'd be prepared to call it 5:30 and give the honourable gentleman a chance to read his amendment before he speaks on it. It's only three minutes to go.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there an inclination to call it 5:30? Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Rose on a point of order.

MR. ADAM: Well I'm just wondering if it will be standing in my name that I, when I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, that is correct.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday). Committee will meet at 8:00 p.m. this evening.