

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 28, 1974

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students, Grade IX standing of the La Verendrye School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Reid, Mr. Humeniuk and Mrs. Baker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

We also have 35 students of Grade X standing of the Arthur Day School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Johnson -- Mrs. Johnson, I'm sorry. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, The Minister of Labour.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

NOTICES OF MOTION

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to introduce a resolution to this House tomorrow on the establishment of a committee, a Special Committee of the Legislature to consider the whole question of land ownership, and due to the speed-up problems we have I'm giving notice now of that resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Leader Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It refers to a question asked on Page 3267 of Hansard and the answer given at the time - which I believe would be given for clarification afterwards - in dealing with the question of the obstruction or the exit of Lake Winnipeg. In reply to the question by the Honourable Member for Riel, the Minister indicated that the department tells me that the removal might not have been as complete as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member can place his question without a lot of preamble. I do believe the rules do call for that, and the Honourable Member is aware of it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to try and place the question as best I can, and I think it's necessary to indicate that the Honourable Minister of Mines in replying indicated that the department tells me that the removal might not have been as complete as possible. The question was asked of the First Minister this morning, I wonder if the Minister's in a position to indicate whether the obstruction has been removed or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the obstruction was removed. It was put in, as was indicated, on a temporary basis and on the basis that it could be removed if the drought conditions then predicted were to change. It was then removed. The department indicated to me at the time I answered the honourable friend, that if removal was not complete as it should have been, that there was a possibility that there may be three inches of the levels reached in Lake Winnipeg this year, which could be attributable to that fact. Since then, Mr. Speaker, the Lake Winnipeg Management Board has reviewed the situation with regard to Lake Winnipeg, and we'll be making certain announcements relative to conditions at the lake. But the answer that I gave stands, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister's in a position to indicate to the House that he has the assurance from Hydro that in fact the obstruction has been removed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have that assurance. I conveyed it to my honourable friend this morning. I undertook to double check as it were, and I have had a telephone call put into the Manitoba Hydro Chairman's office asking for re-confirmation of that fact. -- (Interjection) --

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me whether there were any change vis-a-vis regulations with respect to licensing or catch of whitefish on Lake Winnipeg. I am advised that there was some discussion with fishermen relative to an interpretation of individual quotas in the Whitefish Fishery. The nature of the discussions was as follows: initially the individual whitefish quota was established at 20,000 pounds whitefish; 4,000 pounds sauger and pickerel. Fishermen in '72 requested that the quota be set at 24,000 whitefish, pickerel and sauger, the reason being that fishermen at Warren's Landing cannot harvest pickerel and sauger, and therefore requested that the quota be all embracing. The fishermen in agreement with the biologists indicates that the catches would even out and that there would not be an endangerment of the plans for the fishery. The discussion resulted from the wording on the 1974 whitefish licences, indicating 20,000 whitefish and 4,000 pickerel and sauger. The correct wording should have read, "24,000 pounds whitefish", and this discrepancy in wording has since been corrected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sort of fishing for what the honourable member is looking for; if that's what he's looking for, then that is the answer. If he has a specific problem which I haven't dealt with, I'd appreciate knowing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if, as I understand it, the Minister says that the interpretation that was incorrect or could have been considered to be incorrect, has been changed, and I would think that probably would answer it. But I wonder if he could indicate whether there's been a communication from his department to the Lake Winnipeg fishermen in connection with this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: The error has been corrected, I would assume the fishermen would have received this correction. If he's referring to one group, that is the Lake Winnipeg Fishermen's Association, I'll have to check to see whether the association was advised. But I would think that the fishermen who got the licences would be advised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I.H. ASPER (Leader of Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question's for the Minister responsible for Environmental Management. Has he agreed to permit the City of Winnipeg to commence the spraying program of the city trees using the insecticide methoxychlor starting June 1.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I indicated that an application was made to the Clean Environment Commission. The Clean Environment Commission issued an order which permitted, with certain restrictions and conditions, spraying. I am advised that the City is proceeding on the basis of that order, and I've indicated to the City that I have no intentions of staying the provisions of the order. And as a matter of fact, I believe that the appeal of one of the persons who appealed against the Environmental Commission order was dismissed. That's my recollection. If it wasn't already dismissed, it will be dismissed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Could he indicate why he has not quashed the use of this insecticide, in the light of the statement by the Clean Environment Commission that there may be severe allergic effects suffered by citizens, and also casting doubt upon the effectiveness of the insecticide?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the Commission which he is quoting - and I will accept the fact that he is quoting, although I'm sure he must be quoting only part of what they said - were the ones who issued the order. And generally, on environmental questions where there is no social or economic implications involved, it has been my policy to accept the environmental decisions of the Clean Environment Commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was done relative to mosquitoes and it is being done relative to canker worms. I am certain that if I had not accepted the Commission's order vis-a-vis methoxychlor, that the Leader of the Liberal Party would be getting up saying, "Why are you not permitting the City to spray for canker worms?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question, supplementary, to the Minister is has he not considered the use of a substitute insecticide Dipel which is known to be more effective and is recognized as being safe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the position of the House as a unit, with perhaps some few exceptions, is that these questions should be decided by the Clean Environment Commission; that the Minister should not interfere with the decisions of the Clean Environment Commission; that the department appears and makes their case, the Clean Environment Commission acts in a quasi judicial capacity and makes their decisions. These can subsequently be appealed to the Minister. In considering those appeals, I've indicated to the honourable member that I do not generally second-guess the Commission vis-a-vis environmental questions; although the honourable member may have more trust in my judgment in that regard, it seems that the House has had more trust in referring these matters to the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has he studied the evidence that was brought before the Clean Environment Commission and the decision of the Clean Environment Commission, which was to say the least very equivocal on the subject. And I'm noting particularly the medical effort . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is now debating the question.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question then is, has the Minister read the testimony before the Commission of Dr. LaBella in which he stated that in his opinion the spraying with that particular insecticide could cause and would likely cause severe health hazard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really can't do more than answer what I've answered before. I want to remind the honourable member that when the Clean Environment Commission banned the spraying of mosquitoes vis-a-vis methoxychlor that members in this House asked me why I am not permitting the City of Winnipeg to spray for mosquitoes, and I indicated at that time that on the environmental questions - and the strictly environmental questions where social and economic implications do not arise - we are relying on the Clean Environment Commission to settle the kind of argument that is now being raised by my honourable friend. And in dealing with the appeal, Mr. Speaker, that is the way in which we acted; and, Mr. Speaker, that is the thrust of the Clean Environment Act, which I believe is largely accepted by all of the honourable members in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can't have it both ways. He can't accuse me for not spraying when the Commission says that they don't want spray, and spraying when the Commission says that they should spray.

A MEMBER: Yes he can. He does it all the time.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Water Control. My question is, who is responsible now for the control of drainage in the Province of Manitoba where installations have been put in? And I refer to the Maple Lake drainage ditch where the gates are closed, where "Highways" at one time were responsible for the opening and closing of those gates - and "Highways" can't tell me now where or whose responsibility it is, but it's not theirs. Can the Minister tell me who is responsible?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, where drainage falls under provincial jurisdiction, which is not in every case, then the Minister responsible is the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I normally do not do this, Sir, but on a question of privilege I note there is an article in today's Winnipeg Tribune, Page 3

A MEMBER: Bad paper.

MR. SCHREYER: "The new Osborne Bridge," the article reads, "costly underpass rejected". and I have notes here from the exchange of letters between the Province and the City and I must simply indicate that the article is wrong in every single major respect. I could put it on the record, Sir, to indicate among other things that the province at no time insisted on an underpass to the Osborne Bridge, but rather indicated a preference. The province did not advocate a wider bridge, but rather proposed that if possible a less elaborate bridge be designed

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) so as to interfere minimally with the river bank property and other environmental considerations, etc., etc., but let it be said that the article is wrong in every major respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister responsible for Water Control. I'd like to know who is responsible for opening and closing the gates on drainage ditches - and I refer again to the Maple Lake drainage ditch from the Maple Lake into the Souris River, the gates are closed, and the Highways say they have no responsibility for any further, and they don't know who has.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that the governmental control would be exercised by the Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management if I correctly assess the honourable member's question. As to which staff are now charged with the responsibility of dealing with it within the guidelines - which I know I have not changed and therefore must have existed before - I can't give you the name of that individual, I don't think I will. I will try to find out for you what the situation is with regard to the opening and closing of those gates at the present time.

MR. WATT: Well just a supplementary question then. Would the Minister give me some advice and take it under advisement, who's responsible for the opening and closing of the gates, which are closed now and flooding that whole area? Nobody seems to know who's responsible.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to give some information to my honourable friend as soon as I can.

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

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have two substitutions for the Municipal Affairs Committee tonight. And I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney be substituted for the Member for Charleswood and that the Member for Lakeside be substituted for the Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - BILL NO. 70

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we would proceed now to the Order Paper, that's the supplementary Order Paper for this afternoon, and deal with the adjourned debates on third and second readings.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Adjourned debate third reading, Bill No. 27, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) Debate - second reading - Bill No. 64. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Stand.

BILL NO. 70

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 70. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill yesterday, the Minister outlined the provisions of the Act which purport to replace the old Animal Contagious Diseases Act; and essentially the bill is designed to broaden the interpretation or the meaning of the words "animal diseases" to include a number of other things that would not normally be classified as an animal disease if one were to consult a dictionary. However, the government from time to time do take liberties, and in this particular instance they have re-defined a disease as including a number of other things that by no stretch of the imagination can be classified as a disease. But there is a purpose for it, and I don't quarrel with the Minister in that sense, that the reason for it is to enable the veterinary inspectors to take action in areas that were very forcefully brought to our attention early this spring in a case in the Scantbury area. And I daresay that there may be a number of other instances where the broadening of that

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) classification is warranted.

One of the provisions of the Act that has caused me some concern, Sir, is the provision dealing with the setting up of a central drug and purchasing and distribution agency. And I have an inclination to be a little bit suspicious of the Minister - or of the government for that matter - when they talk about centralizing the distribution of anything. The experience that farmers in this province have had with the Minister setting up a central distribution agency for the propagation of livestock is an experience that a good many farmers will not forget. He has developed this into a very centrally controlled agency, which even prohibits the issuing of licenses unless the applicants for those licenses almost sign away their individual and personal liberties in order to acquire a license. And I'm a little bit skeptical of what his intentions are under Section 14 (1) and 14 (2).

Sir, I know that the Minister in setting up the veterinary clinics across this province, has now got the veterinaries pretty much under his control. And I know that there's been a long standing grievance on the part of veterinary surgeons in this province that the sale of drugs was not one that they had under their exclusive jurisdiction. They complained that people who should not be allowed to sell drugs were indeed doing so, and that it took away from what they considered to be legitimate revenue for the veterinary surgeons. And I suspect that the - although he didn't say so in so many words - I suspect that the reason for the inclusion of this particular paragraph is to ensure that the selling of veterinary drugs will be left to the veterinarians.

Now I don't have a particular quarrel with that aspect of the bill, provided that it is used for the purpose that it's intended, but the Minister has a way of broadening these things out so that the unsuspecting person who accepts some of this legislation at its face value soon finds that he has intended something other than what he indicated that he was going to do. There's no doubt that there are a number of people particularly the salesmen for the feed companies, who have been selling drugs, who have been distributing drugs to their customers. And I wonder to what extent the Minister intends to interfere with that practice that has been going on, or if he intends to limit their distribution of drugs to certain types of drugs. The regulations of course might define more clearly what his intentions are. But I raise these points only because I don't want the Minister to be saying next year that, "well, you passed it", and that we never drew attention to what I think is a legitimate inquiry on this particular provision.

So far as the intent of the other sections of the Act are concerned, we have no objection to this bill proceeding to committee, because we believe that some of the provisions contained therein are necessary and are in keeping with the changes that have been taking place in the livestock industry and indeed throughout the province in the last few years. So with those reservations, we're prepared to allow this bill to proceed to committee, and perhaps at that stage we may have an opportunity to question those who may be interested and who may feel that their rights are being interfered with as a result of the implementation of this legislation. In any case, Sir, it will give us an opportunity to question the Minister a little further to determine just what his intentions are in the enactment of this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to put several things on the record too. I think my colleague the Honourable Member from Morris has very much stated the position that we have on this bill. I would just like to mention to the Minister, that the area that I represent is a heavily populated area when it comes to livestock, dairy, hogs and poultry and as a result we have a fair number of feed companies, both large and small, who are presently selling many of the drugs for the particular animals and for different feeds that they provide to the different customers. I think the question that I would put to the Minister is, who will be able to apply and receive a license under this Act? And is it the government's intent to, as with the A.I.s, to have a monopoly on the whole complete drug distribution in the Province of Manitoba, and that that would be the central purchasing agent for the drugs sold in Manitoba; and whether or not people will be able to bring in drugs from different parts of the country other than buying it from that central purchasing agent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of questions I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister regarding this bill, and that concerns the municipalities, the section dealing with the compensation by municipal people, and I'm well aware of some of the many problems which our municipal people are experiencing today to look after the budgets that's on

BILL 70

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) their desks. I'm wondering what kind of consultations the Minister has had with the municipalities of the province, and how many municipalities today in our province have by-laws for the compensation of animals that are destroyed by contagious diseases. And the Minister maybe could give me some idea of the moneys if they have some by-laws, how much money they have spent over the last oh, two or three years - or any figures that the Honourable Minister may have to find out what expenses that's incurred regarding the program.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 72, the Honourable Member for St. James.

BILL NO. 72

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments and observations on Bill 72 at this time which deals with the amendments to the Clean Environment Act. We on this side can agree in principle with the bill in regard to what is termed abatement project. We understand from the explanation that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources gave to the House today, that it is basically permissive legislation which will allow a municipality to approach the Clean Environment Commission for a hearing when there is a complaint in regards to a business or industry which legally meets the present laws with regards to environmental standards or use of land; and we see nothing wrong with this type of legislation and endorse in principle the idea of somehow assisting the municipalities in providing capital cost toward a problem that they may have and would like to get rid of. And we are concerned in certain areas in regards to dealing with an abatement project as it's defined in the Act, in particular the principle dealing with the agreement that would be finally arrived at between the two parties, the province, or the department and the municipality. And in particular, there is mention in the methods of negotiation that the province will share to a maximum of 50 percent, but it does not detail in any formula what type of sharing that the province would in fact do in most cases. One can assume that, hopefully, in most cases the province would share in the order of 50 percent, but there's no guarantee that it might not be somewhat similar to the famous Winter Works projects that the municipalities experienced through the years; that they looked good when you saw it on paper, but when you actually chose to go into an agreement and develop a project under the Winter Works scheme, quite often the percentage that the more senior government body shared in the cost of the project was somewhere in the order of 10 percent or 29 percent. So that we are concerned that there hasn't been more elaboration on the formula for sharing of costs in such a project.

The other area of concern - and we have to assume and we hope we are correct in assuming, when the Minister presented the bill this morning - that in regard to the conditions that would be included in the particular agreement, that they would include such controls that would possibly see the changing of zonings of lands in the actual development plan for a municipality, or I would presume a city, that it could call upon in principle that the government might request that these changes take place or they would not take part in the actual contribution toward this project, and I would hope that this is not the thin edge of the wedge to become involved in the say and control of planning for a municipality or a city, and I would think that I can understand the government's interest in making sure that if they are investing their moneys that the problem that they're investing the money in to get rid of, will in fact be permanently and hopefully solved - the problem would be permanently solved, and I would presume in the legislation that we have before us that they had thought it necessary to put in this safeguard that prior to any distribution of funds or payment of funds towards such an abatement project, that they could demand that the zoning by-laws be changed or the development plan of an area be changed, and I would hope that when the Minister closes debate on this bill that he will answer these questions because we are somewhat concerned that it would appear, or could appear that the Provincial Government may be getting in the doorway to start to have a very important say in zoning.

We understand that the responsibility is upon the municipality to come forward for such a basic agreement, so that I guess the answer could come back that if the municipality doesn't want it, they don't have to go into the agreement. We just hope that it is going to be used very

BILL 72

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . sparingly and we would hope that both parties, if they have a common problem, that they would arrive at a solution obviously that would be a permanent type of solution, and in such legislation as we have under that particular area would not be necessary in the bill, that the two parties presumably would be able to negotiate and come to a standard agreement that would not have to have legislation that would dictate that the government, the Provincial Government, would have powers to say no, we won't give you your money until you have made the changes that we want.

The other area that we would like the Minister to comment or elaborate more fully on, is that section that puts additional, or appears to put additional powers into the hands of the Cabinet in regard to the change of legislation -- not legislation but the regulations of certain areas, particularly dealing with bathing premises and trailer parks, trailer houses and such, that having relatively short notice in the speed-up time to talk to various municipalities and administrators of municipalities, I am wondering whether there will be any duplicity in regard to inspectors or inspection of such facilities, and I would hope that the Minister might comment on this particular area when he closes debate. I know that I believe the City of Winnipeg at the present time, they have inspectors which inspect the various facilities and we are wondering whether there might not be duplication in this area.

The other comment I would like to make is in regard to the principle now that I understand is approach can be made directly to the Minister rather than through the Commission, particularly dealing in, say, the spraying of pesticides or fogging and so forth, and I understand now that it will be directly to the Department or to the Minister rather than via the Commission. We are still concerned that we have a condition in particularly the city, that here right this minute in the City of Winnipeg that the Clean Environment Commission is controlling the City of Winnipeg, yet there appears to be no real control over the individual person with regard to the fogging for mosquitoes or spraying for worms and so forth; that there has been a decision on the part of the Minister to control the City of Winnipeg and yet, on the other hand, there is really no close control or apparent control over the individual, so that we have a case this year where we are going to have trouble with mosquitoes and worms, etc., and the City has a limited method of handling this problem, yet on the other hand, the individual can go out and pretty well do what he wants and appears to be getting away with it. So I would say that there is something wrong and there should be a policy change in this regard and a review of the present condition that does exist in the City of Winnipeg.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have covered most of the comments and observations that we would like to make, and we hope that the Minister when he closes debate will answer some of those questions that have been raised.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 77. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand) Bill No. 67.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, the other bills we would want to have stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GREEN: I would like you to now proceed to the Concurrence motions.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Resolutions 69 to 73 separately, collectively. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was on his feet.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy the First Minister's present and, if I may, I would like to continue on from where I left off only for a few moments with respect to the Air Canada Overhaul Base and the announcements that were made, dealing with the Department of Industry and Commerce Estimates.

As I indicated in my remarks earlier, Mr. Speaker, had the announcement been made by the Minister of Defence, communicating the information about the facility to be brought back to Manitoba, I would have been reluctant to have stood here in this House and debated this matter at this time, because, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that he had his problems with respect to his own party and to his own cabinet, the cabinet of which he was a member, and I think we all know

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) how he persevered with respect to his own people to try and both retain the facility initially and to try and see that the commitments made to CAE were maintained, and to the employees were maintained, and to try and get some kind of development effort here.

But the problem that I have, Mr. Speaker, and the reason I'm on my feet in this matter, is that the statement was made by the Prime Minister, the remarks were those of the Prime Minister, and those remarks were galling to me when one examined his conduct with respect to the matters that, well, with respect to the chronology of what took place and the matters that were within his power at the time that the overhaul base was removed, and I indicated that he had stated that it's not the object of his government to move jobs from one part of the country to another, but of course, Mr. Speaker, he did that in 1969. I made reference to the last meeting of the Overhaul Base Committee at which the Minister of Labour was present as well, that appeared before the Prime Minister, and he will recall, I think, what took place at that time.

At the time that the presentation was made in Ottawa by the representatives of the community including the Premier, Premier Walter Weir at the time - and I want to recite some of the things that he said at that time - and the Minister of Labour and others who were in the audience at this private meeting but who spoke at the time, the Prime Minister essentially said - and I'm paraphrasing it but I think that the intent was right and that was a phenomenal statement in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, he said, "I rely on my technocrats, and if they say that it's economic for Air Canada to in fact remove the facility to Montreal, I have to accept that and I have to accept the involvement of my Ministers who say that this is the right policy, and I'm not prepared to interfere." And, Mr. Speaker, there were several who said to the Prime Minister, "Well, Sir, if in fact your technocrats had given you information that's incorrect based on economic data that's not correct, are you not going to obligate yourself to review that data and at least to determine whether it's correct or not as the court of last resort, and if it was correct and you said it was correct, then we'd have to accept that determination by you? But if you found that the information was incorrect, are you not the one who has the power to intervene and to see that equity and justice will occur in this case?" And he took the position then that he was not prepared to do that. And he said that.

And I remember that the Honourable Member from South Centre, who at that time was Mr. Osler, basically said in the most uncomplimentary terms to the Prime Minister, that the people here feel that they have been taken advantage of and that they are not getting a proper hearing. And I think that there were a few members of the Liberal Party who at that particular time kicked him in the shins for his remarks to the Prime Minister. But he expressed the mood of the people. And what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is relevant to this particular issue because I have not been happy, and I am prepared to say this to the First Minister, with the way in which this matter has been handled in the last six months. It seems to me that the Overhaul Base Committee who had been involved in this from the very beginning, who included the Mayor of Winnipeg, who, as many are aware, had billboards all over the country about the Air Canada overhaul base - and I believe I've got some pictures of them just to remind those who may be unaware of where he had it. Well this was the kind of picture that he had. "Keep Canada's air policy" or "Canada's air policy's still up in the air". "Keep TCA in Winnipeg." "Parliament can avoid a \$50 million annual economic death blow. Keep TCA in Winnipeg." Signed Mayor Juba - Stephen Juba. This went over the country, Mr. Speaker. This was, as far as I know, were in the major centres. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well you see, the problem I have with the Honourable Minister of Finance and even with the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the assumption at this point is because we're involved in the election and because, as I've indicated, I think the credit can be given to Sterling Lyon for this -- (Interjection) --

Well I will say this to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I really believe, as a politician and as one who has a reasonable astuteness in politics, that if Mr. Richardson's seat was not threatened, the Air Canada overhaul base would not have come to Manitoba. Okay? And the way in which Mr. Richardson's seat was threatened was the announcement of a very credible candidate who could beat him - and that happens to be Sterling Lyon. And I said, Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, that with respect to the credit that had to be given -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and I'll tell you why it's the administrative jurisdiction. Oh yes. I tried to explain this. No, the Air Canada overhaul base committee, the Air Canada

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) overhaul base committee was under the chairmanship of at one time the Premier when he was Minister of Industry and Commerce, but as the Minister of Industry and Commerce the Air Policy Committee has not been called into session, was not called into session, was not brought up-to-date with respect to the matter, and the matter, and the matters that were handled before the Air Policy Committee in the past had to deal, Mr. Speaker, not just with the involvement of Air Canada and the governments involved, it had to deal with the problems of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the members who went to Montreal, the members of the union who were employed by Air Canada, who went to Montreal and found it difficult to be able to carry on there and who quit, had to come here, Mr. Speaker, and call their own press conference, and I was present at that press conference where they explained their problems. And they explained further the problems that the overhaul facility had in meeting even the minimum safety requirements that were required for proper maintenance and overhaul. And, Mr. Speaker, the problem we've had in the last few months is that the government did not at that time, as they should have, called the overhaul committee - and I've got the list of the people involved - which would involve the political leadership within the province, which would involve the leadership within the unions, which would involve the leadership within the Chamber of Commerce and the Farmers' Bureau, which would involve the provincial Chamber of Commerce, and bring them together to a point where at least they have understood what was likely to occur and where the assessment of what was taking place could have been made properly, not in the context of the political decision -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether Lord Rothschild finances the province now or not, and I'm not sure that the Minister of Finance knows that either, so I mean it really doesn't make any difference to me what he says, but I'll say this to the First Minister. For the last six months or when this matter was being dealt with, the employees obviously did not have a friend in him, because, Mr. Speaker, why was it necessary for them to have to work around the structure that had been set up before which was supposed to be the non partisan community effort? And that will rest on his conscience, because I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, and if the Premier is not prepared to acknowledge it then that's up to him, I think, you know, history will show it, that the fact is that the overhaul base that is being brought back to Winnipeg is a smaller facility than that which was taken away. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, Mr. Speaker, that's a bunch of hogwash. Yes, that's a bunch of hogwash, Mr. Speaker, and it can't wash. You can stand up as an argument and you can try to present that -- you don't know what you're talking about. The fact is that the overhaul base was taken away in 1969 - and it wasn't taken away by Premier Schreyer and I'm not suggesting that. There is no question of it. It was taken away by the same Prime Minister who said, "I will not move jobs from one part of the country to another. I work for all of Canada and both places will grow."

In 1969 it wouldn't grow and I want to now repeat why that did not happen, and I want to recall - and I'm sorry the Minister of Labour is not here - the remarks of Art Coulter before the Prime Minister, when he basically talked of separatism. You know, the kind of veiled treason that the Liberal Leader was charged with, he talked about directly to the Prime Minister and I'll tell you why. He made the representation that the person who had the most influence on the government in this policy decision was Louis Laberge, who was the head of the equivalent of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the Quebec Federation of Labour. He indicated as well at that time, that one of the motivations of the Prime Minister at the time, and the government, and for Mr. Mackasey's involvement as well, was the hope that he would support the Liberal Party in the Provincial Election to take place in 1969.

A MEMBER: Ah ha.

MR. SPIVAK: And the representation made at that time was that in effect the decision was a political decision being made to remove the overhaul facility - yes, to remove the overhaul facility - it's not astonishing. Those are representations that he made and I don't think it's so astonishing; I think it's very real, and I think probably that was the motivation. But the circumstances, the political circumstances have changed, and so, Mr. Speaker, again if Mr. Richardson had stood up and said, "I fought hard. I've won. I've tried to do my best. I have accomplished something that I think is to my credit," that would have been different. Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Well, I wonder - I wonder, you know, I wonder, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I can get the co-operation of members. If they want to have a tete-a-tete, why don't they get together and leave the rest of us carry on in

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) the Assembly: If not, let us carry on according to the rules that we have created for ourselves. The Chair finds it very difficult to try and listen and not act like a policeman every two or three minutes. I don't think I should have to -- and that goes for the Member for Swan River as well. His interruptions are no better than anyone else's. Let me also say something else. I have allowed a lot of latitude in debate but when someone becomes repetitive it's necessary for me to remind them. I would hope that the honourable member who is now on his feet will reconsider the direction he's going and stay with Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, when Premier Weir appeared before the Committee in the last meeting, before the Prime Minister, he indicated, and I quote from his presentation the following -- and after that I'd like to quote Premier Schreyer. He quoted, Mr. Speaker, and this was an address presented to the Prime Minister December 5, 1968: "On Monday and Tuesday this week, Mr. Richardson stated the position of the Federal Government and the future of the base. Mr. Richardson made the statement under three headings. (1) The Federal Government is prepared to accept Air Canada's case that a continued overhaul operation in Winnipeg is uneconomic for Air Canada. (2) The Federal Government is not prepared to instruct Air Canada to be an instrument of regional development by continuing the repair and overhaul operations in Winnipeg." Those are the only two items that I think are relevant to the discussion now, Mr. Speaker.

On June 1st at the Fort Garry Hotel, at a meeting of the Air Policy Committee. . .

A MEMBER: What year?

MR. SPIVAK: I believe this was 1971, if I'm correct -- 1971. The First Minister stated: "In his later remarks Mr. Evans will be reminding you of the various commitments made to Winnipeg by the Federal Government. At first the employment situation at CAE Aircraft was very reassuring. Employment rose as high as 1,000, which was some 300 above the Air Canada base employment at the time of takeover." Mr. Speaker, that only indicates, as I've suggested, that the employment at one point was 1,000 but the proposed employment is now 800, so as a result of all this negotiation and as a result of the achievement for which the Prime Minister wants to be applauded, Winnipeg will have a net loss of 200.

Now I recognize, Mr. Speaker, the effort put forth by Mr. Richardson, but having said that, Mr. Speaker, there are still some questions that have to be asked that are not answered, and I've asked the Minister of Labour a series of questions with respect to him and I asked the Minister of Industry and Commerce. At the time the negotiations took place for the transfer of Air Canada's facility to CAE in the sale, the government was involved in trying to see to it that the individuals who would have the choice of going to Montreal or staying in Winnipeg would have their rights protected, and to a certain extent and in specific cases the government assisted and helped where there were problem areas. They received the kind of undertakings and assurances that protected the men either who had their lives disrupted by going to Montreal and the problems of resettlement there, or who wanted to remain with the private contractor and still maintain the best of two worlds, and the Honourable Minister of Labour should recall that. The best of two worlds. Yep. The best of two worlds. -- (Interjection) -- Refute? You're not going to refute it, you'll have to agree with it. The best of two -- well I've got a documentation too. I'd be very interested to hear him refute it. The best of two worlds.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we were involved as a government and the First Minister was involved as a government in trying to protect the interest of the employees, and it would seem to me that the kind of assurance that has not been given, which should be given, is the involvement of the government to see to it that those who want to come back from Montreal who want to come back to Winnipeg, are going to be in a position to do that with the minimum kind of disruption and with the kind of protection that should have been given to them by the Prime Minister in 1969 in the first place by not taking away the facility and disrupting their lives for what was a political decision at the time and for what now is a political decision at the time.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I'm concerned about, and that's why I believe the overhaul committee should be brought back together again because I think there are certain assurances that should be forthcoming and certain information that should be forthcoming, is to understand this development and understand the capital costs related to it and the projections that will take place over the five or ten year period with respect to the overhaul facility, and to be able to make the comparison to what will happen in Dorval, or a new facility, another facility to be

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) built by Air Canada, so that we would have some idea of the proportion that is taking place with respect to new developments and we'd have some idea as well of where we really stand in what has been, I believe, blown up to be bigger than it actually is, and I see no reaction from the government and almost a reluctance to become involved and sort of a passive acceptance that what is happening is something that we have to be very thankful for. And I know the Honourable Member from Portage said, "What about the Mint?" at 12:30 before I sat down, and I think he said something about "What about \$10 million for Churchill?"

You know, we in Manitoba do not have to be beggars about what takes place in this province. Let me ask again whether, you know, if the experience in the United States has been that facilities are placed in the centre of the continent, their overhaul facilities are placed in the centre of the continent for the major airlines, why would it not have applied equally as well for Canada? The private companies who were involved in trying to become as efficient as possible located the air overhaul facilities in the centre of the continent for a very good reason. Because, as the planes went back and forth, they were able to drop down and to be repaired and changed and altered and new planes taken from that point.

Mr. Speaker, I've already referred to the McKinsey Report, which is a confidential transportation document in the hands of the Federal Government, completed by 1971, which indicated that Air Canada should be decentralizing. I've asked the Minister whether he was aware of that, I've asked the Minister whether he has any information on that, I asked the Minister whether that information could be made available to the government so they could determine whether what is being offered is in line with the recommendations received by Air Canada for the decentralization of its operation, and which would strengthen maybe a case for a major kind of development in this province as opposed to the limited facility that we're getting.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are still questions to be asked on this. We're in an election, a Federal Election, in which this issue will become important in one particular constituency and maybe all of Manitoba, and it will be debated by the politicians to a point where it will be thoroughly confused. But let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, and with candor and with honesty the Premier cannot say anything else, what has happened now, realistically, is that the government has brought back something that he took away - and for that matter it is really less than what they took away - that while in the context of other issues this may appear to be a minor issue because the pressure is not on the government, that the Prime Minister cannot be applauded for this action. Mr. Richardson can be applauded to the extent that he attempted to try to do something within his own party, and Mr. Speaker, the problem still remains for those whose lives have been disrupted as to whether the government will have the interest and the compassion to deal with their problems to assist them if they so desire to come back, and to in fact protect their interest with respect to coming back so that they, as individuals, do not have to bear a cost that was unnecessary for themselves. And in this respect, Mr. Speaker, none of the other achievements that may have been referred to by the Honourable Member from Portage, or for that matter by any of the other members in this House, are really substitution for what we were entitled to in the first place. The economics of bringing the two overhaul bases together was never there. The data and the information supplied by Air Canada was incorrect. It was incorrect, it was said to be incorrect by the experts the government had of the day, by the mayor of the City, and by all those who were involved in the overhaul committee who had an opportunity to review it, and as it happens, Mr. Speaker, the course of development at Dorval has proved that the original presentation made to the government about the inaccuracy of Air Canada's information was correct, and that the economic justification upon which a decision was supposed to be made, was made on incorrect information, which has proved to be the case, and still what we are receiving as a result of that is much less than what justice and equity should have provided for this community.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do hope that the Leader of the Official Opposition will stay in the House at least for a few minutes because I do want to bring some matters to his attention that he does not seem to be aware of, and perhaps he'll stay long enough to find out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell him, who was it? Was it not Mr. Hees that told his

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) government and said in the House of Commons that there's no plans for Winnipeg for an overhaul base in Winnipeg? Was it not Mr. Balcer who wrote a letter to his friends, Mr. Roblin and Mr. Lyon, and said that there is no plan for Winnipeg for an overhaul base? How hypocritical can this member be, Mr. Speaker, to take time of this House for over two hours, two hours, and to say Sterling Lyon is bringing the base back? Well if this is the case, I'm glad that he is. If that's what's going to bring the base back, because he's running, I'll accept that, but he was the one that sold out the base. He was the one that sold out the base, Mr. Speaker, him and Duff Roblin. I'll prove it to you. I've got letters to that effect right here if you want to stay long enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped this would have not become a partisan issue. I don't think -- well, at this present time. I really do. Because what has happened, all we've heard is distortion of facts from the Leader of the Official Opposition. We have. And really, to say -- you know, one point that the Leader of the Official Opposition made that the technocrats made the decision, well I'll tell you, Mr. Hees at that time was Minister of Transport. He said we should leave the decision to TCA, it shouldn't be the Government of Canada's decision. Who was Mr. Hees? The Minister of Transport in the Diefenbaker government. And who else said the same thing? Leon Balcer said the same thing. The decision should be left to Air Canada. So I feel the Leader of the Official Opposition certainly has done disservice to this province. I will. I'll read it. Has done a disservice to this province, he's done disservice to his party, because he has not given the facts to this House, a lot of allegation and distortion of facts, Mr. Speaker. I felt if he wanted to get -- he's got the itchy feet and wants to get campaigning, perhaps he should have gone on the hustings quite early and started campaigning, but all he did in this House for two hours, he did campaigning, Mr. Speaker. Really, that's all he did. I think if he wants to really accomplish something, if he really wants to accomplish something, why did he not convince Mr. Stanfield, the Leader of his Party, to make a statement in Winnipeg that the base should come back? That's not the policy of Mr. Stanfield yet. When will it be his policy? He never made that statement yet.

I listened to him on the news, in fact I heard also the news release with Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Lewis did not say that the base should definitely come. He said, "We have enough industry in eastern Canada, in Quebec, in Ontario. I would like to see industry come west, Saskatoon, Calgary." That's the two cities I believe he mentioned, and that was the statement of the other official leader, federal leader. But Mr. Stanfield has not said, to this point, that the base should come here. How hypocritical can you get? And this is what we have, Mr. Speaker.

I would say that the Leader of the Official Opposition surely should stop laying the blame on someone else and let's accept the blame, because when I spoke on this matter on many occasions, I said two parties are to blame, the Liberals and the Conservatives both were to blame. I took that position, I took the position that the late Mr. McGregor was to blame because he didn't give us the facts. Air Canada officials didn't give us the facts. And let's be frank about this, let's be honest. Listening to this distortion affects the whole thing. -- (Interjection) -- Well, we've listened to Yves Pratte, an official of Air Canada, at the last meeting in Winnipeg and what did he say? He said, "Well, do you want one of the best airline services in the country or do you want to use it as a regional development corporation?" And he says, "You have to accept one or the other." He said when we have new planes coming on the market, or we'll be buying new planes, Winnipeg will have to get first consideration. And that's what he stated in Winnipeg, and if that's the case that we will get something now, then we should be playing in a positive approach, we should play a positive approach.

But really, I say to the Leader of the Official Opposition, in what's transpired I would say both parties are to blame to some extent. Was it not the Diefenbaker government that had 47 of the 48 seats in western Canada that sealed the air base's fate when in 1957, in 1957 it allowed a \$100 million Dorval overhaul base to be built at Dorval in Montreal: Is it not a fact? That's a fact, Mr. Speaker, and what happened? At that time the decision was made by Air Canada under the Diefenbaker administration that all overhaul of jet aircraft, of jet aircraft, will be done in Montreal, so it was only natural to assume once we were finished with the prop jobs of the old Viscounts that the base was doomed; there was nothing left for here. Who did it? Who did it? Mr. Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister. Where was Mr. Roblin and Mr. Lyon at that time? They knew this was going on. They knew the base was built. Where was Gordon Churchill? He was the MP for South Centre. The base was in his constituency, so what

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) happened? You know, that's when the fate was dealt to the base at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I must indicate that I do allow a lot of latitude but we are still on Industry and Commerce.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope I would get . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia is dealing with exactly the same subject matter that was dealt with by the speaker previous to him. That's one reason. And the second reason that I would hope he is allowed to continue and in order, is because refreshingly he is speaking only the truth for the record. (Applause)

MR. SPIVAK: I would ask the First Minister to withdraw that remark, not only because, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of privilege, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the information that the First Minister's alluded to is not true and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw my remark, but I ask him to withdraw his.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on reflection, Sir, I think you will find that it is simply not rational to ask that I withdraw that remark. I said that the honourable member that was speaking was speaking only the truth, and what is wrong with that statement? I sincerely believe it to be so.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order -- Order please. Let me indicate that I have asked both gentlemen, and I have indicated I allowed a certain amount of latitude, but I do believe, whether we enjoy something or do not, we should still follow the rules and I'm suggesting that once the honourable member has made his point in respect to the air base, that we get back to Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do hope I have the latitude, the same latitude as the Leader of the Official Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I did make the points that -- and I would have liked to see Mr. Roblin come back to Manitoba and run on that same issue, run on that same issue in Manitoba, because what happened in 1958, and what happened from '58 to '63? He was in this House - what happened to Mr. Lyon when he was in this House from 1950 to 1963? They knew the base was moving because I have a statement in Hansard from one of the backbenchers right behind, who sat right behind the Premier, and I'll put it on the record, Mr. Speaker, in a minute. What was the Manitoba Minister of Labour, John Thompson at the time, in the Conservative administration, what was he told in Ottawa by Mr. Hees? "I'm sorry, it's not the Federal Government's responsibility. TCA has to make the decision." That was his reply. It's on record. He can research that so, you know, the hypocritical attitude that he's taking in the House at the present time - what did Mr. Balcer say to the Conservative Government in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? He was the Minister of Transport in the Diefenbaker government. I'll tell him what he said. There's a letter -- well, it will take an awful long time but I'll quote. I'll quote. That's the letter that the Premier had and that's the same letter that the St. James Council had and the Chamber of Commerce in St. James. This is what he said: "There are no plans for the establishment of a jet engine and jet engine aircraft overhaul at Winnipeg. The new Dorval maintenance and overhaul base has been designed and built specifically for the handling of turbine powered aircraft, and it was also designed to have a capacity substantially greater than the initial requirement, and laid out in a manner which permitted further expansion at minimal cost. In view of the time involved in the long-range planning which is a necessary part of airline operation, I have little doubt that the ultimate consolidation of overhaul facilities in Montreal can be achieved without much major disruption to the lives of employees or economic welfare of Winnipeg."

That's the letter from the Minister, April 1961, but where was Mr. Roblin and Mr. Lyon between 1958 to 1963 when they knew this was taking place? Not a word was heard, because it was a Conservative federal administration in Ottawa. Why didn't they do a thing about it? There's a letter to them. The government had this letter. He said, "Look, the base is finished in Winnipeg. It's built in Montreal," and to give us such garbage as he did.

Now let me tell him what -- this is in Hansard of February 12, 1964. Let him check, and this is one of the backbenchers of the Conservative Government of that time, and he says, I'd like to give you a little brief history," (the member for St. James) he said, "I would like to give you a brief history as it happened to me. In 1957 a group of curlers in Deer Lodge Curling approached me and asked me to do something, if something could be done about the continual

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) removal of TCA Maintenance Base in Winnipeg. They were employees of TCA. I arranged meetings with TCA people and with the Union at the time, and finished off the main discussion with assurances from TCA that this rearranging of personnel was not a dismantling of the base. We know perfectly well that this removal of personnel has continued since and it is continuing right up to this day, up to this week. I felt so discouraged that I took this matter before the St. James Chamber of Commerce. The St. James Chamber of Commerce, together with the St. James Council, prevented this matter from dying."

This is a member that sat in this House in 1958, and his Premier sat one chair in front of him. It was moving. Personnel was being transferred. He didn't know what to do. There was the Premier and for four years that Premier didn't say a word, and for four years Mr. Lyon didn't say a word. So who sold out? That's the government that sold out . . .

A MEMBER: Who was the member?

MR. PATRICK: The Member for St. James at the time. At the time, that's right. Sitting right behind the Premier. He was so concerned that there was continual removal and he knew all along. He knew, but he was afraid to tell his premier. Sure the premier knew and Mr. Lyon knew, but what did they do? Not a word - not a word was said, Mr. Speaker. And I spoke in the House at the same time and I'll just quote one sentence. I said I was so disappointed with the member. I said all he had to do when he knew this was taking place, to take one step down and advise his front benchers. That's what I said in the speech at the same time, on February 14th, so he knew for four years. That administration, the Conservative administration knew that the base was moving. Their MP - the base was in his constituency - he knew. Why didn't he do anything about it? And that's the letter; the quotation that I just read is from a letter from Leon Balcer who was Minister of Transport in the Conservative administration in Ottawa at that time, and that letter was available to the government, it was available to everybody around the city, so surely, surely the kind of speech -- I think that the Leader of the Official Opposition certainly has done disservice to his own party, to his own party, really.

So my question is, Mr. Speaker, why didn't Mr. Roblin act then and why didn't Mr. Roblin act until there was a change of administration in Ottawa? That's when they began to act. And really, the air policy committee started not by the mayor of Winnipeg, it started by the St. James Mayor, Mr. Hanks, and representative of the union at that time, and I believe there were representatives from the Manitoba Federation of Labour. That's the first few meetings were held and Mr. Hanks was instrumental.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can do is just hope that the Leader of the Official Opposition would have taken a very positive approach on this matter, very positive approach, because really, really what he told us was a bunch of distortions, it really was. I would say that he will really accomplish something, he will really accomplish something if he convinces his leader, his national leader, to make a statement in Winnipeg that he wants the base moved in here, with so many employees. Then you'll have some substance to it and you'll have some clout at the present time with the kind of debate, but I know that that's not the kind of politics that the Leader of the Official Opposition wants to be involved.

MR. MARION: Ill-founded hypotheses.

MR. PATRICK: You know, I couldn't believe it. All the Leader of the Official Opposition spends talking that you shouldn't give credit to this member, or shouldn't because he doesn't deserve it, who cares who gets the credit? Let's accomplish something. Let's get the base to come here. I think that's what's most important. But to make the statement that he made is that the only way it was accomplished because, you know, Sterling Lyon stood against him in a nomination, you know, to contest a constituency -- well, he inferred it by stating that the decision came after Mr. Lyon stood for to contest the constituency. It wouldn't have happened, the statement wouldn't have come from the Federal Government if Mr. Lyon wouldn't have stood. That's what the honourable member said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that the Minister, the Federal Minister, Mr. Richardson, has on already several occasions threatened to resign and almost did? Is it not correct on the Mint situation? You know, that was the case. It was the same case as far as -- he made it pretty strong that the second heavy water plant has to come to Manitoba, and surely, you know, that the Minister has to. I would say -- look, I don't need to argue for some Minister because he can debate and so on and fight his own battles. In fact, I don't know the Minister that well. But all you have to do is just check your record in the last, say, 15 years

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) or 20 years and you'll find out that Manitoba received more in the last five years than it did in the past 20 under both administrations federal, Liberal or Conservative. That's right. That's true. That's true.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'll reply to the member. I do not take anything away from the former Premier to build - that's what he's mentioned, to build a ditch, but I would say he had a Prime Minister, he had a Prime Minister in Ottawa, and every province negotiated a 75 percent arrangement, federal arrangement and at that time I believe we only got 50 percent, so he didn't make such a good deal. So that, you know, he was negotiating with his own kind. So, Mr. Speaker, surely the Mint, the Research Plant that's coming to this province for 12 to 15 million dollars; the Mint; the Grain Building, that was \$8 million that should have gone to Saskatchewan, that was more depressed than we were; infrastructure at Churchill, 20 some million dollars. So really - the Fish Research Institute at the University of Manitoba.

So, if what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of speech that we listened to this afternoon, or this morning and afternoon - really, really, I think that the Leader of the Official Opposition could have done much more justice to the cause, would have done much more justice to his own Party if he would have taken a different approach. I could go on in respect to the Minister's estimates. I know that my leader, the Member for Wolseley has taken a very strong opposition to the Saunders Aircraft; and again, the Federal Government is buying two planes, and I understand if it works out they intend to buy more - and again, the attitude of the Federal Minister was that if the money has to go anywhere else, it might as well go here to keep some jobs. That was his attitude, and in one sense you may take that this is wrong, but that was his attitude. So what I would like to say to the Leader of the Official Opposition, let's put the facts and let's put the record straight. Let's put the record straight. Well, I would like to dispute anything that I have said in this House in the last 15 minutes - any of those letters - where was . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Please, no tête-à-tête. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition says well '69 why don't you bring it back? Can you take a structure that's worth about \$150 million, a building, the base, and transfer it physically to Winnipeg from Dorval. You can't do that. And everybody know that, unless the Leader of the Official Opposition can do it. Well, that cannot be done. And I hope the start has been made, I hope it comes to fruition. And I think if we take a positive action, something will happen, irrespective of who forms the government in Ottawa; but it has to be a positive action, not the kind of action that we heard from the Leader of the Official Opposition. And I would like to ask him again, next time his Leader is in Manitoba, please ask him to put his policy on Air Canada, you know, on record - because it's not on record at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to devote my time regarding the Concurrence on Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, to something that I believe is Industry and Commerce. But I do have a comment on what the other two speakers have had to say. The only real comment I would have in that regard is, I read from a statement that says this: "It is one of the worst decisions ever made in Canadian history." That statement was made by the Defence Minister, James Richardson, on the transfer of Air Canada overhaul base from Winnipeg to Dorval in 1969 - and in 1969 there were no Sterling Lyons in this House, no Duff Roblins in this House, there were no Diefenbakers in Ottawa; it was made in 1969, that statement was made, and the Defence Minister made that statement.

You know, the Member from Assiniboia is stating that: Have the Leader of the Conservative Party come out and make a statement. I remember in an election, a previous Prime Minister of this country, or a Leader of the Liberal Party nationally coming to Winnipeg before a federal election and indicated - indicated - Mr. Pearson indicated to the people of Manitoba that the Liberal Party was in power, the Air Canada base would never have been moved, never

CONCURRENCE

MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) be moved, and he came back into power, and where is it today? So we don't really want people to come out and make statements that are not going to happen, and we really don't like Prime Ministers that come by and give you nothing, give you nothing when they get here, give you what you should have had before. And we also don't like Prime Ministers that sit on their butt year after year and do nothing for this area, and when there's an election come across the country giving you goodies, handouts of goodies and say: "When I get elected again - we'll wait four years - and maybe I'll look at you again later on." Mr. Speaker, that's what we don't like in Western Canada. --(Interjections)--

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I also remember going on a plane with the Minister of Labour - with the Minister of Labour of this government and the Minister of Industry and Commerce of this government to Ottawa in 1970, a plane went down to Ottawa. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the Member from Minnedosa was there representing the Chamber of Commerce at that time. And, do you know who carried the ball for this area in that whole meeting down there? Mayor Juba. Mayor Juba did the fighting, not the government over there, not the Minister of Labour, not the Minister of Industry and Commerce. So this Government of Manitoba really can't take a lot of credit for raising a lot of issues about Air Canada. There's been a lot of issues raised by people outside the government that have done more than the government has ever done.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to speak to the Minister of Industry and Commerce regarding the gas problem that I wanted to have an urgency debate on the other day--(Interjection)-- and you know, there's nobody I can think of better to handle the gas problem than the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce got up during the discussion we were having regarding the gas problem. He said he had been in touch with the Minister in Alberta. He said that they have been working on it very hard, and he said that they were probably going to work to an interim supply situation. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Radisson doesn't miss anything whether he's here or not here, it goes over his head at any time.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said the interim supply of gas, they were trying to have some available, availability of interim supply of gas to the Gas Company in Winnipeg. He felt that that interim supply would help keep industry and commerce moving in Manitoba. He also felt that the situation was a serious one and that he was working on it. But, Mr. Speaker, the situation will not change by the Minister's announcement to have some interim supply of gas to the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company. The Province of Alberta has not said that they will not supply gas to the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company; they have said we will supply gas to them after we have made a study on our requirements, and after we have made that study we will let you know whether we can increase, or how much we can increase the supply of gas to the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company. And it's going to take, they feel, according to the information that people in the Gas Company has, approximately four to six months for that study to be made. And after that study is made, then they have to make - if they are allowed to have more gas - the Winnipeg Gas Company has to build a pipeline from the producer to the pipeline which brings it to Winnipeg and that could possibly be another six months. And the Gas Company at the present time, Mr. Speaker, says that if they got the permission for extra gas right now, this very day, they would have a hard time supplying gas to this area by the end of December. You know, and people turn the thermostats up in those houses that are being built right now - next December they'll be turning those thermostats up - so the Gas Company says, we can't hook anybody else up. There'll be no new installations in Manitoba.

Now the industry and commerce of Manitoba is seriously hurt, Mr. Speaker. There are men in the construction trade, there are people building senior citizens' housing and public housing; the Provincial Government is building public housing - there are suppliers who have inventories of furnaces, water heaters, etc. to be installed and there are those men who have to install them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to explain how many people are going to invest any more money on the basis that we might have a little bit of supply or some interim supply for the next four months and they're not sure after the four months is over whether they're going to get the extra gas or not. So, Mr. Speaker, you know, I can't visualize people investing money on that basis. I can't visualize them continuing with construction on that basis. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce in my opinion must have had some indication from somebody that this was happening, and it would seem to me that he kept

CONCURRENCE

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) saying that it would go away, it wouldn't possibly happen, we couldn't have a situation that would harm our construction industry happen in Manitoba like this. So he must have dreamt it would go away. But all of a sudden, in one day without any warning, you know, I was told by a person in the Gas Company that they had a meeting with the House Builders Association, and when they left the meeting the House Builders' people were in shock - in one day, they were told there'd be no more gas hook-ups - and the most the Minister can tell us when we wanted to debate it, was there may be some interim supply. That doesn't help the economy of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

For some reason or other we don't seem to be able to get any answers. We asked that the government get in touch with the Government of Alberta immediately, which is apparently what has happened. And, Mr. Speaker, they have been negotiating and nothing is happening. Now what is the Minister planning to do from here? Are we going to have a rationing of gas? Are we going to take a look at industries that should maybe use coal, and take the gas from them? Are we going to - what is the Minister of Industry and Commerce proposing to help a situation that will be a drastic effect on the people of Winnipeg, a drastic effect on the economy of Manitoba and Winnipeg? But we still haven't got any answers.

Mr. Speaker, it's not unlike the Saunders Aircraft situation, because at that same time when I was in Ottawa with the two Ministers, Mr. Jamieson got up at that meeting and he said the air industry, the air industry, the aerospace industry is probably the worst industry anybody could possibly think of getting into at this time. But no, the Minister of Industry and Commerce came back and got into it. And now the Premier says that the only reason it should be successful is because the Government of Canada should be putting money into it. You know, I don't really like a government of mine spending good money after bad and blowing money down the drain on a poor project, but our Minister of Industry and Commerce didn't take any advice from anybody then and he obviously is not taking it now; and he's not concerned it would seem right now, because we haven't got a solution. He may get up and say, "Well, it's only four or five days," but right now the construction industry is grinding to a halt, and will continue to on buildings that have to be hooked up or heated with gas in the Province of Manitoba that has temperatures of 30 below from time to time, and those buildings will not be built. They will not be continued. And the Minister of Labour who's supposed to be concerned with the people who work in this province, goes about his merry way wandering down the halls, spouting nothings from his seat regarding the situation, and he doesn't seem to be worried about the men that will be out of work. I wonder if he's had any conversations with the Minister of Industry and Commerce about the subject, and I doubt it very much.

So, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have brought it back to industry and commerce in Winnipeg which is going to grind to a halt as far as the construction industry is concerned, where the building is heated by gas in this province - and ask the Minister what, what is he going to do about it? And if he can't get the gas, and all he can get is a trickle of interim supply, he'd better start having some answers right now on how we're going to overcome the situation in Manitoba. And the Minister of Labour had better think about it too. So yes -- (Interjection)-- yes I guess I would. I guess I would. And if the Progressive Conservative Party would have stayed here and talked for three months on the situation and that would help it, we would do it - and that would be doing more than your Minister is doing right now. But what we need is gas through a pipeline into Manitoba so that we can hook up new construction. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolutions 69 to 73 pass? The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciated some of the remarks that were made respecting my particular department, and I also appreciated and was very interested in the debate as it pertained to the administration of the Federal Government as well.

I don't know where to begin. I suppose we could start from the last speaker and work backwards but, you know, the honourable member was very concerned about gas. Mr. Speaker, I suggest he emanates enough gas, perhaps he could heat up the City of Winnipeg himself in the next winter with the way he's carrying on; the way he's carrying on, the way we get the gas from that particular side of the House, I don't know whether we'll have any problem in heating.

CONCURRENCE

A MEMBER: Aw come on, sit down, Frank.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. EVANS: When I'm finished, Mr. Speaker. I'm just getting started. I want to say that I'm not satisfied at all with the proposal for interim supply, but I want to assure honourable members that we are doing everything possible at the present time to ensure for our - not only for Greater Winnipeg Gas, but also for Inter-City Gas in Portage la Prairie and Plains Western Gas in Brandon, the adequate amount of supply on a long term basis, which means at least 20 years. And this is a matter that is being very actively worked upon, not only by myself, the President of Greater Winnipeg Gas, but also the staff of the Department of Industry and Commerce. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that ultimately if we are not successful in getting assurances of a permanent source of gas from Ontario to meet our growing needs in Manitoba, then our recourse must be to the National Energy Board, because ultimately it is the National Energy Board that has the authority over the interprovincial and international movements of gas. And it is, I believe, the stated policy of the Federal Government - the National Energy Policy states that there shall be no exportation of natural gas from Canada until all Canadian domestic requirements are met, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is evidence in Winnipeg and in Manitoba that Canadian requirements are not being met. And as I explained to the honourable members the other day, I have been in communication with the Federal Minister of Energy, and I've made the point very clear that we were suffering here in the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba; and the Honourable Mr. Macdonald has been in touch with various authorities in the Province of Alberta, and I would hope that we will be able to resolve this matter in the near future. We're working as expeditiously as we possibly can, I don't think we can do anything any quicker than we can. And I might add for the information of the honourable members, we've had many hours, many hours of discussions with the officials of Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, apart from any discussions with authorities in other jurisdictions. And I don't want the honourable member to leave the wrong impression, however, with the people of Manitoba with regard to rationing. I hope he was not alluding to any rationing on the part of existing customers of the utility. This is not the case, it will not be the case, no one is talking about adequacy of supply for existing customers. All existing customers and all applications which have been received and accepted as of about a week ago have every assurance of being supplied for a long term period, which is 20 years, or whatever it is. What we're talking about is the inability of the utility to supply new customers, potential users of gas. I want that to be clear. Perhaps the honourable member understood that, but I was a bit concerned that maybe members of the press or members of the house or members of the general public may be somehow under the misapprehension that their gas would be rationed this coming winter. And I want to state again, therefore, positively and categorically, there is no question whatsoever of rationing of gas supply to residential consumers, commercial consumers or industrial consumers. Anyone who is hooked up to the gas utility service is assured of continuing long-term supply.

We have, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions appeared before the National Energy Board at various hearings and we have taken the position very strongly that the levels of exports out of Canada is too high, that it should be reduced, and indeed we even went so far as to suggest that on those exports continuing a tax should be levied in order to discourage the exportation and to bring a more realistic price back to Canadians to the national economy than we are now obtaining.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into a debate on the Air Canada Overhaul Base but one cannot help but make the odd observation, having listened to the Leader of the Official Opposition, and having listened also to the representative of the Liberal Party, who did himself well in the remarks that he made and in putting the problem in historical perspective. I get the feeling that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who has left the House as he often happens to do after his speeches, I get the feeling that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is a bit petulant about the whole matter. We did involve him in our expedition to Ottawa when we hired a DC-8 and filled it with representatives, yes the Mayor of Winnipeg, the mayors of other towns, and representatives of Chambers of Commerce, representatives of unions, and in fact the entire cross section of the Manitoba community, and he did participate, and we had many meetings with the Air Policy committee. I detect a sense of petulance because I believe he has felt that he has been left out of the action somehow the last few months when we have had,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Mr. Speaker, many a meeting with the appropriate authorities in Ottawa, when we've had many a meeting with the Honourable James Richardson and the Honourable Jean Marchand, two key ministers involved in the Air Canada situation, and indeed perhaps a feeling left out when the Premier of this province sat down with Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister, to discuss the matter as well.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wondered where all this money of the Department of Industry and Commerce was going. I can tell him that is where some of it's gone, into an awful lot of research that has been done on the entire matter to present a rational position on behalf of the people of Manitoba. We've had numerous meetings, numerous items of correspondence, telexes, telephone calls, ad infinitum. There has been a lot of activity behind the scenes, Mr. Speaker, for the last several months. We haven't been blowing our horn about it, but the fact is that we have made a case for the Province of Manitoba, and I will give credit where credit is due, I say that having discussed this matter on many occasions with the Honourable James Richardson, not just the last few weeks but over many months, that I'll give credit where credit is due that the Honourable James Richardson honestly and sincerely worked very very hard in this connection and I will give him credit in this matter.

The reference to the fact that Sterling Lyon was nominated to oppose Mr. Richardson is simply ludicrous. If that's all that the Leader of the Opposition can come up with as to the Conservative contribution to this re-establishment of the air base, then that shows you how little the Conservative Party of Manitoba, and how little the Leader of the Opposition has got to offer in this whole matter. I would simply ask them this, during which provincial administration did Air Canada reduce the maintenance employment by 1,000 jobs? During which provincial administration did this occur? And now I ask him, during which administration is Air Canada now coming back to Winnipeg and to Manitoba, on top of the additional 1,000 jobs that have been created in the interim in other aerospace industries. Under which administration? Which administration did we lose the Air Canada base, and under which provincial administration is it coming back, Mr. Speaker?

At any rate, and I was very pleased to hear the Honourable Member from Assiniboia relate to various other federal expenditures that are occurring in Manitoba. He mentioned the expenditure of about \$12 1/2 million on the upgrading of the facilities at the Port of Churchill. This is something, and again I go back to the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, what are we doing in effect with the moneys of the Department of Industry and Commerce? I can assure him that we have spent hours, days, weeks, months, on this matter and many many a meeting with the Mr. Marchand, the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I would remind him too of the resupply at Churchill. I think that is a very significant development for suppliers in Manitoba and in Western Canada generally to take the resupply from the Montreal area and bring it to western Canada. This will have some significance I think to our businesses in this part of Canada.

I would refer to the research done by the Department of Industry on heavy water plant. I refer to all the work that we've done, and indeed a very heavy load has been placed on our Transportation Research Branch. All the work that's been done with regard to transportation rates and the whole transportation structure as it affects Manitoba. This is fundamental to the economic progress of Manitoba, and I for one will not apologize to the Leader of the Opposition to have more funds available for this type of research, which I think is the kind of research we can base future economic progress. The Prairie Air Service - we could refer to this and the work that was done by myself, by the department, but I will not go any further, Mr. Speaker, I think that I've made the point that I would virtually put down the Leader of the Opposition's remarks and attitude to the attitude displayed by very small immature boy who doesn't get his own way, and who's sort of angry or mad because he's left out of the action. I say so much for those comments and those criticisms of the Leader of the Opposition.

Going into the department and relating to other remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition this morning and early on this afternoon. I want to say at the outset that I will try to refrain from making the insulting remarks that the Leader of the Opposition seems to delight in making about individuals in this House. I will try to avoid insulting the Member for River Heights as he has insulted me this morning. I think that type of debate by the Leader of the Official Opposition is simply demeaning of his own role as the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Demeaning of the role and unbecoming of the position that he holds.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd)

The Leader of the Opposition made a number of criticisms, one of which is not uncommon to my ears and to the ears of others here, the lack of relationships between myself and the Department of Industry and Commerce with the business community, that all of a sudden because he no longer is Minister of Industry, or because the Conservatives are no longer in government, there ceases to be any cordial friendly co-operative arrangements or relationships with the business community. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is another bit of sheer nonsense that just does not stand up to examination. And I can relate to many agencies and many organizations where people from the business community at large are actively assisting this government. I believe there was a question asked by the Honourable Member from Roblin as to the make-up of the Manitoba Transportation Advisory Committee, and perhaps if I just went down the list indicating the 50-odd organizations that made up this particular advisory committee I could indicate to the members of the House the degree to which many business oriented and other professional organizations in Manitoba are working actively with this government in the realm of economic development policy.

The Manitoba Transportation Advisory Committee - I won't read the names of the people because the names can change, although we have the present representatives if you so desire, but it is made up of the Manitoba Aviation Council, representative of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, a representative of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Northern Association of Community Councils, the Branch Lines Association of Manitoba, the Port Churchill Development Board, the Centre for Transportation Studies - this is at the University of Manitoba - the Canadian Industrial Traffic League representing certain carriers, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, the Canadian Freight Association, the Air Transport Association, the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, the National Farmers Union, Manitoba Division, and the Manitoba Trucking Association.

I could also refer --(Interjection)-- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Are there any reports of that committee that's available for members of the House, or of those committees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the committee as such has not issued any reports per se. It has taken positions on various items; it took a position on the Overhaul Base, passed a resolution. There are a number of items that the committee has under consideration, and perhaps some day a report per se could be issued to the public, but that was not the intention; the intention was to get advice from the committee on very specific items pertaining to transportation. At the moment we are involved particularly in the question of northern transport problems, and I might add that we've concerned ourselves with rail transport to northern Manitoba, to Churchill in particular, and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian National Railway has now announced that it intends to upgrade the line to Churchill north of Gillam substantially in order to take the heavier hopper cars and other new freight cars that are now being built.

Pertaining to liaison with the business community, I could refer to the Economic Development Advisory Board, which is made up of a number of prominent businessmen; I could refer to a liaison committee which we have going now for three or four months with the Manitoba branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. We are in the process of setting up a liaison committee with the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, and they have responded very positively to this. I say I could go on, Mr. Speaker, talking other branches, or rather other institutes and boards and councils that we have operating in an advisory role essentially, which demonstrates conclusively that there is an accord and a spirit of co-operation with the Manitoba business community.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made reference to a cement report and referred to it as a meaningless document. Well, Mr. Speaker, he has the privilege of seeing a report that no other Cabinet Minister has seen other than myself. It's a preliminary document which is going to be the basis of some discussion as to how we should proceed; to what degree should we proceed in studying the matter more quickly and in more depth. Certainly any in-depth study will involve considerable discussions with members of the two cement companies. There is no doubt that this must happen, and will happen. But I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) I make no apology for being concerned. Our government has, and does purchase millions of dollars of concrete per year, cement per year, as does the City of Winnipeg. Both bodies are very concerned, as perhaps others are, about the lack of competition that seems to exist between the two companies that we have. There does not appear to be competition on tenders, and that is some cause for concern. The consumers of Manitoba are concerned, not only about the lack of competition on bids but also the lack, the differential in the cost of a ton of cement between here and Ontario. In 1970 the differential was \$5.10 per ton; in 1971 the differential shot up to \$7.84 a ton. Now maybe there is an explanation for all of this, and I'm not drawing any hasty or early or premature conclusions. I would submit however that the Leader of the Opposition did a disservice to the cement industry of Canada by bringing a confidential document, which includes a lot of material on individual companies which we would not want to release to the public; he does a disservice to that very industry that he seems to be protective thereof. But, Mr. Speaker, having been brought to our attention again, or to the public's attention, I can simply state that we will pursue the matter and we will be discussing the whole question of pricing, of profits, with the representatives of that industry.

The Leader of the Opposition questioned the relevancy of the department and myself, my own relevancy, Mr. Speaker. The Member from River Heights inferred that both the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Industry and Commerce were entirely irrelevant to the economic situation, or words to that effect. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we are irrelevant. I don't accept it. I accept that criticism, but I say this, I would rather be irrelevant to the economy of Manitoba than destructive of the economy of Manitoba, and the society of Manitoba, which I submit categorically was evidenced in the economics policies pursued under the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Leader of the Opposition now, and by his Conservative colleagues in the previous administration. The Leader of the Opposition asks: What are our policies? Where are our policies? Where are our guidelines? I would ask, what was the Conservative policies and what were the Conservative guidelines? Our policies have been stated; they've been stated - obviously he doesn't read our annual report - they're stated in the forward of the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce. Economic development policies have been stated in the Guidelines for the Seventies, a document that was issued by this government last year.

But going back, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind Members of this House what the Conservative policy was, the Conservative economic policy, because I would like to know and I'm sure the people of Manitoba would want to know after listening to the criticisms of the Leader of the Opposition, they would like to know, well what would the Leader of the Opposition do if he were in control of government? I think we have to look at the past to see what he did while he was a member of the previous government as Minister of Industry and Commerce. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the then Minister of Industry and Commerce followed a policy of what I would call crude economic growth --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, he's asking, what's our policy? Well, here's he just come to his seat, you know, and he's missed my other remarks, and I am not going to waste the members' time of this House to repeat what I've said a moment ago or two.

Well I'm not going to waste my time just because the Leader of the Opposition happens to flit in and out of this House like a gadfly, and comes in in the middle of a debate and is rude enough to speak from his seat, as well as insulting people in his remarks.

The crude growth policies I submit, Mr. Speaker, mean growth, economic growth at any cost. It doesn't matter whether you pollute the atmosphere; it doesn't matter whether you flood out half of northern Manitoba, as was planned under the previous administration; it doesn't matter whether you bring in low-skilled, low-paid workers into the Manitoba economy. I wish I had the clippings with me - I don't have them - but there are clippings of the former Minister of Industry and Commerce saying, low-wage, low-skilled workers are good for Manitoba. Bring them in and we will use the taxpayers' money to educate them and train them, and he's quoted in the paper - I haven't got it with me, but if anybody wants to challenge me on that assertion, I'll be glad to in a matter of an hour or so bring them and table them, because I do have statements whereby the Leader of the Opposition, the then Minister of Industry and Commerce, stated that it was good for Manitoba to bring in low-skilled, low-wage workers, and we would use the taxpayers' money to train them. Not only did he say that, but he forgot to tell

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) us, which we found out since coming to government, that the former government committed us to spending close to a quarter of a million dollars to pay to bring those low-skilled, low-wage workers from foreign countries to Manitoba. They used the taxpayers' money; they committed us, they committed us to nearly a quarter of a million dollars to subsidize the importation of low-paid workers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, on a point of order. I believe the Minister should resign. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister has in discussing this matter indicated that something was hidden from the House with respect to this particular item. I would ask, you know, on this particular item that he was just talking about, I would ask that he reconsider his remarks before he suggests that it was hidden, for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, it was an arrangement that was arrived at in co-operation with the Federal Government and they participated 50 percent with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I still don't know what the point of order was. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we paid out of the public treasury of Manitoba a large sum of money; the taxpayers of Manitoba paid to bring in, paid to bring in low-wage, low-skilled or unskilled workers, and the newspapers, the headlines said: "Spivak says this is good for Manitoba". All I was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that in these articles that I read there was no mention made of the government also subsidizing, using taxpayers' funds to bring these people in. Okay so much - you know, I'm saying, what is the Conservative Economic Development Policy? I say, it was a growth at any cost. It was growth, it was a crude growth policy, it was a giveaway policy. You might say, what is the giveaway policy? Well you can look at some of the examples under MDF, and I'm not going to go into that entire messy episode that we inherited. I'm not going to talk about giving away of half of the forestry resources of the north to so-called Swiss entrepreneurs, but I want to suggest, and I want to remind the honourable members of this House that the policy of the previous government, and I know when the original deal was signed by Premier Roblin, I understand that the now Leader of the Opposition was not then Minister of Industry and Commerce, but nevertheless he was Minister of Industry and Commerce for a couple of years, or whatever period of time, before the government did change, and I know there was variations in arrangements and he was the Minister responsible for the MDF. You know, here is an example of Conservative growth policy; you know, Manitoba's Roblin shakes hand with \$100 million. Here's Duff Roblin with Dr. Oscar Reiser, Dr. Oscar Reiser so-called Swiss financier, so-called Swiss . . .

MR. ASPER: To the Minister, is that the Oscar Reiser who's under indictment for defrauding the people of Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Right on, Mr. Speaker, that is the same gentleman, the same gentleman. Hopefully the U. S. Securities Commission will be helping us in our pursuit of this great international financier which Premier Roblin found for us, and I'd invite members of the House to read the Western Business and Industry Magazine of April 1966, and it goes into great detail as to how the Conservative economic development policy of Manitoba was getting us a huge investment of \$100 million. --(Interjection)-- Well Bud Sherman's - there's a picture of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry in another issue. I think that's the Manitoba Business Journal. But here is, "Roblin's mighty bison breaks from a trot to a run". There's a picture of Rex Grose. I can't help remember, Mr. Speaker, when the former manager Mr. Rex Grose resigned, that the Leader of the Official Opposition very emphatically and vehemently called for my resignation because we were losing the number one economic developer, the best industrial developer the province had ever had. I was to resign because Mr. Grose chose to resign because things were getting a little hot. The Gordie Howe, we were losing the Gordie Howe of industrial development in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I think that this article, which is now history, is very revealing but it gives you a glance and an understanding of the giveaway policy of the Roblin government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: Then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Department of Industry and Commerce under the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, the now Leader of the Opposition, also had as part of its policy the expenditure of many thousands of dollars

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) on various promotional, very, not specific promotional items which there is some argument for, but on general promotional objectives, and he issued the war cry, "The Spirit of 70". "The Spirit of 70" launched by the Leader of the Opposition in January 1968 at the so-called Business Summit Conference. I must take the opportunity to read very briefly from an article appearing in the Toronto Telegram in January of 1968 where they try to report, and try to capture the mood, of this summit meeting, and this is exemplary of the policies of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister. "The turned on businessmen with the urge to expand, a nose for markets is hardly an oddity in the modern economy, but the question that came up most frequently during the recent Manitoba Business Summit Conference in Winnipeg was whether it was possible to turn on an entire business community. The consensus was that it was possible, at least for a day. The prima facie evidence was that 1, 850 Manitoba businessmen turned up for the one day show, 750 more had to be turned away, but the lucky 1, 850 heard upward of a dozen speeches, some urging them to meet the challenges of expansion and export, and some giving them at least an inkling as to how they could. With something of the atmosphere of the modern political convention, they also heard a song called the Spirit of Seventy and a slogan, "Manitoba Growing to Beat Seventy". They listened to the famous Mennonite Children's Choir and the youthful spirit of 1970 drummers. They shared the biggest sitdown dinner in the history of Manitoba; they saw what must have been the biggest head table in the history of banquetry approximately 150 people, including much of Manitoba's political brass and Canada's corporate brass. Whether or not Spivak and his Industry and Commerce whizz kids turn on enough businessmen to beat seventy, history should credit them with a massive and imaginative experiment in group therapy."

Mr. Speaker, that was an element of, and a very important element, of the so-called policy of the former Minister of Industry. I am afraid that this is all that's left of the Conservative economic policy, is the drummer boy. Here he is and you know, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter was when the Leader of the Opposition was undergoing this massive group therapy, Manitoba's economy was virtually in the doldrums. Whether you're talking about manufacturing, or investment level activities, the level of unemployment, or whatever economic indicator, in spite of the massive therapy, or group therapy, in spite of all the war cry, the self-hypnosis that went on, the fact of the matter was that the economy of Manitoba was stagnating, it was stagnating. I'll quote all kinds of articles and figures that I've done that, perhaps I've done it on one occasion, but there are times when members should be reminded, and I'd be quite prepared to do so about airlines not being certified, about bakeries closing down, and this is an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press.

As a matter of fact, I have it here, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not sure whether I should really take the time of the House, but it's pretty disastrous. It's pretty disastrous. It says: "Some of the biggest industrial development stories of 1968 were those slated to be filed in the economic ruin basket. The closing of the Air Canada base was the worst, but the closing of the San Antonio Mine at Bissett, Manitoba, and the bankruptcy of Parkhill Bedding and Furniture Ltd. in Winnipeg, which threw 160 men out of work last fall, followed closely behind." You know, "A large bakery in Brandon closed its doors, Neon Products bought out Northern Paint Co. Limited of Winnipeg, Canadian Iron Company announced that it would be closing its structural steel fabrication operations in St. Boniface, and Union Reps said that as many as 100 men would be put out of work" and on and on and on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: "You know, the profit of the Manitoba Telephone System dropped drastically, Central Park Lodges of Canada, Winnipeg based firm which operates 16 elderly care homes across Canada was sold to Trizec Corporation in Montreal for \$2 million. Plans of Greb Shoes for a 3/4 million dollar plant at Inkster Industrial Park remained in limbo since the firm announced its intentions in 1967, partly due to high taxes in the Industrial Park area. Plans for a \$4 million convention centre apparently fell through after, well it fell through and nothing happened. The convention centre happened when we came to government. Investors Trust Company was sold to the Montreal Trust Company, the last hopes of a revival of a Bank of Western Canada died, Moores Restaurant closed down in Winnipeg. Moore Business Forms moved its western head office to Vancouver, which reduced its Winnipeg staff, and so forth and so on. Ralph Hedlin of Hedlin, Menzies and Associates, a consulting firm which employed 30 economists and supporting staff, moved his base of operations to Toronto." This is an

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) article written by Mr. Sheldon Boles of the Winnipeg Free Press. It appeared on January 1, 1969, and he was reviewing the economic situation in Manitoba. The title is, "Manitoba, a great place to be from", and that was 1968. He reviewed the situation in 1968, and on January 1, 1969, this article was published.

There is a lot more to it but I won't take up the time of the members. The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition is doing the people of Manitoba and members of this House - leading them to believe that nothing is happening under the Department of Industry and Commerce, nothing is happening under my ministry. He suggested that I was irrelevant and that our policies were irrelevant, I presume, and I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of the Department of Industry and Commerce under this administration are far more relevant to the economic scene and the economic needs of Manitoba, than the policies of any previous government with regard to industrial and economic development, and I'm not going to belabour the various programs. I explained those in my estimates - unfortunately many members opposite were not here, including the Leader of the Opposition. I talked about energy research, and there's energy research --(Interjection)-- Yes we're spending a little money on energy research believe it or not, and this is an additional expenditure. There's more money being spent on transportation research. There's more money being spent on regional economic research, and all of this research, not academic research or theoretical research, but applied research; research for a plan of action. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that some of the transportation research has resulted in some very significant developments in the transportation field. I refer to the work we've done on Churchill and I think there's been a breakthrough there, and I can use other examples as well.

We are spending more money than ever before on rural development programs; we're spending more money than ever before on helping small businesses, and we have the facts. I have the figures, and I'd be glad to table them at any time, Mr. Speaker, comparing the amount of money that is spent to assist private enterprise, small and medium size enterprise in Manitoba today compared to six or seven or eight years ago. You know, the Leader of the Opposition asked how relevant I am, and how relevant was the Department of Industry and Commerce? I would say, Mr. Speaker, I would invite him to go and talk to the hundreds of businessmen who participated in our rural Community Management Development Program. You can say, okay, so what. But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Yes, and we've had excellent co-operation from rural chambers in this program. You know, and again this belies the impression that the Leader of the Opposition wants to leave that there's no communication, no rapport whatsoever between the business community and this government. It simply is not so. But the fact is he can go and ask hundreds of businessmen who are now operating more efficiently, more productively, and therefore more profitably, and hopefully are paying better wages thereby than they were before. --(Interjection)-- Yes more taxes, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance. And there are countless, and I have listened to these people myself. I've been all over this province, Flin Flon, Selkirk, Brandon, and many other places, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin, and I've heard these people - Swan River - tell us --(Interjection)-- Swan River, yes. The honourable member wasn't there. But we had testimonials from members from Swan River. Have I got two minutes more, Mr. Speaker? One. Well look I have to conclude, and I will conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude --(Interjection)-- well we have to deduct the interruptions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: I would say, ask the people at Rivers, Manitoba, how relevant we are, and I refer to Sekine bicycles; ask the people in Morris, where we brought Viscount trailers and a winery, ask the people of Morris, ask the people of Portage la Prairie, where Phillips Cables Limited is now being established, ask them how relevant the Minister is, and the department is; ask the people of Morden, where they vote Conservative apparently; ask the people of Morden how relevant the Minister of Industry and Commerce was; ask the people in Brandon how relevant we were with regard to Pioneer Electric and McKenzie Seeds; ask the people at Winkler how relevant we were, where Monarch Industries is now establishing, based on a productivity audit which this department sponsored, and you can ask the Klassen brothers about that yourself if you don't believe me; and ask the people of Gimli how relevant we are. Mr. Speaker, I would submit all those people, and the businessmen will tell you that this government, and this department, and this Minister, are much more relevant and more meaningful

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) and more productive than the previous administration, or the previous Minister, could ever possibly imagine to be.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to take part in this debate but when the Minister had the audacity to say, to ask the people of Portage la Prairie about Phillips Cable I couldn't contain myself, I really couldn't. The facts of the matter are that Phillips Cable came to Manitoba on the initiative of the company. They came by encouragement through the DREE grant system with a grant of \$906,000, or thereabouts, for establishing a certain number of jobs, and my friend the Minister had absolutely nothing to do with them locating in Portage la Prairie.

As a matter of fact, my honourable friend, with others in the Cabinet, exerted their best efforts to have that industry go to the Town of Selkirk, and it was only because, it was only because the president of the company put his foot down and very firmly said, either we go to Portage la Prairie or we're not coming to Manitoba. And the Minister knows that.

--(Interjection)-- That is true. That is true. I ask the First Minister, is it not a fact that the president of the company had to insist that he wanted to go to Portage la Prairie? I know the story, I know the whole story of this. And for the Minister to stand up and take credit for that is unbelievable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Industry state his matter of privilege.

MR. EVANS: My matter of privilege is this that the Honourable Member is getting up and stating that a certain event happened, a certain event happened in Portage la Prairie because of a Federal Government DREE grant, and he's inferring that a certain event, this event did not take place because of efforts of this government. My matter of privilege is that the honourable member has not got all the facts, he has not got all the correspondence, and I would invite him to a meeting in my office with Mr. Fred Lindsay, the Chairman of the Board of Phillips Cables, next week to discuss the real facts of why that company is in Manitoba. It's not because of DREE, it's not because of DREE, and I would invite the honourable member because I cannot debate it in the House.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has confirmed pretty well what I have said so far is by and large correct; the only thing is I don't know all of the other facts. I don't know all of the other facts, and I admit that. --(Interjection)-- Well the First Minister said there was no pressure. The information I have, and it's very reliable information, is that there was a concerted effort to try to get that industry to go to Selkirk, and they didn't want to go there. --(Interjection)-- Well I'm sorry to have to disagree with the First Minister but these are the facts as I know them. Well I hope the First Minister joins in the debate because I'd be interested in hearing what he has to say. But I don't mind, it's human nature for a Minister to take as much credit as possible. But really that strained credibility of the Minister to actually have the gall to take the credit for Phillips Cables Limited coming to Portage, or coming to Manitoba.

I would ask the Minister what program that he has instituted, or has in his department, that encouraged Phillips Cable to come to Manitoba. I'm sure it was the \$906,000 based on the number of jobs had a lot to do with them locating in the DREE area, of which Portage is a part. I would like the Minister, or the First Minister, to tell us on this side what specific program encouraged that industry to come to Manitoba that they are responsible for. I'd be very interested to hear that. Very interested.

As a matter of fact, I can inform other members of the House that when my honourable friend arranged a cocktail party for certain people in the Portage district, the councils and businessmen, and so on, and he was kind enough to invite me to it, and I enjoyed it, but I was rather disturbed when my honourable friend acted as the chairman of the event and he did take quite a bit of credit, I know that. At the same time, while it was announced by an Ottawa civil servant, or rather a federal civil servant that there was \$906,000 of federal money input into the program by way of grant, my honourable friend had the gall to knock Ottawa from that platform. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Yes. He had the gall to take a swing at the Federal Government for other programs. So really, so really, I think I should take a little bit back because the Minister and his department did make some financial input. They put the cocktail party

CONCURRENCE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) on to take the credit, so that they could take the credit for the program.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 69 to 73 passed.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2, 123, 200 for labour -- passed; The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

. . . . continued on next page

CONCURRENCE

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): For Labour. Mr. Speaker, there are two or three aspects of the Labour Department operation in estimates that were left unconsidered when we looked at the estimates of the department and I want to just bring them to the Minister's attention at this point. They may in part have been touched on but I think there is some re-emphasis necessary.

One area in particular, Sir, is that of environmental health and occupational safety. I believe in the early stages of the session we had a chance to explore the problems and difficulties of the fragmentation of authority and responsibility that exists in the area of occupational safety, including health, but we have not had an opportunity to go into the subject as deeply perhaps as some of us would have liked and so I want to bring the problem to the Minister's attention once again.

My conversations on this subject with people in the field of employment and in the field of industry and labour generally have led me to the conclusion, Sir, that a good many working persons and industrial employees in the province feel that we don't need more laws in the area of industrial safety and environmental and occupational safety, but we need better enforcement of the laws that we've got. And this I think is a point that we want to re-emphasize for the Minister's consideration at this juncture of consideration of his estimates.

The message that I have received here has been that under the present government there has been very poor enforcement of the laws that exist under the Employment Standards Division. There is certainly an inspectorate in existence to carry out the responsibilities of reviewing the laws and regulations governing occupational safety, but my informants, the spokesmen from the labour movement, with whom I have had conversations on this subject, tell me that the Inspectorate Division is not enforcing those laws, rules and regulations. They feel that, as I've suggested, that the laws are there and we don't need additional laws compounded and piled upon those already in existence; but they do feel that those laws need to be enforced. They're not being enforced properly at the present time.

They feel too, Sir, if I may say so, that a service would be performed, industry generally, if the inspectors under the Employment Standards Division were moved around in their areas of responsibility and review. I've had it said to me that there would be advantages to a circuit kind of operation for these inspectors to transfer from one particular area of inspection and responsibility to another, rather in the manner of foreign services officers who are shifted around to different international posts of responsibility at regular intervals.

The people who've spoken to me about this subject tell me that they feel that this would prevent a laxity and an apathy creeping into the role of the inspectorate and into the work of the inspectorate, and keep a fresh input, a fresh approach to problems of industrial and occupational safety available at all times. They feel that under the present system there definitely is an apathy and a laxity on the part of many in this role, and it's desirable that that condition be eliminated. Mr. Speaker, I think that part of the problem in the whole field of environmental health and occupational safety lies in the fragmentation of authority that exists there. I have suggested this to the Minister, and perhaps others have suggested it to the Minister in the past.

I want to just place on the record again some of the facts relating to supervision and administration of environmental health and occupational safety in the Province of Manitoba to underscore this argument. I think that any conscientious review of the situation, such as I can detail in some of the facts I'm going to place on the record now, would lead any impartial observer to the conclusion that there is a widespread fragmentation of authority in this field, that it does exist, and that the result is a less and fully efficient effective and complete service. I believe, Sir, that through consolidation of authority and responsibility there could be an improvement in the services that are currently provided in the occupational safety field.

At the present time there are varying responsibilities, there are disparate duties, there are responsibilities with or without direct authority, and they are spread among various departments, boards, and individuals at the Federal Provincial and civic levels. The consequence has to be a jungle, and has to be a situation of almost total inefficiency. To determine whether a more efficient and effective method of ensuring safe and healthful working conditions can be developed, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister, and all of us, can and should give consideration to these facts.

1 - The fact that the Employment Safety Act and its regulations are administered by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

2 - The fact that it has never been resolved as to the extent that safety includes health.

3 - The fact that the Department of Labour is involved, Sir, where there are potential hazards to employees relevant to elevators and lifts, boilers, gas heating units and fire hazards.

4 - The fact that the Department of Labour is involved in technical and engineering matters in areas of safety.

5 - The fact that the Department of Health has been involved in occupational health as well as public health. A director of occupational health was appointed last year.

6 - The fact that the City of Winnipeg Health Department functions in areas of occupational health within its geographical boundaries.

7 - The fact that the Department of Mines and Environment has responsibility in areas of mine safety and environmental problems, which appear to include the occupational environment.

8 - The fact that the Federal Department of Labour functions in occupational areas of safety and health within its jurisdiction. Wherever provincial services are provided they are provided under agreement.

These are some of the evidences, some of the facts pointing to the support of the case that I attempt to make, Sir, that fragmentation of authority in this field is wide and extensive, and that some consolidation is desirable, and indeed overdue.

In Saskatchewan, I believe the consolidation of responsibility for occupational safety and health under one authority has been introduced now. Up until 1972, according to my information, Sir, occupational safety was under the authority of the Workmen's Compensation Board, but since that time occupational safety and health has been placed under the authority of the Department of Labour of the Province of Saskatchewan.

In Alberta, a report of the Alberta Select Committee of the Legislature on Workmen's Compensation recommended consolidation of responsibility for enforcing occupational safety and health requirements under that province's Department of Labour and Manpower. Education and safety development was left with the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Provincial Industrial Safety Associations.

In the United States, the recent enactment in the United States of the Occupational Safety and Health Act would indicate the broad concern and interest in concerted action in that country to reduce the terrific impact of occupational injuries, including occupational diseases.

As for other parts of North America, particularly other provinces of Canada, there are various arrangements that are in effect. It may be, Sir, that a full study is warranted to determine the best manner in which to provide to the worker safety and health services in his working environment, and I submit that to the consideration of the Minister.

In any event, Sir, I would hope that the foregoing tends to underline the fact, if it needs underlining, that there is a serious fragmentation of authority and responsibility in this over-all field of environmental health and occupational safety, and that it's time that our government, our province, this Legislature and this Minister, looked at the situation and determine what steps may be taken to bring some order and some efficiency out of what now borders certainly on chaos and inefficiency.

Sir, in other areas I would say one or two words, and I intend to be relatively brief because the subjects that I touch on now have been subjects of extensive debate and review during this session and remain for the most part challenges and responsibilities that this Minister must meet and problems which, if he can't solve, he must live with. They are problems in the field of employment and industry generally, and particularly problems insofar as they apply to the construction industry in Manitoba and to the garment industry here.

We have on frequent occasions in the session, now nearly four months old, reminded the Minister of the problems existing in those two industries where worker shortages are concerned, and we have frequently asked him for some indication that he's moving in the direction of finding solutions to those problems. We are still hopeful that he's moving in the direction of finding those solutions. It may well be that between now and the time this House next meets he will have come up with programs that not only meet the kinds of objections that he has to conditions in the garment industry, but meet the current problem of the serious worker shortage there. It may well be that between the time that this House rises and the time

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . we meet again, he will have come up with the solutions to the worker shortage in the construction industry in the province. Up to this point in time we would simply remind him that on the basis of our information those problems still exist, and still exist to a serious degree, and that employers generally in those two industries are still looking desperately for some sort of relief from the worker shortage pressures they face.

I know I for one have brought these matters to the Minister's attention on occasion in the session now nearing its end, and certainly other members of the Conservative caucus and members of the Liberal caucus have done likewise, and he has met those questions and those challenges each time with the assurance and re-assurance that he is working on the problems, that he has been sitting down with the leaders of the garment and construction industries, developing programs to meet their needs. I would hope that before the session ends we'll see some tangible evidence that those meetings and those alleged efforts of the Minister's, have paid off with answers. Up to this point in time I don't feel satisfied that we have had the answers, but hopefully in the remarks that the Minister will presumably be making before the concurrence motion is passed, he will be able to tell us something about the solutions he's bringing in those fields.

At last count the garment industry was still crying literally for something close to 1,000 workers. We're advised by the Minister that part of the industry's problem lies in the standard of wages paid therein. The industry spokesmen themselves deny this. They claim that their wage standards, wage levels, are reasonably competitive with those in other Manitoba industries, and that in any event the question of minimum wage is not at the root of their problem. They would like to have access to immigrant workers if a stream of immigrants were made available to them, if their shortages could not be filled from the unemployment and employment streams as they exist at the present time in the province.

The construction industry, particularly the heavy construction industry, has suggested that it faces the same kind of critical shortage of workers, critical problems; they too have indicated that they would be interested, indeed might find it necessary to recruit abroad to keep the building trades worker rosters up to the desirable levels, and I'd be interested, as my colleagues would I'm sure, in a response from the Minister to this demand and to this question on the part of the building trades themselves.

The employment picture in Manitoba appears to be reasonably good in comparison to national levels so presumably the Minister is not going to be able to find from the unemployment stream the necessary workers with the necessary qualifications to fill the gaps in those industries. If he is not going to permit immigration from abroad, or recruiting from abroad, then we would like to know what he does propose to meet those problems.

The only other point that I wanted to place on the record at this time, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the hiring and firing practices at Saunders Aircraft in Gimli, and I would be interested still in some response from the Minister as to what kind of recruiting practices are in force there. It's my understanding that a number of skilled tradesmen were relieved of their responsibilities at Saunders in recent months and that they were replaced by sheet metal workers, and others who were recruited in England. If Saunders Aircraft --(Interjection) -- well, if Saunders Aircraft --(Interjection)-- Exactly, No. The Minister may perhaps misunderstand. If Saunders Aircraft is permitted to bring in, to recruit workers from England, and elsewhere, why are the garment industries, and why are the building trades not permitted to do so? --(Interjection)-- I'm not being critical of those recruiting tactics whatsoever; I just see a glaring inconsistency in the positions taken by the Minister on this subject. He has said that he is not prepared to go very far in the direction of recruiting workers for the garment industry here as long as there are unemployed in Manitoba. Well that's fair enough. But if he can't fill those gaps from the unemployed stream in Manitoba, then I suggest he's being irresponsible if he risks the viability of the garment industry simply because he's being stubborn about recruiting overseas for them.

On the other hand he turns around and acquiesces in and presumably effectively supports and endorses the recruiting of overseas workers for Saunders Aircraft. Well he can't have it both ways. He's either in favour of recruiting from recruiting skills, he's either in favour of recruiting skills or recruiting people who can be trained, or he's not in favour of recruiting them. --(Interjection)-- Well the Minister of Finance says, recruiting skills, but my information is that the people who have been relieved of their duties at Saunders Aircraft

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . in the last few months were skilled workers. They were sheet metal workers, they were air frame mechanics, they were Class A mechanics; they were originally at CAE, employed at CAE, some of them. In any event there are many who once were at CAE who lost their jobs because of the transfer of aircraft overhaul jobs and responsibilities to Montreal, who are now driving trucks, and performing other jobs like that around the city, who could be hired to fill those jobs at Saunders. I have no objection to the fact that the Minister has gone to Britain to fill those jobs, but he cannot have the argument both ways. There are skilled workers here who could fill the jobs. They once worked for Canadian Aviation Electronics; they now, because as I say of the loss of those aircraft overhaul operations to Montreal, are making livings, scraping out livings by doing other jobs around the city. They could have been hired for Saunders Aircraft, and that group includes, as I say, skilled workers, sheet metal workers, air frame mechanics and Class A mechanics.

Now if the Minister chooses to look elsewhere for those skilled workers. Fine. Well then let him look elsewhere for workers for the building trades and for the garment industries too. That's all we're asking him. I don't believe that it's a logical argument to follow the one practice for one industry simply because it happens to involve a substantial input from the Manitoba Development Corporation and from the public purse, and follow a totally different, diametrically opposite policy with respect to industries in which private money and private enterprise is the prime operator.

So we would like some rationalization of that anomaly from the Minister, and some explanation of what he's going to do to make sure that the building trades industries and the garment industry in this province remain viable through a summer in which both are crying for labour, which apparently is not available to them at the present time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Well, Mr. Speaker I feel it's incumbent on me to say a word or two in answer to the presumed labour critic of the Official Opposition. I appreciate, I appreciate the involvement of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry but I must point out, Mr. Speaker, from what he has said this afternoon he wants it both ways.

When I announced yesterday that the Government of Manitoba had approved of an increase in the minimum wage, my friend, the labour spokesman for the Conservative Party, rose from his seat and expressed holy terror in the fact that, horrors, that we had increased the minimum wage from \$1.90 upwards to eventually \$2.30 on the first of January of next year, and his request of me is, well how many people are you going to put out of work as the result of the increase in the minimum wage? Now today my honourable friend is saying to me, where are the workers going to come from? He accuses me as Minister of Labour on one hand of causing unemployment by paying a little more reasonable fair wage in the garment industry and other industries as well. Now he says, where are you going to get the workers from.

He also, or representatives of the Opposition, said the other day when the announcement came forward as to the return of Air Canada personnel, or facilities, to the Province of Manitoba, where are you going to get the workers from? Today he stands in his place and condemns us because there has been, in his words, some curtailment of employment at Saunders Aircraft, which is associated with the Air industry. Now I say to my honourable friend, why don't you be consistent. You accuse me of inconsistency in many of the programs that we have in the Department of Labour, and I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, for one moment that we are perfect. We have never said that. But here my honourable friend, at least in these two areas, the garment industry and the aircraft industry, being just as inconsistent as inconsistency can be. He indicates that I have placed a restraint on the immigration of workers into the garment industry.

Surely my honourable friend, being as knowledgeable as he is presumed to be in the field of labour and immigration, should know that immigration is basically the responsibility of the federal authority, although they did listen to us in our presentations, or representations, to them, that in industry such as the garment industry that we have found from past experience that an influx of any great magnitude of workers does not solve the problem. My colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce speaking this afternoon on his Concurrence Estimates indicated some activities entered into by the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . gentleman that now sits, when he's in his seat, as the Leader of the Official Opposition. At that particular time that honourable gentleman as Minister of Industry and Commerce went on a junket all across Europe, to London, to Rome, and to many of the other countries seeking, seeking employees to come for the garment industry here in the Province of Manitoba, because they were in dire straits at that particular time. The government of that particular time, so I understand, paid incentives for workers to come into Manitoba in the garment industry. And where are they today? They're not simply around, Mr. Speaker, to the degree that the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, now the Leader of the Opposition, envisioned.

I say to my honourable friend, you must be realistic but you cannot simply fill the vacancies in the garment industry by going out and importing people, because of the fact that unless they are oriented to our type of living they soon get disillusioned by the type of work that they perform, and far better, in my opinion, for those in the garment industry assisted and encouraged by government to develop within our own country people who are qualified and capable of performing in that industry.

It is the same, Mr. Speaker, in the construction industry. The previous government entered into a contract on northern development of Manitoba Hydro, and quite properly there was an agreement entered into with the Allied Hydro Trades Council for provisions in a collective agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one indication that the previous government of the day gave a tinker's damn about trying to train people as apprentices in the respective industries, and we are facing the crunch today. Under the policies of this government, Mr. Speaker, the construction industry is at the highest level it's ever been in the history of Manitoba. I recognize, I recognize that there is a shortage in some fields and trades in the construction industry. Having said that, I also recognize that there are some of the trades that have a temporary surplus.

But I say to my honourable friend the labour critic for the Conservative party that if he would lend his efforts, or if his government, the previous government, had of lent their efforts to a proper apprenticeship training program, we wouldn't be in the crux that we're in today, and we're trying to catch up. We're doing everything we can at the present time to induce changes in our apprentice training programs to shorten the lengths of the indentured program. And it's tough. It's not easy; it can't be done overnight. I'm sure my honourable friend would appreciate that.

So I say to him that before he spouts off in the field of the lack of availability of personnel, that he should back and seriously consider methods by which we can unitedly surmount the problems that we have at the present time.

So I say to my honourable friend, I don't mind, Mr. Speaker, his criticism. As a matter of fact if the Concurrence of the Estimates of the Department of Labour had of passed without a few barbs from my honourable friend, I would leave here at 5:30 terribly disappointed. I am so used to my honourable friend rising and criticising and condemning. But anyway I guess he's made my day today, and I'm not disappointed because he hasn't; he hasn't let the estimates go through without a few barbs, or what you call them.

Now he started out on a reasonable note in his remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when he was talking about environmental and occupational safety. When I introduced the Estimates of the Department of Labour I did draw to the attention of the House that a task force is working on this great problem, and I agree with him that it would be far more advisable that if under a common umbrella, the matters of occupational safety was brought under a common umbrella so that everyone knew exactly what the provisions in law were.

But here again, Mr. Speaker, it goes beyond the question of merely legislation. We had some discussions not too long ago when we were considering the Estimates of the Department of Labour about the incident of fire. Just as the incident of fire has a direct relationship to the lack of adequate consideration of the human element, so is the case in safety.

I want to say to my honourable friend that there has been more prosecutions made and laid as the result of unsafe practices in industry, and particularly in the construction industry, since I became the Minister of Labour then there ever had been previously. Without any change, without any change in legislation, because of the emphasis that has been placed on industrial safety by not only the Department of Labour itself, but by the Workmen's Compensation as well. I say to my honourable friend, I agree with him, we don't need more laws, but

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . we want to have, and need to have a common understanding of workers and employers that it's their united responsibility to do whatever they can to cut down the incident of accidents.

Of course my honourable friend the other day when I introduced amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act, he was quite critical of me because of the fact that I placed, or indicated, that the government was going to place the responsibility for the financial input on industry as a whole. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend would concentrate on his wont to bring about industrial safety and a lowering of the incidence of claims on compensation, he would do far more than to criticize the methodology that we are using in the field of Workmen's Compensation, because it is in that area, safe practices at home and at work, that will lower the cost of industrial as well as home accidents. And we're trying to bring this about through educational programs of the Workmen's Compensation Board which, as my honourable friend knows, comes under the general direction as Minister responsible. I wonder how many of the programs that are carried by the Workmen's Compensation Board on TV my honourable friend has watched as an indicator of the efforts that we are trying to achieve to make people safety conscious.

My honourable friend talks about the employment inspectors. Talks about employment inspectors not enforcing the laws. I agree. I agree with my honourable friend that we might as well, or should have possibly three or four times as many labour inspectors in the Employment Standards Division as we have. But were we so to have, I'm sure that my honourable friends opposite would be among the first to jump up and say, there's that government again increasing their civil staff between - service staff beyond all due bounds. Duplication. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to my friend that I think that there is no more a dedicated group of civil servants than there are at presently in the Employment Standards Division and we do not allow, we do not allow under any situation or circumstance, Mr. Speaker, a violation to go without investigation in order that we fulfill our obligations.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this generally answers my honourable friend. If it's the will of the House to pass the estimates, I take my seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye will have another opportunity another day. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I wish to make some changes, substitutions on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. Substitute Adam for Malinowski; McKenzie for Einarson; Bilton for Brown. That's on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning. (Wednesday) Agriculture and Municipal Affairs meet at 8:00.