

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 3, 1975

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 80 students Grade 9 standing of the Spring Valley School, under the direction of Messrs. Collins, Curtis and Peters. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

And we have 10 students of Grade 2 to 7 standing of the Big Black River School under the direction of Mrs. Kidds. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the Minister of Co-operatives.

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

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the Committee meeting for Thursday indicated A. E. McKenzie Seeds. They are apparently not available for Thursday night. We'll have them another time. I'm also asked to communicate to the members of the House that there is apparently some activity taking place in the Press Gallery room tomorrow at 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Morris.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the House Leader indicated that McKenzie Seeds will not be available before the Committee on Thursday. I wonder if he could advise the House just what will be available for that Committee on Thursday, or if he has any plans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there were several other companies going to report, Moose Lake Loggers, Minago Contractors and Channel Area Loggers. And we will have McKenzie Seeds on, but not this Thursday night.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the statement by the Federal Minister of Environment concerning the Study Board recommendations on northern flooding, can the Minister indicate if he has been in contact with the Federal Minister of Environment and whether they have arranged any form of meeting between the two levels of government to discuss the recommendations and the question of compensation for northern flood problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't been in contact with my federal counterpart recently but this question has been discussed between Madame Sauve and myself, and between her predecessor, Mr. Davis and myself, and I believe that by and large the province has been proceeding to deal with many of the recommendations that are contained in a summary report, many of them which have appeared before, particularly with regard to compensating anybody who suffers damages by virtue of the Diversion. That has been a commitment of this government for several years.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. On the subject of compensation can the Minister indicate whether in view of the concern expressed by the Northern Flood Committee, which I believe represents the northern communities involved, whether there will be any special adjudication mechanism established as called for in that study so that there would be a fair adjudication not just to individuals but to the communities involved.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated again, well over two years ago, that if

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . there is any person in Northern Manitoba who is not satisfied with the settlements that Hydro is willing to make that they will be permitted to present their claim to a tribunal appointed other than by the province, or at least an independent tribunal, a judge, we certainly indicated to the Federal Government that we would be willing to consider an appointment of their choice if they wish.

With regard to community compensation or individual compensation, those are matters which would be dealt with by a board. I'm not sure what the honourable member means by community compensation. The province has indicated to the people concerned that we have no intention of negotiating for the future, social and economic rights of the citizens of Northern Manitoba with the Northern Flood Committee. The Northern Flood Committee is a group whom we are willing to discuss negotiation of claims with but we don't recognize them as being the representative of every citizen in Northern Manitoba. As a matter of fact, elected representatives of those citizens are sitting in the House.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the Minister's last answer. Can the Minister indicate if the government is not prepared to pay compensation for community damage such as outlined in the report where it indicates that communities such as Thompson will suffer recreational damage, transportation damage and so on, to what degree will those communities which are going to suffer damage, not as individuals but as total communities, to what degree will they be compensated, or will there be some kind of alternative support given to them to overcome the damages or grievances that the communities themselves suffer?

MR. GREEN Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate that the government is not prepared to consider community compensation. I said that that would be a consideration that would be made in the general situation. We are not having difficulties with those communities, Mr. Speaker. There's no doubt that the water supply in Churchill, that any problems associated with Thompson, any problems associated with clearing of trees, etc., one need only look at what is occurring in South Indian Lake to know what community activities have been undertaken by the government in this respect. The claim of a community receiving compensation of a damage variety, other than a program to rectify any problems that are associated, physical problems, that are done, is one which I'm not able to grasp immediately. Although I'm not suggesting it's not there, it would be subject to the other matters that have been already alluded to. That is they could be presented to a tribunal if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked a number of questions in regard to the South Indian Lake construction camp. Since the member did not give notice at that time I was unable to answer those questions. I have the information now. One question that was asked was in relation to the nature of the camp. The purpose of the camp was the involvement of as many residents of South Indian Lake as possible in the variety of local training and employment opportunities which would be available as a result of townsite development; a training on-the-job experience for from three to ten individuals on managing, operating and maintaining a construction camp at South Indian Lake.

The member then asked the awareness of myself and the First Minister in regard to this matter and the awareness of the Provincial Auditor of this matter. The audit of which the Leader of the Opposition had a copy was an internal audit by the Department of Northern Affairs. The audit was received by the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs office on September 24, 1974. The matter was dealt with by the Deputy Minister and other members within the department and myself, and I do not believe the Premier was aware of the developments that took place. The purpose of the audit was to determine the financial status of the camp operations in relation to initial projections when the camp was conceived, to assess the administrative capabilities and performance of those responsibilities for the management and operation of the South Indian Lake construction camp, and to determine the amount of capital investment associated with establishing and maintaining the camp operations.

The other question that was asked by the Leader of the Opposition related to the follow-up in terms of that particular audit. As I mentioned, the follow-up was carried out by the Department of Northern Affairs upon receipt of the internal audit done by the department at the request of the department. Recommendations that were carried out following the audit:

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. McBRYPDE cont'd)

(1) A full-time camp clerk was hired to maintain accounts and to follow-up on outstanding accounts receivable. (2) Dominion Catering was contracted to train, instruct and manage camp operations. (3) A system of bulk buying was provided by Dominion Catering with full accord of the Purchasing Bureau. (4) The price of meals was increased to all users of the facility except the workmen belonging to the main contractor, as per contract. (5) Metropolitan Security was hired to provide protective services. (6) Administrative deficiencies identified in the audit were acted upon by the Department of Northern Affairs.

The current situation of the campsite, Mr. Speaker, is that the camp, as the construction project is completed, will be phasing down and closing out about the end of July. A final audit is scheduled to be done at that time. The department has no grounds to believe that mis-demeanour has taken place. Because of the lack of inventory control in the first year the opportunity for loss existed but no specific instances could be identified. Some generosity in providing meals to residents for their health and well-being undoubtedly took place. Further training and closer supervision of camp personnel has improved the efficiency and productivity of camp operations.

So Mr. Speaker, when the report was received the appropriate action was taken by the Department of Northern Affairs to correct the problems identified by the internal audit.

If the Leader of the Opposition has any further allegations or any further information, if he could make those available to myself then further action could be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could inform the House if a replacement has been appointed to the Animal Industry Branch, or whatever the technical term of the branch is, a replacement for Dr. Robson has been made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister might indicate when a replacement for this important branch in the department will be appointed?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is a difficult thing to be definitive about. We are trying to determine the way in which we would want to reorganize the department or, in the absence of reorganization, the structure, as to who might be a logical candidate for that position.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the appointment will be bulletined or if the Minister might inform the House if he's considering some cutback in expenditures in the department in this area.

MR. USKIW: Both possibilities are true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can an appointment of a new Chairman of the Manitoba Labour Board be expected shortly or will it await the outcome of the two June 25th by-elections?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend the . . .

MR. GREEN: Bob Wilson may be available . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should simply say to my honourable friend the appointment of a Chairman of the Labour Board to succeed that distinguished lawyer Murdoch MacKay, awaits the consideration of the Minister of Labour after his recommendation to his colleagues in Cabinet, and when that is done then the next Chairman of the Board will be appointed.

A MEMBER: It awaits his pleasure, eh?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources, and ask him if, to his knowledge, if all of the claims submitted to the Flood Assistance Board have now been dealt with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that they have all been dealt with. The last time I said there was just a few outstanding and it turned out to be several thousand, so I better

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . get at the actual figure before I respond definitively.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister would also find out if there is a delay in negotiations with the Federal Government on their share of the cost?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is any delay. There are sometimes arguments as to whether something falls into the category of what the Federal Government has agreed to share to. That may be the case, the honourable member may have some knowledge of a case of that kind, but when it is agreed that it falls within the guidelines then I don't think that there is a problem getting federal money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and would ask him: In light of the fact that Quebec will be implementing its own new packaging regulations and the Federal Government has already implemented new packaging regulations, is the Provincial Government going to be making representation to the Federal Government with regard to the standardizing of packaging in Canada?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, this perhaps may be better directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable House Leader. I wonder if at this time he could reply with a little more precision than he was able to use last week in connection with the number of bills that are still to be presented during this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there would be more than about three, possibly four, maybe not that number.

A MEMBER: Maybe five.

MR. GREEN: No, I don't think it would go higher than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and would ask him if he's had representation made to him from industry in Manitoba with regards to the new packaging regulations of the Federal Government and the Quebec Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Yes.

MR. BANMAN: Is the government now undertaking a study in the Province of Manitoba to see what the effects of this new legislation will have on provincially-based companies?

MR. TURNBULL: There is no formal study under way, Mr. Speaker, but staff of my department have been in discussion with federal people to ascertain just what might be worked out so that these two government jurisdictions will not be passing legislation which may be detrimental to Manitoba-based industries.

MR. BANMAN: I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, and would ask him if the Manitoba Design Institute is involved in studying this particular problem?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if it has not come up on the agenda of the Design Institute, but I will undertake to see whether it has been formally discussed by the Manitoba Design Institute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Health. Can the Minister indicate or have the answer supplied as to whether the department intends to provide support for the summer programs of the Lunch and After School Programs which are presently funded by the provincial department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the support that is being now provided would be adequate to carry them over the summer months, unless there is a STEP program that might be plugged in for the summer months. I'm not sure and I can take that as notice.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Acting Minister of Health also determine whether the Provincial Government is planning to provide support for the senior citizens' handyman services that provide maintenance and home making services to senior citizens at the present time?

MR. MILLER: I don't know of any program which is being planned for the summer which is not one that is carried on for the 12-month period.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to restate the question. In view of the correspondence that I have also received, a copy to the Minister of Health and other members of the government concerning the stoppage of the handyman services that are available to senior citizens, is the government considering future funding for these programs?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is referring to a federal LIP project which may be coming to an end. If that is the one he is referring to, to my knowledge the province is not at this time prepared to step in and simply resurrect a program which the Federal Government is phasing out.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for MDC. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if he has had a reply from the Chairman of MDC with regard to the possibility of CAE doing some of the work that is presently being contracted out by Saunders Aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Not as yet, Mr. Speaker. It may be the inquiries are a little bit delayed by the printing process, as usually the questions get printed and they are forwarded on. However, the chairman will be before the committee tonight. Perhaps that would be an opportune time for the honourable to put the question to him which would save it coming up again in the House. He will be before committee tonight.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if his department or he has been in contact with the Federal Government with regard to new work for the CAE plant in St. James?

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my office has been in touch with the office of the Honourable Jean Pierre Goyer, the federal Minister of Supply and Services, that is the government department responsible for purchasing by the Federal Government. I'm advised that CAE has had an opportunity to bid on many projects but that in just about every case they have not been the low bidder. I'm also advised, however, that other Manitoba companies in the aerospace industry, such as Bristol Aerospace, have been successful in recent months and have received substantial orders. However, I am getting a detailed listing of this information and when it's available I intend to make it available to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the Minister indicate whether his department or his department in company with any of the aerospace firms in Manitoba have made any effort to negotiate or develop agreements with the firms which are presently bidding for the new defence air contracts of the Federal Government in the new defence air patrol craft that they are planning to construct?

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

MR. EVANS: Well I would imagine that the Manitoba companies that are in the aerospace industry are most alert to opportunities that exist in the federal purchasing field and will take every opportunity that they can to bring business to Manitoba.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, the question I's like to put to the Minister is, in view of the fact that the new defence contract will total \$500 million, has the Department of Industry and Commerce not undertaken to determine whether there is opportunity for sub-contracting work with the various firms which are planning to bid or are now bidding on those contracts to see if we can be part of the consortiums or arrangements for those bids?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Department are in communication with most of the major companies in Manitoba, including the aerospace industry, and I'm sure there have been discussions and we are always making our services available to Manitoba companies. In this respect, I know Manitoba aerospace industries have been very aggressive

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . .in taking every opportunity to bid on federal contracts. Beyond that I don't think I can add very much at this point in time.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister in order to find out - has this government, the Provincial Government, made any specific and direct representation to federal officials who are considering the criteria for such contracts to determine whether as part of a decentralization of the aerospace industry that part of the criteria in accepting bids will be the dispersal of that work into different parts of Canada, including Manitoba where we have this fledgling aerospace industry? Has that representation been made, and has that case been made to the Federal officials in this specific defence contract proposal?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, not in regard to this specific defence proposal. But I can assure the honourable member that we have had numerous discussions with the appropriate Ministers in Ottawa, particularly the Minister of Supply and the Minister of National Defence, on this entire question of putting out more work in Western Canada, and particularly in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on this related subject, the first and thus far only joint provincial-federal show with regard to purchasing by the Federal Government, was conducted here in Manitoba a couple of months ago. I think that is indicative of our efforts to bring about greater purchasing by Ottawa in Manitoba and from Manitoba firms. But with regard to the specific matter, I think it's a bit premature, but we'll certainly follow up any suggestions that the honourable member wishes to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, one week ago the Member for Riel raised a question of the Honourable the Attorney-General regarding the legal fees for CFI, and the answer from the Honourable Attorney-General that day was "very shortly". I wonder what he means by "very shortly" - one week, two weeks, three weeks, six months?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call No. 29 on Page 2 of the Order Paper, The Payment of Wages Act.

BILL NO. 29 - THE PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 29, The Payment of Wages Act, for second reading. MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first of all, that we have at the present time a bill called The Payment of Wages Act - and that for some considerable period of time, my fellow Ministers of Labour in Western Canada and I have been meeting to consider ways and means through which we might be able better to serve the workers in our respective communities who find themselves unfortunately in a position where they're having great difficulties in collecting wages due them. And also, due to certain provisions in the present Federal Bankruptcy Act, that the order of priority for the payment of wages to a worker is considerably lower in rank than other claims.

I think first of all, Mr. Speaker, it would be only fitting and proper for me on the introduction of this bill, to refer to some remarks that I made this fall at our Labour Ministers' Conference held in Victoria. I am quoting from the remarks I made at that time: "Like other jurisdictions, Manitoba has long had a labour standards and wage collecting system. The standards themselves, of course, have been changed and added to from time to time, and will continue to do so in the future. The particular concerns I wish to raise for discussion relate to our wage collection procedures, and ways in which they might be improved. The importance of effective wage collection procedures cannot be overemphasized. Legislative standards mean very little if the means of enforcing them are limited or are weak. As is the case elsewhere in Canada, employees in Manitoba may take action on their own to collect wages owing to them under the provision of a number of statutes, such as The Wages Recovery Act. But these are not really enforced by government departments. And because of unfamiliarity with this legislation, the costs of litigation, uncertainty as to the outcome and time limits, it is

## BILL 29

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . logical for employees in most cases to rely on the department's wage collection system - and in fact it would appear that the vast majority of employees alleging wages owed to them, do so. We feel an onus, therefore, to make the system as effective as possible. We have been reviewing our own procedures in Manitoba and looking at provisions in other jurisdictions." And that, Mr. Speaker, was the basis which my colleagues and I discussed The Payment of Wages Act - and as I indicated a moment or two ago, that is one of the reasons that this bill is before us today.

Another aspect dealing with this matter, was an endeavour of the Ministers in consultation to attempt to arrive at a methodology where we would be able to have common and uniform legislation in the four prairie provinces at least, and also, to effect reciprocal agreements between the respective jurisdictions in order to overcome the difficulties that many employees have been confronted with insofar as collection of wages due to them.

So that, sir, is the basis which led to me as the Minister of Labour in Manitoba asking for the consideration of the bill at this particular time.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some notes on the proposed bill itself. The Payment of Wages Act is being re-enacted with numerous proposed amendments, and contains many of the provisions that are in the existing Act. In general, the proposed changes to the Act are intended to strengthen procedures for collection of unpaid wages by providing for such things as priority of wage claims over other types of claims, directors, wage liability, and the possible bonding of some employers. Also there is provision for transferring some of the wage collection responsibilities from the Labour Board of Manitoba to the Employment Standards Division, and for speeding up the process of wage collection.

The Act is also being amended to make it applicable completely to the Crown as well as to other employees who were previously excluded - and I refer, Mr. Speaker, to farm labourers, domestic servants and professional employees. Another suggestion contained within the proposition which is now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a provision within the Act whereby a payment of wages fund may be established by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Unpaid wages could be paid out to employees out of this fund, and thereafter the Division could take whatever legal action was necessary to recover the moneys from the employer concerned.

In more specific terms, the major changes proposed are as follows: As I indicated a moment or two ago, the Act would be applicable to the Crown, its employees, persons engaged in agriculture, fishing, farming, dairy farming, domestic service, professions, etc. At present, such persons are excluded from the application of The Payment of Wages Act. It might be noted that with the possible exception of the Crown, these same group of workers remain excluded at the present time from The Employment Standards Act, which provides for such things as minimum wages, hours of work, overtime rates, general holidays, termination of employment. As a result of the proposed changes, The Payment of Wages Act will be applicable to all workers except independent contractors and self-employed.

A new provision, sir, in the Act, provides that directors of a corporation are liable for the unpaid wages of the employee of the corporation where the corporation itself fails to pay wages. This liability extends to two months' wages and twelve months' vacation wages in respect of each employee. At present, directors may not be held personally liable under Labour Standards legislation enforced by the Department of Labour. In some cases, it is difficult to identify the actual employer of an employee, because certain businesses are closely associated or related. Therefore, a new provision stipulates that where associated or related businesses or activities are carried on through more than one person or firm, the board may determine that all or any one of such persons or firms are a single employer for the purpose of the Act and may be held jointly for unpaid wages. Experience has shown that wage claims have sometimes not been satisfied because of the higher priority given to claims of secured creditors. Therefore the new provision stipulates that claims for unpaid wages have priority over claims of all other creditors including those of the Crown and secured creditors.

Dealing with wage complaints. Where an employer fails to pay wages, the employee may within six months, it is suggested, in the proposed amendments, as against the present 90 days after the date on which the wages were due, file a complaint with the Division. The Division may investigate the matter and, if it finds the wages are owing, it may order the employer to pay those wages. If it finds that the wages are not owing, the Division may dismiss the allegation. An employer of an employee who disputes the findings of the Division has seven days in

## BILL 29

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . which to apply for a hearing before a board for the determination of the matter. Where an employer does not comply with the order of the Division, and does not apply to the board for a determination, the Division may file a copy of the Order in the County Court, whereupon the Order becomes a judgment of the County Court in favour of the Division. Similarly, where a board order is not complied with and the time for appeal has lapsed, the Division may file a copy of the order in County Court.

The above procedure is similar to the existing procedure, except that the Division rather than the board is given responsibility for filing and enforcing orders for the payment of wages. It also eliminates the need to adhere to some of the time-consuming procedures, where an employer fails to pay wages and fails to apply to the board for a determination within the prescribed time.

Another proposal in the Act, Mr. Speaker, stipulates that the Minister may require an employer to furnish security for wages in the form of a bond. Where such an employer fails to pay wages, the Minister may apply the proceeds of the bond towards the payment of the unpaid wages. If an employer fails to provide security required, the Minister may apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for an Order prohibiting the employer from carrying on business in the Province of Manitoba. At present, the board may require an employer to furnish security in the form of a bond, but only after a complaint has been received. This provision, however, has been ineffective in most cases, since very often the employer who refuses or fails to pay wages has very few if any assets remaining and is therefore unable to furnish security. Where complaint is received and the Division has knowledge that a person is indebted to the employer concerned, the Division may order that person to remit to the Division part of or all the moneys owed to the employer. The Division may then use these moneys to pay unpaid wages. This, at the present time, is being done by the board rather than the Division.

Regarding the rights of appeal, as before, a person has 15 days in which to appeal a board decision or the Order to a judge of the County Court. However, a proposed amendment provides that this right of appeal does not extend to a person who failed or refused to appear before the board when the board was considering the matter. A prosecution for an offence may not be initiated after the expiration of one year. At the present time, it is six months after the commission of the alleged offence.

I have made reference to the possible establishment of a payment of wages fund, Mr. Speaker. The reason that this is in the bill itself, is due to the fact that this has been something that has been under consideration in many jurisdictions, and we felt that it would be advisable to suggest the inclusion of the provision making it permissible to establish a fund in the Province of Manitoba while we're dealing with the Act as a whole.

A new provision stipulates that the Minister may request that the Attorney-General authorize a member of his department to act on behalf of an employee in any proceeding that may be necessary to recover unpaid wages. There are some, Mr. Speaker, that feel that since Manitoba has adopted a legal aid function, that this may not be necessary; but to be amply sure, a suggestion that the employee can receive necessary legal aid, this provision is contained within the Act. The intent here is to enable a public official to act for the employee to recover wages for an employee in accordance with procedures set out in statutes other than Labour Standards statutes - for example, The Mechanics Liens Act.

A new provision states that an employer may not discharge or threaten to discharge an employee because the employee has given information to the Division, has filed a complaint, or has testified before the board. (At the present time, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, there is no protection for the employee for giving information in respect of non-payment of wages.) Where an employee is discharged for any of the above reasons, the board may order the reinstatement of the employee with or without compensation.

Those remarks generally, Mr. Speaker, indicate the contents of the bill. I'm happy to say at this stage of introduction that, as a result of the combined representations of the Ministers of Labour in Western Canada - and some of their colleagues in other parts of Canada as well - together with help from other interested parties, there is at the present time a bill before the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, a bill which has passed second reading approval in principle in the Federal House dealing with the Bankruptcy Act is now being considered by the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. In respect of wages, the bill - a copy of which I have here, Mr. Speaker - provides as follows:

That wage earners be given priority over all creditors - something that labour and worker



## BILL 29

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . has been fighting for, for a long period of time.

Secondly, that the priority covers wage arrears up to a maximum of \$2,000 for each employee;

Thirdly, that the directors of a corporation will be personally liable for arrears in wages as well as the corporation itself.

I realize Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, that the subject matter is controversial. I realize that many people, learned in the law, will question the propriety of this bill taking precedence over a number of other bills such as the Wage Recovery Act, Mechanics Liens Act, just to name a couple, and I can appreciate in the opinions of some of my legal friends some consternation, and I'm sure that when the bill reaches committee there will be a considerable number of arguments and divided opinions. But I want to reiterate and repeat, the basic fundamental principle behind this bill, Mr. Speaker, is the protection of the wages of the worker who has earned them.

Under some of the legislation that we have on the Statute Books at the present time, provisions are made for legal action for recovery of wages and debts due for wages; but the onus is not on the department concerned, but on the individual to initiate, at self-cost, proceedings for recovery of wages. So I say one of the basic principles of this bill is to assist the worker who unfortunately has not been paid his wages - and again I say, in all frankness and sincerity, that I am pleased to know that some of the recommendations at least, made by my colleague Ministers of Labour, has found ears in Ottawa where the order of priority under the Bankruptcy Act will be changed if the bill is passed, as suggested, to give the worker top priority over taxes due to the Crown either provincially, federally, priority over sales tax and the like.

That, sir, is the introduction to this bill. I recommend to my colleagues in the Assembly that permission be granted for the bill to go to committee so that expressions of opinions as to its validity or expressions of opinion otherwise may be heard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize, I know that there are differences of opinion with a number of people, particularly in the legal profession, as to the advisability of the legislation of this type. There are those who hold to the opinion that possibly due to changes that it's no longer necessary to introduce a bill having such positive effects as this one in order to protect the employee and to ensure that he or she receives wages justly earned. Having made these observations, Mr. Speaker, in consultations with others, I think that this bill is worthy of being adopted in Manitoba. I assure all members of the Assembly that my colleagues in other jurisdictions in the west agree with the basic principle evolved. We appreciate and realize that before we can have full reciprocity insofar as payment of wages are concerned, we have to change some of our reciprocal Judgment Act provisions to become uniform, but that is something we can consider once this bill is adopted.

I also would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not positive at the present time whether the Act before us provides for this or not, but I would suggest that approval in principle be given to the bill; it possibly be passed to come into effect on proclamation following the consideration which will be given to Bill C-60 in the Federal House - that is the Bankruptcy Act - so that we will not find ourselves in a position of conflict with the orders of priority that may be established and other provisions of the payment of wages. If this is done and this bill comes in on proclamation following Bill 60 and representations made at the federal authority, I think it would be to our advantage. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I'm thoroughly convinced that the basic principle contained in the bill that I have the honour to present for the consideration of this House is worthy of the support of all of the members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the House Leader, I'm not just sure where we stand on the Order Paper. I understand there may be some second readings, adjourned debates on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take the second readings in order as they are. Very well.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you would kindly do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 41. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

BILL NO. 41 - MONEYS FOR CAPITAL PURPOSES FOR MTS

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first read this bill I thought it was something I could go along with without any trouble, because there's a lot of computer work these days and I thought possibly the centralizing of it would be a good thing. But as I gave it more thought I had to think of other businesses that the government has been in and they never made a very good job of running them. There was lots of work for them, like Flyer Coach, and there was all sorts of market for the product but between management and the way they were handled there was nothing but money being put into them and it has been a source of losing money ever since they started, and I began to think that this might be just something the same. And I'm wondering, in Manitoba today, how is it that the CN and the CP, who had a staff of 18 to 20, have reduced it to 3 or 4 at the present time, and I'm wondering if this here new computer data centre is supposed to be competing for private business as well as doing government business. And in the government business, the Hydro has their own computer machines, the Liquor Commission have their own computers, and so have the telephone and these. And I'm just wondering are they not better served by having their own machine and specializing in the work rather than having it go over there, and I know that it will probably be followed through, but what's going to become of these computers at the present places now? I'm just wondering, have we got to buy them all? We're talking about a large amount of money; it's talking about \$10 million to go into it. I'm thinking, we're probably going into something that isn't going to pay its own way, because at the present time there's people in this field who aren't fully employed, they could do more work. And then I'm wondering about the Phoenix Data Processing Centre that the government got involved in a few years ago; it's been losing money. I think that we lost about a half a million on it last year. Are we bailing it out? Is it going to be in the new building?

So, I'm reluctant to see the government going into another form of looking after, shall we say, because so far the ones they've went into, they've cost us money. And not only that, but the people who are in the business today, if these people lose money it's not going to come out of the telephone account which, I'm very happy, it's going to be kept separate although it's a subsidiary of it. But the very people who are running these computer machines now and trying to compete for work . . . and if it comes that they're paying for it out of the general revenue, actually they'll be helping to furnish the government with competition. So the way I feel about it, I think that the government should not go into this at this time. I think that they should try and advertise their work out for bid. I think probably that they'd get bids on it that would be more competitive and maybe we'd be saving money. I don't see any point in the government going into it just so as it's got another industry going that's losing money, because I've heard the government say that too often and to me, I'm one of those persons that think if you go into business in anything, that you should try to see that it pays its own way or makes money. I'm afraid that this one here is probably one that's going to end up by losing money, it's going to have to be subsidized. I don't know how we're going to check up on it; if it happens to get enough of the government work and it's written into the other departments, we won't know just whether it's paying or not.

I feel that at this time I'd like to see the government not going into this computer center and exploring more, putting their work out for private bids and leaving the computers in the Hydro building and in the Liquor Commission and every other place where they have their own computers and let these people look after their own. I'm really afraid that we're going to be putting \$10 million into a building and then subsidizing it afterwards and really helping to stifle private enterprise again because there won't be anybody else try to come in and do a bigger job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, addressing some remarks to this particular bill, I'm afraid that to begin with, the basic handicap that there has been so many words expressed in the past in this House about the dangers of government control and government enterprise and arch socialism and all the other kinds of hyperbole that daily passes for rational debate in this House, that when a bill finally comes along in which those dangers are real and apparent, that in order to try and express the kind of concerns you have, it falls into that kind of discourse that sounds commonplace and ordinary because the vocabulary has been so worn-out by the constant call to alarm. It's like the old story of the boy who cries "wolf", that you can only do it so many times, so when the real danger appears it's not very easy to make

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . the case because the words almost fail one in terms of describing the consequences or possible consequences that really could have a damaging and severe effect upon the operation of government in this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that for all the innocuousness by which this bill has been presented, it looks exceedingly innocent in its form on that while sheet of paper called Bill 41, and yet I think that it really is a subterfuge; that if one begins to examine more carefully what we're being asked to approve, one can see that it carries with it a number of very serious questions about the nature of operation of a government in this present day and age. I suppose, if nothing else, that danger is created by the fact that we're dealing with the computer and the computer in our own day and age has begun to take on the symbolism of modern technology, it's become the arch representation of the new order of industrial technological society, and having had to use computers a fair amount in my own work, I realize that in fact, they really are pretty simple machines, in fact, in terms of storing equipment, storing information and being able to have a much quicker recall than most human beings but, in fact, the complication of a computer is not that difficult.

What is far more difficult and far more complex is the organization by which computers are owned and operated, and I suppose that anyone who has been following American news lately would come to the realization that as the anti-trust suits against IBM begin to become introduced in the United States we're finally beginning to get a peek into that very mysterious world of computer manufacturing, marketing and servicing. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is that particular area which gives me some cause to concern, so that when the bill came along I tried to decipher in some way what we are really attempting to do and whether it really made sense. I know that the Minister when he presented his bill gave us a case for efficiency, of centralizing the five or six major computer centres that are presently operating in the government, and I believe that the basis for that goes back to a report prepared for the government by a consultant that they hired from the United States, Mr. Campbell by name, and I think that there can be on the surface a fairly serious case made for efficiency in government. But the problem I think was well posed by the Premier last night when he said you can hire two experts and get three or four different opinions. I think that that is the case, that there is certainly a good deal of dispute, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, about what really constitutes the efficient use of computer systems and how, in fact, government itself can become, if it's not careful, captive to a marketing arrangement and to a centralized organizational setup which does two very major things.

First, it provides for an escalation and aggregation in costs which are very difficult to control. And they're very difficult to control, Mr. Speaker, first, because no one except the few experts who run them really know what the costs are, that it's very difficult for laymen such as ourselves in this Legislature to be able to effectively determine the kind of dollars involved in a major computer setup. It's much easier for us to spend the five or six hours we did last night haranguing about the two cent increase in gas tax, that's something that is still within the orbit of understanding of the layman politicians, it's something that we can sort of get our teeth into, and maybe that's why we spend so much time debating those kinds of issues, because they are simple to understand.

But the case I'd like to make to this House, Mr. Speaker, is that the proposal put forward in terms of amalgamation or centralization of computer services is not less important than the kind of debate we got into last night, but it's much more difficult for a Legislative Chamber to assign accountability and responsibility to, because so much of what is attached to computer operation is interpreted and versed in pretty technical language, in scientific and pseudo-scientific expertise, so that in fact part of the whole ambition is to confuse and to make it into a closed world. As a result, Mr. Speaker, you find that in many cases the world of the computer becomes an uncontrollable world. I think that there's no clearer case than if one would refer back to the series of articles that were written in the Globe and Mail back in December of 1973 which I am sure some of the members have, which carried with them the description of the computer setup in the Ontario government and use the findings of the committee on government productivity of the Ontario government that spent about two or three years looking into the problem, use the findings of that to make some fairly important kinds of conclusions.

First is that it would probably be much better if governments did not have their own computer operation run and owned by government but in fact would tender out for private

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . firms because, for one simple reason, it was a better way of controlling costs, that the only way of making any kind of control is to make sure the computer experts had to bid against one another, that you had to sort of flush them out in the open and make sure they had to play their hand openly, which can only be accomplished by a tender system.

The other fact that came through loud and clear to me, Mr. Speaker, meaning that report of the Ontario committee, was that in fact the centralization of computer facilities carries with it a lot of hidden costs. We had a slight debate last evening with the Premier and the Minister of Mines about what constitutes a hidden cost. To my mind a hidden cost is one that can't be detected through the conventional instruments that we apply in a democratic system such as estimates debates because, to begin with, if you set up a large computer establishment using the new large IBM 37168 which are the newest machines which I gather are the proposal that the government plans to introduce, you immediately acquire a very large overhead, that it requires a much heavier overhead than the smaller decentralized machine.

So I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that we spend a moment and ask why are we doing this? I think it goes back, really, to the fact that the major computer users in the government system - Liquor Commission, Manitoba Hydro, Autopac and other groups - had two or three years ago plans for expanding their own hardware so that they could acquire a heavier capacity, and it seemed only logical at that point to ask the question that rather than expanding four or five different kind of computer facilities wouldn't it be easier to consolidate them all into one machine and provide for a common usage and common programming facilities and suchlike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question that comes first, to centralize it means you have to phase out your existing machines. To phase them out is immediately a dollar loss, because it's very difficult, particularly with the kind of equipment the Provincial Government has, to find a resale market because they are somewhat old-fashioned but they could be upgraded. That's the point, they could be upgraded, probably at less cost if you add up the cost of brand new machines - two or three major 37168's which are big machines and expensive machines - as well as to provide them into a new physical facility, into a new building, into a brand new kind of government construction which I gather is also going to have the side value, at least we're told, of rejuvenating the downtown core of Winnipeg. So I suppose that the rest of the downtown core can, rather than being entertained in the beer parlours on Main Street, can go and watch the computers whirring away as one aspect of their rejuvenation. But I won't deal with that particular argument, Mr. Speaker. The mere fact is that the replacement cost of this new machinery is going to be a very significant factor. Secondly, is the overhead applied to it.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of the indirect costs associated with a large centralized computer, and that comes down to issues like what happens when all your operators are tied to one machine if that particular segment of the public service decided to go on strike. The whole works get tied up. You're no longer simply having Hydro and Telephone Systems and Autopac, each of which are under different bargaining units, you are now, sort of in a sense, captive to one small bargaining point, one small bargaining unit. And if there's been any lesson learned in the last two or three years of public service disputes, it is the whole sort of, a building incapacity for small groups of public servants located in strategic locations to hold up for ransom the rest of the government. We've seen examples of how 20 dock workers in Vancouver can hold up the whole grain shipping movement. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we'd be putting ourselves in the same vulnerable position in this respect if we all of a sudden tied in every bit of any processing this government does to one unit of control; that all of a sudden we may find ourselves some day with the whole machinery being tied up or being held up for that kind of costs. So I think that it is those kinds of indirect or secondary considerations that must be raised about it.

Now, the case I want to make then, Mr. Speaker, is that this is not necessarily cost-efficient but may be highly expensive, particularly when you relate it to the alternative, because that's the one thing we haven't heard the Minister speak about in his own presentation, that is, Mr. Speaker, that there is alternative. And as I took some time to consult with people in the computer field, they suggested to me that really what the government is doing was the fashionable attitude in the late 1960s to consolidate and concentrate and centralize,

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . but in fact it would be much more efficient and probably much more utilitarian if in this day and age, rather than centralizing, they maintained a decentralized computer system which was tied together by a network, having a common data basis, but breaking the different components and using the machine separately, that you could get a much more economical use. Now that is an alternative to the present program that we're talking about, as well as would do away with any necessity of building a new building.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I must, I suppose, beg the apology of members of the House if I act with some skepticism when I hear the First Minister and other members of the economic benches say to us that they are desperately concerned about costs, and desperately concerned about holding the line on government spending, because they are prepared, it seems, to undertake a fairly major debenture of \$10 million, plus all the other additional personnel costs, at a time when capital is highly expensive, when it may not be necessary. And so when they say, "Show us where you can save money," well Mr. Speaker, I suppose if you wanted a simple answer we could save the government a lot of money if we simply put Bill 41 in limbo and had an opportunity to examine it more fully. So when they ask the question - I'm afraid they're asking it rhetorically because I don't think they are really serious about the issue then it would strike me that what they are trying to adopt in this case is a computer system which may not in fact be necessary, and because it may not be necessary it may be even doubly expensive over and above the actual placement cost that we're looking at. So, Mr. Speaker, on that one line of argument alone, I would suggest that the proposal coming under Bill 41 from the dollars and cents kinds of criteria may be a mistake.

But, Mr. Speaker, even beyond that, even if the Minister with all his elocution and wisdom was able to convince me that somehow he was going to save money, he would still not convince me that the presentation put forward in this bill is a very wise course for this government to follow. It comes down, Mr. Speaker, to a fundamental question about the whole problem of information in government; that if you look at the experience now in many governments around the world, we find that perhaps the most serious danger that is posed to the operation of a democratic system rests on two areas. One is the disclosure of government information to citizens, to know what's going on, and the difficulty by which governments acquire very quickly, through the use of computer, a very heavy and almost impenetrable system of monopoly over information; that we are witnessing down in the United States now, that through the results of a centralized computer system, there is now a combination of information trade-offs or exchanges between FBI files and local police files and income tax files and health and security files, and so all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, every single vital statistic about every one of us in this Chamber and every Manitoban is now going to be put on all the same cards, and it just takes a simple matter of reprogramming to all of a sudden splay out - to . . . we don't know, the complete and total profile of every citizen. --(Interjection)-- Well Mr. Speaker, and that's the point. That already is coming close to exist, eh? The question is, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is going through, and if this Minister of Consumer Affairs and this government had any real concern, there would be a companion piece to it, and that is a bill on the rights of information, to protect against the invasion of privacy that may be involved in this kind of operation, and to also ensure that there is full disclosure of information that should be made available to the citizens.

I raised a question a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of Health and Social Development, about the question of the confidentiality and access to the files and information that is used on clients for the Department of Health and Social Development. In fact we didn't receive a very satisfactory answer. He said, "Well, we've had no complaints." Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, we've had no complaints because that is part of the invisible curtain of government; because really what the kind of dangers that we're getting into is that all of a sudden we're setting up the worst kind of tyranny, and that is a monopoly of information, and unless there is a companion piece that goes along with a bill such as this which provides for the rights of citizens in relation to the disclosure of information and, more importantly, provides very stringent security precautions in the use of computer programming and the use of computer information and the use of data, then this bill represents a very significant and serious danger.

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

Now it's not one that the citizens are going to be marching the streets on, and I think that in part the Ministers on this side have a tendency to put up straw men as their argument. I've listened to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources saying, "Well, no one's throwing stones at me about the gas tax." Well, maybe this is simply because he doesn't make himself a target, or whatever the reason may be. But the fact is that there are many problems and many difficulties and many dangers to individual rights which are not made visible to people, and part of our job as elected representatives is to bring attention to those facts, and that we don't need a demonstration on the steps in order to try and use our own intelligence and our own ability to try and decipher the implications of legislation such as this, and detect where dangers may exist. And, Mr. Speaker, I have said with every possible emphasis I can, that this bill represents that kind of danger, and unless we are prepared to provide the proper safeguards and the proper protection against the use of information that is now being compiled and collated and gathered and stored in the computer systems of this government and other governments - because I don't say that this is the only purveyor of the problem; I'm saying that every government has a responsibility to do it - unless we are able - and business organizations in fact - my greatest disappointment with this bill is that there isn't a companion piece to it, providing that kind of protection and that kind of safeguard. Because if we don't become a little bit more vigilant about the dangers, those invisible dangers to our rights, then, Mr. Speaker, invisibly those rights will evaporate and we will not be left with very much in the end, because really what's happening is that if you talk about one of the real dangers of a centralizing position where you've got telephone system information, and health and social development information, and taxation information, and Liquor Commission, and it's all on the same data base, then if you have followed in any case the issue that's now being raised in Eastern Canada and the United States about computer sabotage, you'd realize that you're placing a few individuals in a strategically critical position where they can correlate or use that information because they're the only ones that have the keys to unlock the door.

It really raises some real problems, both in terms of computer espionage and the security against it, of who uses that information and for what purposes. Does all of a sudden the information that is acquired on a client for the Department of Health and Social Development end up for use by officials of the Department of Consumer Affairs when they're considering loans or considering other actions in those areas? Does the information that's compiled by Student Aid or is the information acquired by Hydro in terms of people's addresses and incomes and so on, where is this information being used and what safeguard is in this bill to make sure that this new corporation that we're setting up is a corporation that would come before this House for examination? Are the basic rights put down in the Corporation Act to provide this protection? Mr. Speaker, none of that is in this Act. We are being asked to establish a corporation that will centralize the computer operations of this government, which will carry on to itself immense powers of monopoly of information with no accompanying safeguards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not and should not be allowed to pass this House in that form, because if we pass it, then we are being negligent in our responsibilities and our rights to make sure that those issues of civil liberties and the rights of people are protected. And, Mr. Speaker, because we're into Speed-up, we don't have any opportunity to present our own amendments, to present our own qualifications to it, so simply say to the Minister in the clearest language possible, this Act is only half a piece, and while I'll quarrel with even the question of whether we should be centralizing in its own right, we certainly should not be centralizing without the proper safeguards against the invasion of privacy, nor should we not be centralizing unless there is also built into that Corporation Act it's being asked to establish, issues about what kind of information should the private citizen have the right to be disclosed to himself. Because, for example, Mr. Speaker, we have seen many times in this House, when we look at the operation of the big government departments which are active in areas of environment and which are active in areas of public works, and which are active in areas of major kinds of activities that could have an effect upon the environment, could have a damaging effect upon the social and economic procedures in this province, one of the reasons why the Opposition is often frustrated and limited in its

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . abilities is because we don't have the ammunition to use, we don't have the ability, because it's all being locked up.

I heard the Minister of St. Johns saying, with great sort of regret, he would be the first to say that any information the government has should be made available. Well, horsefeathers to that, Mr. Speaker, because that would be a song and dance day when they would make a lot of that information available to members, not only on the other side, but to private industry. How open and accessible are the Hydro files to the groups opposing them on the northern flooding problems? Really how open and accessible was the data that they compiled? Not very accessible at all. So, in the same question, we've . . . God, how many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, have we argued that we want to see the kinds of figures and data that are being produced in the public service insurance area? Not very available. So when the Minister of St. Johns makes that statement, I would say that he himself has probably very quickly had a lapse of memory what goes on in the Cabinet room, because there have been many cases and incidences where there has been a preservation on information, and I believe that government has certain rights to preserve in areas where there is confidentiality concerned, or where there is comments made on individuals, that when government itself is becoming the greatest storehouse of economic and social data that we have, to say that that data should be locked away for their eyes only, only for the use of their experts, means that in fact we are putting a very distinct - and, I would say, doing it consciously - a distinct handicap on the ability and capacity of a variety of private groups and opposition groups and so on, to provide alternatives, because in an age when you're dealing with highly technical subjects, dealing in an area where the world is no longer a simple matter of problems that the layman can understand but needs a kind of complicated information in order to make useful and articulate kinds of responses to government programs, if that information is locked away, then there's just no opportunity for alternative positions, there is not opportunity for alternative cases to be made. We're simply flying blind, and it is no wonder that government when it's in power, whoever is in government, whether it's Liberals or Conservatives or New Democrats, whoever happens to be sitting in the Chair at that time, has a distinct and major advantage.

So all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we have a bill presented to us which had the opportunity, as it was setting up this corporation, to take some forward steps in providing for greater rights of disclosure and greater rights of access to information, in establishing basic rights of access to information, to ensure that that computer facility, that centralized sort of . . . that we're going to be locating down somewhere around Main Street, would be not a data center with sort of high walls that only government professionals, experts, and officials can use, but in fact that bill should have contained basic rights of access for private citizens as well. Then we might have been making some progress. We might have been making some kind of advance in terms of maintaining an open system. But as it is now, Mr. Speaker, all we're being asked to do, in effect, is to aggrandize and exaggerate the already overweening power that is often contained in government because of its monopoly on information. We're simply saying, boy, let's give it more tools and more instruments and more capacity and more centralizing, to create a higher and more impenetrable monopoly.

Well, that, Mr. Speaker, is the kinds of concerns that I want to raise about this bill, because I think it goes to some fundamental issues about operation of government. And as I said at the outset, it's difficult to try to put forward the case because we have cried "wolf" so long and in so many ways about the dangers of government takeover and the dangers of government monopolies, that when something serious really does come along and we have to use the same language, it somehow loses its impact because, in fact, it sounds the same as what we said before.

But I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that my own feelings of this case do not come into the normal rhetoric of political exchange that is often heard in this House. I seriously think that this kind of bill can pose very serious problems down the road, not just for this government, but if and when and how the time comes that they're sitting on the opposite side, they're going to feel the same way. And I think if we had any concern about the basic rights of individuals in this province, then I think that we must insist that this kind of consolidation and centralization of information, pool of information ability, have, and go along with it, a much clearer definition in terms of the corporation that's

## BILL 41

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . going to be set up and the terms of reference and the bill that will be written into the company's Act, a very clear indication of what rights of privacy will be protected and what rights of disclosure will be obtained by private citizens in this new age of computer monopolies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): Well, just on the last few points raised by the Member for Fort Rouge, if I did not see this as but a step in the direction mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge, in that information should be in the public domain, I wouldn't support the bill. Because I, too, share his concerns about monopolies of information. In fact, for the past few years that I've been involved in politics, the fellows who have been here since '69 will tell you they get sick and tired of me talking about a Human Resource Research Council. The only information, in my view, which should remain privy, is that relative to an individual and that which is under consideration by governments for immediate planning, that all information should be in the public domain. If we move in this direction that all information is in the public domain as much as possible, then it becomes a matter of what assumptions are made, as you wander through the available data, to which your conclusions will be; that if we can understand the assumptions made by different people as they view the data, then we can better understand the conclusions that they arrive at.

But nevertheless, in his comments that, you know, that this government hasn't provided information, I would suggest that is not true. If it has done anything, it has over-provided information; there is actually a cacophony of information. I recall the Leader of the Opposition, relative to Hydro, taking the reports which are all the information which had been gathered up to that point in time, and dumping them on the floor, and this, you know, this epitomizes the difficulty that we face in that really people can be given the information but they don't know how to deal with it, because they can't assimilate it or interrelate it or anything else. But nevertheless I, too, share his concern because in one of my earlier speeches in the Legislature relative to storage of information, I paraphrased what Rothschild had said, that he didn't care what politics were prevalent in the country as long as he can control the economy. We're perhaps moving in the direction that the control of information is really outweighing the control, you know, of dollars in the economy. But I see this as a step in the direction that will give us the capacity, and I have the assurance that we will move in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Would the Minister permit a question? Could the Minister point out, though, that in this particular bill, or really in any other statute in the Province of Manitoba, where it is very clearly set out, the statutory rights of disclosure and protection against invasion of privacy that would accompany the establishment of this facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I couldn't point it out, you know, in this particular bill, but nevertheless, this government has more than demonstrated their inclination to proceed in this direction with the consumer protection type of legislation that we brought in. Information which is in systems relative to individuals has to be accurate, and people have to have access to that information, and the transmittal of that information in an irresponsible manner puts the person who provides the information in a position of libel, I suggest; he's liable for the accuracy and for what happens relative to the dispensing of that information. But in a chapter-verse, regardless of what government is in power, you can only rely on their integrity to do just what you suggest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am also concerned about several things involved with this bill, and I would like to probably just reiterate what several of the speakers have said before. No. 1, of course, is the bureaucratic build-up that we see taking place right now; and the No. 2 issue, of course, is the loss to the Legislature, I think, as far as the scrutinizing of different testaments in different departments. And I would just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, like to show what has happened with regard to computer processing in another related company - which is, of course, owned by the



## BILL 41

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) . . . . the government - and I think it points out the point that I'm trying to make with regard to the build-up and also the loss of ability for the Legislative Assembly to scrutinize the estimates. I don't think we have to go very far and just have a look at Phoenix Data, what happened to that particular company.

In 1973, that company showed a deficit of \$551,000. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the company was purchased when the company that had loaned money from the Manitoba Development Corporation went bankrupt and the Manitoba Government purchased that computer center for what they felt at that time was a very low price because it was bid on. Now, Mr. Speaker, last year they mentioned that they were going to have a break-even position this year, and they almost did, in that they lost \$32,700, but all we have to do is look at the revenues that that particular company derived. In the year 1973 they derived \$154,000 from computer time and associated charges from the Province of Manitoba and Crown agencies, and in 1974 they sold computer time and associated charges to the province and Crown agencies to the tune of \$881,000, which means that they sold roughly \$650,000 more computer time to the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make here is that in a particular thing like a computer, which is sort of an abstract thing and I think most of us over here couldn't put one's finger onto exactly what productivity is derived from the particular computer or what exactly the cost benefit of a computer is, I think you can see very clearly by this small illustration that what can happen is that we can start charging different government agencies, whether it's the Department of Education for having students coming in and using computer time, and charging the Department of Education for that, or you can have related Crown agencies coming in and charging them for computer time, and nobody really understanding or seeing what is happening, with no checks on this particular large installation. And as mentioned by the Member from Fort Rouge, you go ahead and centralize all the Crown agencies, what's going to happen is that if you do have a strike, or a related strike in that particular field, there are very few people can tie up the whole machinery of the government and make it virtually impossible to function. And I think their bargaining position, of course, in this particular case, would be very good.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few words and the apprehensions expressed by my colleague from Pembina and also the Member from Fort Rouge, I couldn't see myself supporting this bill at this time to going ahead and spending another \$10 million of taxpayers' money and getting into a highly competitive and highly obsolescent type equipment of the Manitoba Government.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add a few comments in this debate at this time. I, like my honourable colleagues from Pembina and from La Verendrye, am concerned about the bill before us and what the actual intent of the government is at this time to deal, or to handle this particular corporation that they're setting up. I'm not quite as concerned as the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge with regard to disclosure of privacy, because I take the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to his word and I understand, in his introduction of the bill at second reading, that the centralization would not include the Health Services facilities and it would not include post-secondary education areas, and I would presume that a lot of the personal history of individuals would be included in these particular computer centres at the present time. Also, Mr. Speaker, in my past business experience, I had the opportunity of working with a consulting firm that used to rent computer time from the computer centre at the Norquay Building and also out at the University centre, so that the possibility of someone stealing information from those sites, if it is possible, probably could have already taken place, and I would presume that there are present precautionary measures that look after this.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also had the opportunity back in my early business days to sell computers, and it's a very competitive market because computer companies also sell services, and this is what alarms me when we look and heard the Minister in his presentation indicate that - if I can quote him - that they would hopefully, by centralizing the computer facilities, be able to go out in the private and public sector and be competitive and gain business for the centre, and obviously to help it operate and cover its costs. But one of the things that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that any computer company, whether it

## BILL 41

MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . .be Honeywell, IBM and the others, they have two features they sell when they sell a computer. One is called "hard wear" - that's the actual animal that does the calculations; and the other feature that they sell is called "soft wear". And soft wear is the people. They are the professional people who are trained to program the computer; they're trained to go out into a firm and say, "What are your problems in accounting or in data processing?" And they sit down and they have the ability to analyze the problems, go back and program their computer, and sell you time. And this is basically what the Honourable Minister is talking about. But the computer companies, the major ones, float these people around from province to province, because it's very difficult to maintain the expertise in one location because it becomes physically impossible from a competitive point of view. Now I would suggest, if the Minister is sincere in his comments when he introduced the bill that they were going to go out in the private sector and compete, that he will be building up what is called the soft wear component.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this then tells us, as my honourable colleague from Pembina has stated earlier, will obviously start to build up your overhead. And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that what could happen if this route is followed is that there will be a budget come in and they'll say, "We need a couple of programmers; we need a couple of salesmen," and they will try and develop this expertise. And then the next excuse will be, "Well, now that we have this, we have to go out and sell more time," and so forth. So that we can see where this thing could blossom into a large toy - and I call it a toy because in our experience in dealing with different governments and even in the municipal government, when you get involved with a computer, whether it be an analog or a digital - and we're talking about digital computers here - there is a tendency of administration people in government administration to think that there is a need for a computer at times when there isn't, but the very fact they have a central computerized system they have to justify its need, its use, then you will get these toys being put in around the province when in fact they probably are not required.

So, Mr. Speaker, it to me looks like we're not just getting involved in centralizing the computer facilities for the government, but we're now developing a corporation that could blossom into something that later will become a very huge white elephant that will have cost the taxpayers many dollars, but we won't be able to get rid of the while elephant because we're locked into its operation in the government day-to-day operations.

Mr. Speaker, the next question that we raise on this side is why the reason to deal with the Telephones? We can accept the proposals that are put forward by the Honourable Minister when he introduced the bill that, you know, it's a natural tie-up because of the communication link, the utilization of telephone lines for the different stations to feed back into the computer, but they already have this. The computer centres that exist here, or the stations that are located here, will still utilize these telephone lines and the Telephone System will get this business, so that really the two aren't that closely related when you get into the expertise of the soft wear end of it. And, Mr. Speaker, one then starts to wonder: is this, as my honourable colleague from Pembina indicated, a method to bail out Phoenix Data? Or in fact is this a method to expand Phoenix Data now under the guise of the Telephone System? Because as we go further into the Act, there's the principle that the Telephone System in future can raise the money for any future expansion. Now all of a sudden we no longer have to deal with MDC in approving loans. At any time that the Minister wants to expand his computer business, he can utilize the Telephone System's credit, its borrowing ability, and he will be able to bring in his capital estimate here and say, "We need \$10 million." And he has this little corporation running in one corner of trying to develop computer business in Manitoba.

So we are very concerned about this bill, Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues have indicated who have taken part in this debate prior to myself. We're very concerned of why this approach. And we question whether in fact it is the most efficient approach because there are obviously many hidden costs involved if the Honourable Minister expands into the computer field, like he was talking about in his introduction.

And Mr. Speaker, also, I believe, the Minister introduced during his debate, or part of the debate, that there appeared to be a lack of proper service for facilities outside of Winnipeg and Brandon, I would think, the urban areas that the Minister's talking about,

## BILL 41

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . . for private industry to utilize computer facilities, but what the Minister doesn't realize, or he failed to mention if he does realize it, that the Telephones or this corporation will still have to have those trained technical and professional people to go out and service these centres in the same way that the computer people have at the present time, so that he will not overcome that problem. He still will have to physically have on hand these people who are capable of making the necessary repairs - and it's not just as simple as repairing telephones; that these are specially trained people that have the knowledge of the equipment and they also have the knowledge and ability to program many of them and to develop programs.

So I believe, in sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that the government in my opinion is taking too big a jump. If what the Minister said in his introduction is a major portion or a major thrust in this bill that's before us, they want to get into the business both private and public, they want to offer this service, because Mr. Speaker, we can see that it will become an amplified Phoenix Data that will utilize the Manitoba Telephone System's name in its borrowing power to cover up any problems which might occur in the future - and we think there will be problems - and will cover up any debate that might take place here if it was under something like the MDC. So for this reason, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support the bill at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker, may I, on a point of personal privilege, appeal to you for better delivery of the Hansard. I don't see how we can possibly carry on with this Speed-up in the House, Mr. Speaker. We haven't got the Hansard. I haven't even got the remarks of the Minister who had introduced this Bill 41, although I was prepared to speak on it this afternoon. We don't have the Hansard and I do appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, some way we can speed it up. --(Interjection)-- Well, I do withdraw that. I've received the information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. If the honourable member would check with his House Leader I'm sure he'd get things organized.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has spoken already. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . on a point of order. I think if there's any blame I'll have to take it. It wasn't the House Leader that asked for these . . . notes, it was myself, and I did have a copy of them but I didn't distribute them to all members of Caucus. It was not the House Leader's fault.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs is out.

Bill No. 44. The Member for Gladstone. (Stand)

Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. (Stand)

Bill No. 48. The Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

That's the list of bills. The Honourable House Leader. Except 16 and 40 on Page 1 - for Third Reading, 16? Does the Honourable Minister of Mines wish to speak to Bill . . . or is that in Committee of the Whole?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Bill 16 is . . . by the Committee of the Whole House.

No, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I refer honourable members to Page 33 of their Estimates Book. We were on Resolution 70 (a). The Honourable Minister of Labour has 20 minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: How many?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Twenty minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: The other day, Mr. Chairman, I spoke of certain incidents of the past. I think it would be now fitting and proper for me to make some observations, as the Minister of Labour, of events of today. And when I used the word 'past' a moment or two ago, I was referring to the immediate past and occurrences in the House.

But today I want to dwell for a few moments on what I conceive as one of the most unfortunate periods in the whole history of labour-management relations since Confederation. I cannot conceive of any fair-minded, intelligent person in Canada, as well as other countries, I cannot conceive of anyone viewing the happenings of today without a sincere degree of apprehension. I realize that some of the things that I may say at this stage may not find favour with the trade union movement, with management, or with government, for it seems to me as I observe what is going on in Canada and across the world, there is an utter lack of responsibility to covenants, to agreements, and to the law of the land. It seems today that no one gives a damn about agreements, whether they're agreements in connection with labour-management relations or otherwise. I find, as I study the situation and the observations being made by many today as to what is wrong with the community, that no one really - at least in my opinion - faces up to the fact that what is wrong today is a gradual ominous weakening of responsibility.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, as an old trade unionist both chronologically and otherwise, that there was a time when a collective agreement meant something. It meant that that was a condition of employment for the duration of the period of the collective agreement. I find today in many cases it doesn't mean a continental; that where two parties have agreed to certain conditions of employment and signed an agreement today, a week from today it doesn't mean a continental. I don't fault labour alone because of that, because the responsibility has to be shared by management. I don't say that this applies to all of the trade union movement and to all collective agreements, but I suggest that it's time that we took a very close look at the covenants and the agreements that we enter into.

I have seen, as I'm sure members of this Assembly have seen, utter defiance of the law by both management and labour and individuals. Time after time in this House we hear speakers of all parties talk about irresponsible youth, talk about the directions that our youngsters are travelling today, and question those youngsters, when we at the same time in our respective areas of jurisdiction do not face up to our responsibilities. I find from time to time presumed labour experts of all political parties and of all inclinations say that we need more legislation in order to prevent strikes. But, Mr. Chairman, when we look at legislation dealing with strikes, for instance, I think I can point out that legislation is not the answer to our problems.

I noted with a great deal of interest certain resolutions passed at a recent convention of the Opposition - and I'm not trying in this to be politically antagonistic, but to illustrate what I mean - resolutions which asked that the Assembly should consider legislating against strikes in the public service. Mr. Chairman, we've had on the books in this province for many a year no prohibitions for the right to strike with hydro workers of the Winnipeg Hydro, but there was the threat of strike. We had a prohibition insofar as the provincial hydro worker was concerned. There could conceivably have been a strike. For years we had the prohibition of strike with the police in Manitoba, and there was no strike. They have the right to strike today, and there was no strike because of the fact that they accept responsibilities. There was no legislation ever that I am aware of which would have prevented our nurses from going on strike. They had the right to strike and they used it in order to assist in obtaining their objectives, and I don't fault them for it, because Mr. Chairman, if we'd had the legislation to prohibit it it wouldn't have mattered a damn, it could have happened. We've had nurses strike across Canada in various jurisdictions where they were deprived of the right by legislation of so doing. We've had trouble after trouble after trouble in the postal areas across the country where there had been prohibitions in some sections against strikes, but there were strikes. We've had legislation introduced, compulsorily, in respect of the railroad worker prohibition of strike, after due course, but didn't terminate the strike at that particular time.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

And so the story goes. I say that we're an irresponsible group of people living today when we consider our attitudes in the field of labour-management relations. We had management in a strike that apparently finished today, that in accordance with information revealed had arrived at a collective agreement and then decided, or some official decided well, it was a mistake, we shouldn't have done it, we shouldn't have agreed with you to the terms and conditions, and yet the strike was prolonged for another ten or twelve weeks, and just been resolved after management and labour had come to what was considered to be a satisfactory collective agreement to each.

And I say, Mr. Chairman, that we in our respective positions have got to start facing up to reality in the industrial world, and in particular insofar as union-management relations are concerned. And we as legislators cannot turn around and say, we haven't our responsibility as well, because we have, we've been ignoring it.

For all too long we have been wont to only attempt to solve difficulties on a piecemeal basis. In many jurisdictions in this Dominion of ours Legislative Assemblies have found it necessary, indeed, it could have conceivably happened here in Manitoba, that by legislation we would compel people to get back on the job during periods of discussion of problems that should not have reached the stage of strike.

I have tried in my limited way, without very much success I admit, to attempt to sell different concepts of the settlement of disputes among which is an agreement to enter into voluntary binding arbitration on parties concerned. It hasn't been done. Mr. Chairman, if we legislate, as we do from time to time, compulsory arbitration doesn't work because there is open defiance.

I'm sorry that I as a Minister of Labour find it necessary on the introduction of my estimates to have to dwell on this particular aspect of today's relationships between management, labour and government. And I plead with all concerned to put greater effort into trying to resolve these differences that exist today.

We were fortunate here in Manitoba, and still to some degree, fortunate in that for many years we've had very stable labour-management relations. The number of work stoppages and time lost from industrial disputes have generally been small in comparison with most other jurisdictions. It sounds well for Manitoba; it is well for Manitoba. But I'm not speaking today just simply as the Minister of Labour in Manitoba, I'm speaking as a Minister of Labour who has had an opportunity of discussing with colleagues of the same ministry across Canada similar problems, and they are alike. We have to take a very close look at ourselves. I say compulsion is not the answer, education is.

I call upon management and labour to band themselves together with co-operative management union or, if there is no union, management-employee relations committees to constantly work throughout the year, so that when it comes time to start open negotiations for changes in collective agreements, they understand each other.

We are all too wont today in my opinion, to lay the blame on the ever-increasing inflation to the field and to pinpoint it toward labour; such is idiotic and is not true. The wage increases that have been granted recently, some by compulsion, some by agreement, do result of course in increased prices of commodities. But the fault is not with labour. I suggest that the fault lay with government, labour and management in that they don't get together to try seriously and resolve their differences. Labour is not responsible, and I join with the Canadian Labour Congress in saying that. Oh, yes, it's true, as one or two investigations into the construction industry particularly have revealed, that there are areas there of more than irresponsibility. But government has permitted that to go on, and it's true that today government has in the areas that I refer to caused commissions of investigation to look into these matters. But I think, Mr. Chairman, because I know that my time is up for my preliminary opening statement, I want to re-emphasize that today is a day of utter irresponsibility of total populations of our so-called advanced free world, that none of the areas that I refer to, government, management or labour face up to their own individual responsibilities in these areas, but love to charge the other component with the fact that there is no stability today. When we look at our youngsters we look at their misdemeanours, and we wonder why, wonder why they're constantly being charged in juvenile and other courts with misdemeanours. How in heaven's name can it be otherwise when we as legislators, politicians, members of management, and members of the

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . workers' areas cannot face up to our own responsibilities.

I welcome the opportunity of making this presentation of my estimates for this year. I welcome to enter into discussions with members of the Assembly in the field of labour. I particularly have one or two other points to raise when we get to certain sections in the estimates. But I could not help, Mr. Chairman, and fellow members of this Assembly, allow this opportunity, while I hold the position of Minister of Labour, to express a hope and a desire that we will before too long once again become responsible that the law of the land, the law of human relations, the law of relationships between management and labour, will become covenants, the agreements that we enter into will be observed. No longer should we tolerate the utter disrespect that the population in general has for the law of the land, and possibly even more important than just the law of the land, the law of common sense that we are brothers together, we can work together, we can produce together. But it's only in togetherness that we're going to achieve greater things for this province of ours and greater things for Canada and the free world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 (b)-The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that was a stirring challenge and a stirring call-to-arms from the Minister of Labour, and I'm sure that it fills all of us with a desire to co-operate with him in the struggle to try to bring the sense and climate of responsibility to this troubled field, to which he has referred. He has said that he doesn't blame labour for the present crisis-ridden situation, and in that I wish to assure him that members on this side of the House concur wholeheartedly. He has said that he wants to call upon labour, upon management, and upon government to get together, to work together, to face up to their responsibilities in the field of industrial relations, in the troubled field of industrial dispute, and once again I wish to assure him that I and my colleagues on this side of the House concur in that stance 100 percent. But we ask at the same time, while we support him, while we concur in that position that he takes, we ask at the same time what accounting he can give to us of his stewardship in this department over the past year that in any way indicates that he has taken the lead in that kind of responsibility, that he himself has taken up that kind of challenge, that he himself is working to effect that harmony, to produce that communication which he obviously desires? He may be doing so. He may have undertaken a number of initiatives in this field. And that's what we're here for, Mr. Chairman, as we address ourselves now beginning at this point in time, to the estimates of his department for the current fiscal year.

This is what we're interested in far more than the simple definitions of dollars allotted or requested in specific areas of operation. What we want from this Minister in the few hours that we'll have with him now that his estimates are before this committee, is more than mere professions of ambition and of hope and of idealism in this field. What we want from him is an accounting of his stewardship over this department during the past year, of his plans and his projections for the current year, for the months ahead, and of his defined lines of operation as he sees them in meeting the very problems that he has alluded to.

So that's what I will be concerning myself with as we examine the Minister's estimates, and I defer to your direction in this respect, Mr. Chairman, when I suggest that it will be at a later point, a later resolution in the consideration of these estimates that I should offer my counter-overview of the situation prevailing in the industrial relations field today. The Minister has offered his overview in presenting his estimates to the House. I recognize that we are not dealing with the Minister's salary at the present time. We will be dealing with it at the end of the items before us, and therefore I would suspect, sir, that you will direct me to defer any overview of that kind that I might have until the last vote before us on these estimates. So there are many things I want to say in that area but I will defer them till later in the estimates, having just made that initial point, that as we address ourselves to these estimates what we really want, what I really want from the Minister is not so much a minuscule accounting of where every \$5 bill is going to go, but how we are going to under his leadership, and hopefully through his imagination and inspiration, cope with these challenges in the field. We haven't had that accounting of his stewardship on any debate we've had in this House during this session.

So I just wish to issue that one challenge to the Minister through you, sir, at this stage in his estimates, that that's what I see these estimates as being all about. I sincerely hope that we can honestly and reasonably seek out and obtain that accounting from him in the few hours

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . ahead of us which will be devoted to this particular estimate section.

Now we're looking at one specific vote in front of us at the present time and in order to be in order, Mr. Chairman, I realize I must address myself to it, and that is vote 70 (b) Salaries. Under General Administration in the department there is little difference between the amount being asked under the estimates for the current fiscal year and the amount requested under the estimates for last year, and I recognize that even in the worst of inflationary times, and even under the best administrative techniques, there is going to be some increase in the expenditures facing a department and its officers, and the increase here seems to be relatively minimal so I have no criticism to make of the fact that there is an additional appropriation being sought in this area this year. All I would ask is for the Minister to advise us as to what he now supervises from the point of view of a salaried staff in his department, whether this increase represents an increase in staff, or whether it just represents the kind of inflationary increase in incomes that one could expect in today's economy?

. . . . continued on next page

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do wish at this time to express my thanks to the Minister when he introduced his estimates, and perhaps extend also my compliments to his staff, and I know that I do get a certain amount of communication with certain members of his staff and they have been of assistance to me.

I also can express my appreciation to his executive assistant, I guess it is, Mr. Art Wright, who I know has been of great help to many members in the House, not only myself.

But I listened quite carefully to the Minister's remarks and I do not quarrel with his sort of definition of the problems that he described that we're confronted with, not only in this province but other provinces, but I was disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that he did not provide any medicine as far as some of those problems are concerned. I'm sure that there is maybe areas that we have to start looking into that we can provide some changes, and perhaps some reform, and what's happened that we've lived for many many years under certain regulations, under certain rules and certain legislations, and maybe it's time perhaps this is the time that we have to start looking and perhaps redefining some of those regulations, and really finding some new solutions to the problems that we have, and perhaps we can start experimenting to some extent and see if the new solutions that we're looking at and finding, perhaps this would cure some of the problems that we have.

I would have hoped that the Minister would have - and perhaps he will when we go item by item - or I hoped that he, when introducing his estimates and I know that time did not allow, but I am concerned about areas in his estimates, and I would have hoped he would have given us some information in the area of workmen's compensation to see if there's any changes proposed in the make-up of the board, in the area of . . . I know I've had discussions with him before, that there's going to be a legislation in the area of the 40-hour work week, what will take place. I know that we've debated and talked about the minimum wage. The minimum wage has gone up in some of the other provinces. I know that the Minimum Wage Board has reported to the Minister, and we have no information at the present time from the Minister. So I had enjoyed his presentation of his estimates on other occasions much more because he really got to the nitty-gritty, to the nitty-gritty, and in saying this I do appreciate and respect that the Minister has been not well and he's been away from the House, and I'm glad to see that he's back in his usual form.

But I was not quite satisfied in the form that he introduced his estimates because, as I say, we've got the workmen's compensation, the 40-hour work week, the minimum wage, the industrial safety - is the Minister satisfied with the industrial safety in this province? I know just last week we had a fatality in a mine. A couple of people - it was a fatal accident. We had trouble right here in the City of Winnipeg in one of the high rises, and have these been investigated, and are the necessary changes contemplated by the Minister? So there are . . . there's the increase in the fire prevention. I know that the Minister has appointed a special committee. I want to hear if that committee has reported, if there's going to be any legislation as a result of that committee in the area of fire prevention.

I know that the Minister has given us reports, and I thank him for it, during this session about unemployment. Now in the area of unemployment I will expect to hear from the Minister if the employment will continue to rise this summer, what do his projections, indications and studies indicate. If it will rise, has the Minister any kind of work program for these people, or is the Minister prepared to recommend to his Cabinet that perhaps we bring back the program that we had for senior citizens homes, and perhaps include some more in that area. I'm sure that the Minister has some of that information, so I think that when he gets an opportunity I feel that he should give us this type of a report, that we have more information.

I'm interested in the role of women in the labour force and I still . . . This is the year that perhaps is the proper time to discuss the role of women in the labour force, and again I'm getting many complaints and discussions. When we debate this issue I've discussed it with them, and they say, "Well, you're just saying this but you're not doing anything about it." What is the mobility, what is the upward mobility in the labour force in the civil service within the government? The point is, it'll never take place in the private sector unless the Minister makes sure that it takes place in the public sector, and if he ever had an opportunity, he's got an opportunity this session, and this year, and perhaps next year as Minister of Labour to really give this the kind of impetus that's required. So I'm interested to know what will happen.



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . .

The benefit pension plan, there's many areas. I'm somewhat concerned about the apprenticeship. How many people that start in the apprenticeship programs complete, or what's happening in that area? There's great concern in that area, and I know that the Minister will be able to give us some statistics and some information. But it's come to my attention that there is concern. So I'm not, Mr. Chairman, debating these issues or debating these areas, I'm just asking the Minister to give us some report in this area, and as we go item by item perhaps we can make speeches on each item. But at the present time I'm asking the Minister what he has to report because on previous occasions he did report to the House on his introduction of the estimates. So give us some indication. We were able to take some notes down, and when we came to clause by clause we were able to pursue the matter much better and much more to our satisfaction. But this way the Minister has not given us any information. Either he'll do it again when he gets an opportunity, or he'll be getting up on each clause and debating it. So I wish that we would have some area.

I know in the area of pension benefit that we discussed it last year. I know that the Minister has made some arrangements with other provinces, but at the present time there's no transferability of pensions into the private sector, and this is another area that the Minister can show great leadership.

So these are just a few points that I'm raising with him at the present time. I hope that he can give us some information and we can have a much better debate, and much better discussion as we go on item by item, and in bringing up these areas I was not debating them, I'm asking the Minister to give us some information, so we can discuss it in a much better and more intelligent manner, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the reason I didn't give the comprehensive report that my honourable friend from Assiniboia refers to, this year as compared with other years, is that I'm under the understanding that the format was changed in that the Minister had about an hour or so to make a general observation, and then when we got into the various sections of the estimates then further explanations would be given and a further debate take place, or a freer interchange of information between the Minister and the members of the Assembly. It was for that reason that I generalized in my opening remarks. First of all my observations of transactions while in absentia, and then a general observation of my viewing of the overall picture applicable not only to Manitoba but elsewhere as well.

I want to assure my honourable friends who have spoken that it will be my intention as we get to the various component parts of the estimates, to make a reasonable explanation of what is going on. I'm sure that if I don't fill my honourable friends in with sufficient information, they will prod me into saying a few more things because I do think that I am reasonably conversant with what's going on within the Department of Labour, and not entirely satisfactory, no, and it appears to me that my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge in reference to salary --(Interjection)-- Fort Garry, I'm sorry - the Member for Fort Garry made some reference to the salary position. It might be that I will vote with him if he proposes the motion that has been proposed on a number of occasions in this House. He may be amazed if that is his intention, that he would have my personal support.

But I do want to assure the Member for Fort Garry that I will be giving an accounting of my stewardship in the various sections as we deal with them in the estimates. I thought that that was the format for this year. I tried to adhere to it.

Now the first question my honourable friend asked of me deals with the item 70, the Salaries under 70(b) and he asked questions as to the lack of any appreciable increase. We have endeavoured within the department to keep expenditures within due bounds and any increase there in it is due only to increment increases salary-wise. There has been no, that I can recall, increase in staff under that particular appropriation. So any adjustment in salaries is due to increases in wages and increments, and the like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(b) -- The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Just one passing comment on the Minister's remarks, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to see budgets kept in line, and I've been one of those on this side of the House who has asked perhaps most repeatedly and most strenuously for the government to demonstrate some rationalization in its spending programs, and to cut and hold the line wherever it can.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . However, this is one area in which I think that some additional expenditure, provided it's directed towards providing manpower and womanpower and ability to the industrial relations field, it's one area where some additional expenditure of that kind would be justified, considering that the Minister sits in Cabinet alongside colleagues who have enormous budgets at their disposal, and considering that he presides over a departmental responsibility that in my view is probably among the most crucial and critical with respect to the welfare and the well-being of the province. It seems to me that if there's been belt-tightening imposed, this was probably the wrong department to do it in. The Minister may well need more help, more administrative help, more manpower and staff power in order to cope with the challenges that continually seem to bubble to the surface on the industrial relations field. I would say to him that where I am very desirous that the government cut spending, or at least hold the line in every area possible, I would hope here that there have not been stringencies of budgeting imposed to the expense of the successful operations of the department itself, or at the expense of those operations.

I would hope that we are not expending excess moneys in other fields where some savings could be effected and inhibiting and limiting the kinds of work that the labour department could be holding a very tight line on the budget available to this Minister, particularly in the field of administrative salaries.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, in the administrative salaries we just deal with the salaries pertaining to the internal operation of the government, the payment of wages, salaries to the staff for the internal operations of the department. And the other areas my honourable friend refers to, we will be able to expand on the increases that take place. But we found that when we were considering our estimates that it wasn't necessary for us to add to administrative staff for the purposes of that section of the estimates.

Additions were made in other sections and when we reach them, then we'll be in a position to indicate and develop more fully the changes that were made there.

Now I do want to say, Mr. Chairman - I'm sure that it would be permissible for me to say this now, we're dealing with the administration - how I appreciate, too, the work that is being done by the administrative staff, the Department of Labour. It's true, and I guess natural, that from time to time we do have some differences of opinion dealing with such matters as legislation and the operation of the department. I'm sure that's acceptable. But I feel that I have in my Deputy Minister, the Directorate of the various departments, people of outstanding capability who have been a great deal of help to me. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we should have had increases in expenditures in salaries to reflect the points that I've just made. However, in conformity with Cabinet decision of uniformity of application of salary to administrative staff, we honoured that and as a result while there could have been an increase, there wasn't. But the staff itself was not increased, and that reflects in the dollar aspect of the administration costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(b) - The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I have one specific area of question I'd like to pose to the Minister, which I think properly comes under this question of the administration of the department. But as the Minister has probably noted, from time to time in this House our own group has been particularly concerned about the question of manpower policy in the province, the way that we can try to more effectively match up the particular job requirements in the province with the numbers of unskilled and unemployed individuals who are still not able to find proper and useful work and that, as my understanding goes, we still have a core group of five or six hundred young men and women who are still, for example, on the City welfare roles. I'm sure that one could expand upon that number and indicate that it is probably upwards of a couple of thousand of those people who are caught by the structural unemployment problems, that aren't susceptible to solution by fiscal and monetary stimulation of the economy but must have a specific way of matching up their own skills, or developing skills, so that they can be matched up to job requirements. And I guess one of the things that many employers in the province find most grating is that they are unable to find the kind of personnel that they need for many of their activities - and yet they keep reading about, or hearing about, or knowing about, people who are out of work.

It seems to me that there is a fairly big slippage within that system, and that, Mr. Chairman, our problem has become compounded, I expect, by the increased emphasis that we

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . now see in the whole field of immigration. One of the areas that has concerned me is that we seem to have eliminated, in part, the provincial responsibility for immigration settlement, and I have heard members - I don't think the Minister himself has said this, but I have heard his colleagues - indicate - in fact, it was the First Minister as I now recall - who indicated that as far as he was concerned immigration was a Federal problem, and if you go back to the BNA Act, that's just not true; immigration is a shared responsibility, Federal and Provincial, and that once an immigrant arrives on these shores, it is up to the provincial governments to look after and tender their needs, and make sure that the settlement into the economy is their obligation. And it strikes me that because of the increased attention we are now paying to changes in immigration policy and what the population job requirements are going to be in this province . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. This is a very interesting topic, but I don't really see where this comes under the administration of the . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to finish, I think I will be able to demonstrate that the line of questioning is very pertinent to this particular division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that if you are talking about that, that perhaps you should come down to Apprenticeship and Industrial Training.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, no, Mr. Speaker, for those members of the House who are trying to, I know in all good spirit aid, that's not the point that we're trying to raise. The question we are trying to raise is: what capacity and what organizational form is existent in the Department of Labour to manage those problems? That's the question I'm raising, that there are a number of related topics, problems, issues, that revolve around the question of the supply of manpower, the use of manpower, how that fits in with immigration problems, and the issue that the Minister has never clarified for us - he says it is his responsibility and in fact other of his colleagues have pointed the responsibility at him - now I want to know where and how within the department, where within the organization of the department is that responsibility being exercised and implemented; to what degree has the Minister adapted the organization of his department to cope with that particular multi-faceted problem of use of manpower and immigration and skills. I think the Minister had indicated at one point that he was setting up a special task force, I believe, to develop immigration policies related to Manitoba's immigration cases. What we really want to know - understand - at this point, in raising it as a query, is what is being done within the department to organize and manage that particular combination of problems, and then to also provide the co-ordinating capacity for the Provincial Government in all its functions in this manpower area.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the difficulty raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and also, Mr. Speaker, while saying that, I realize your difficulty as well, as the Chairman of the Committee of Supply, when we are dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Labour and the general adherence to observations of the department, item by item. It happens that I am the Chairman of the cabinet sub-committee on Manpower and Immigration. It is in that capacity that many of the problems raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge - and very valid and pertinent questions and problems I would admit - that come under my general observations or guidance, or call it what you will, but not precisely as Minister of Labour, but as the Chairman of the sub-committee of cabinet, and I do speak, I do speak on behalf of the cabinet, Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, and in the field of Manpower and Immigration I do, in that capacity, attend meetings with Robert Andras and others dealing with the very valid problems raised by my honourable friend. I think I will be able to indicate to him in some sections, such as the Women's Bureau - and we discussed the Women's Bureau, the involvement of women in employment and related immigration - and in those fields and one or two other fields in the construction industry, the importing of workers, I can handle some of it there as to the directives within the Department of Labour, but I do say to you, Mr. Chairman, and my honourable friend, I appreciate and I realize the difficulty of trying to adhere to the general rule of dealing with the estimates item by item when such other responsibilities happen to be mine insofar as my relationship as the Chairman of the sub-committee of cabinet on Manpower. Certainly, they are related.

I do want to say, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend from Fort Rouge, that I recall the First Minister mentioning the responsibility of the Federal authority so far as immigration is concerned. It has always been my concept that there is an input at the provincial

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . level so far as immigration is concerned, and, for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I discussed this with Robert Andras and my colleagues just last week in Montreal. But I do say, Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult for you and difficult for the Member, indeed difficult for me, to attempt to adhere to the rules that have been established for the consideration of Estimates when the other areas are of such a broad nature that we have inter-departmental committees constantly working together, representatives of the Departments of Education, Health, Social Development, Agriculture - we meet each week, that particular committee meets, but it doesn't have a direct bearing on the Estimates of the Department of Labour. Possibly the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge could figure out some way we could have a discussion in greater depth on that.

A MEMBER: I see your salary . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but my salary . . . Mr. Chairman that is a valid point. I would agree under the Minister's salary, but my involvement in the Manpower Committee of Cabinet is not directly related to my salary as Minister of Labour. I'm there as a member of cabinet but it's not connected directly to my salary as Minister of Labour, but because I happen to be a member of cabinet. So it gives me a bit of a problem, and then, of course, time limits as well give me a problem - but I guess that's historical. But that is a problem and I can appreciate the Honourable Member for Fort Garry saying, well it's under the Minister's salary. It's true, I am the Minister; I do receive my salary through the appropriation of the Department of Labour; my other activities I don't get any extra pay for, and on occasion they are more arduous than that of just simply being the Minister of Labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: In reference to the final remarks of the Minister; just because he does not get paid for that extra work does not mean that we are not going to permit him to deal with that subject that was raised by the Member for Fort Rouge. I think it's quite appropriate for that subject to be raised during the course of the consideration of the last item, which will be the Minister's salary. In spite of the fact that it does not relate directly to the Minister's responsibilities, he still has that responsibility and he is obligated to report to the House, and the only occasion on which he can report to the House is under that particular item, and I can assure him that there will be no quarrel on this side of the House if questions are asked and he chooses to speak on that item at that point. But I think that is the proper time for him to be dealing with that subject.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is quite acceptable to me. When we come to the last item - I believe the Minister's salary is discussed last - when we come to that particular item, then we can go into the matter of problems of manpower and possible solutions of manpower, what we are doing, and what we hope to do about it, and so on. And I appreciate the suggestion of my honourable friend from Morris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 70(b) - passed. 70(c) - passed. 71: Mechanical and Engineering Salaries (a) - The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us an accounting of the effect of the new legislation we passed in the House last year pertaining to stationary engineers, the stationary engineers' profession, and classifications relating to same. There was some considerable interest and debate in the House at the time that we were dealing with that legislation last year, and I think it would be timely if the Minister could give us a brief accounting of the results of that legislation and how it is being accepted in that professional craft field, and how the bill itself is working out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I first of all indicate to my honourable friend that the bill itself has not as yet been proclaimed. The reason being for that was that there was contained within the bill provision for regulations and the setting up of an advisory board to recommend the regulations. The board has been appointed and has been functioning fairly frequently, but it as yet has not completed the consideration of the regulations. And, of course, regulations are no good without the bill, and we decided last year the bill wouldn't be any good if we didn't have regulations, and we also agreed that a committee advisory board would be set up.

I can inform my honourable friend that the board is set up - a board of five members, two representative of the employees, two of the employers, and an independent chairman

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . chosen by the Minister. The employee members of the board: Mr. Edward Parr - I'm not sure of his employment agent; I think he is connected with the Operating Engineers' Union. The second representative of the employees is Mr. George Smith of the Operating Engineers' Union, who made considerable representations in committee, the member will recall. He's a member of the board. A Mr. Sukhan, representative of the employers - I'm not sure but what he isn't at the University of Manitoba or is it one of the hospitals? Do you recall? And Mr. Thompson, Edward Campbell Thompson, representing the employers; and Mr. Frank, Horst Frank, a member and Chairman of the Board - I believe he is the chief engineer, operating engineer, at the University of Manitoba. So that is the membership of the board.

The board has had held thus far, that is, as of recent date - this memo's dated May the 26th . . . The board commenced meetings on December 5th for the purpose of reviewing and advising on regulations to be adopted under the Act. The board has held eleven meetings, ten of which were all day sessions during the period from December 5th to April 1st. A review of the regulations was completed on April 1st and has now been submitted to the legal draughtsman for checking and comment. And when this has been completed, the board will again review the regulations and attempt to finalize them. So that is the situation prevailing at the present time with the board, the Power Engineers Advisory Board.

I might say also that my honourable friend and members of the Assembly will recall there was some argument and discussions which took place when the bill was before us for consideration last year as to the title of the bill, whether it should be "Power Engineers" or "Engineers" of one description or the other by definition. I may say representations were made to me once again to make sure that the title of the bill did not reflect professional engineers in this field. However, in view of the discussions that took place when we were considering the bill last year, Mr. Chairman, I deemed it advisable to carry on with the title that was adopted last year. It's my understanding that the members of the Advisory Board are getting along reasonably well together and, as they indicate, the regulations have been finalized to the degree that they can be placed before legal authorities for making sure, if at all possible, that there's no hitches. I think that in itself indicates that the committee or board is working well together, and we're hopeful that the outcome will be satisfactory to all concerned. I think that's specific with the engineers . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman, In other words, the bill is virtually complete as far as regulations are concerned provided those regulations meet the legal niceties and legal requirements, and one could reasonably expect the bill will be proclaimed during the current year, is that correct?

MR. PAULLEY: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that in all likelihood the bill will be proclaimed this year; but we want to be sure that the regulations are satisfactory to both employee or union and management, and the general public, so that there are not hitches. I anticipate the bill will be proclaimed.

Again, on another topic of responsibility under this particular appropriation dealing with Mechanical and Engineering department, if you will recall, Mr. Chairman, we had a considerable amount of discussion last year - I'm sure this is of interest particularly to the Member from Fort Rouge - we had a considerable discussion last year dealing with building standards, and here again we set up a board of people expertise in their particular field to assist the staff and the department in arriving at decent standards and decent working operations in the building area, and in particular with the National Building Code aspect as applicable to Manitoba. The Building Standards Board has held eight meetings since it was formed and the affiliated committees to the board itself have held 57 meetings. This is a total of 65 meetings that have been held since the board had its first meeting on December 10th of last year. The board has set a deadline of June 30th for completion of all the work on each section of the National Building Code, and it is expected that the recommendations will be received shortly thereafter. The membership of this board is: Mr. Andrew W. Gilliland, representing the Association of Professional Engineers; Mr. Phillip Young, representing the Manitoba Construction Council; Mr. John Fischer, representing the Manitoba Federation of Labour; Mr. Ralph Thompson, representing the Manitoba Association of Architects; Mr. Ken Ginter, representing the Canadian Mobile Home and Travel Trailer Association; and the Chairman, Mr. Claude Wright, who is a

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . professional engineer and was engaged in this area of activity. So here again, in accordance with the desire of the Assembly, a board was established that's looking into the area of the building standards code for Manitoba.

I might say, too, Mr. Chairman, that I have met with a number of municipal people to consider their requirements at the local level, and I would say that we're having pretty good harmonious relationships between the department and the municipalities. I've also met and discussed on a couple of occasions with some of the building associations to discuss common problems in the field of construction.

We also have had a fair amount of correspondence with such organizations as the Paraplegic Association as to the provision of adequate entrance facilities for wheelchair personnel. This committee I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is doing a pretty good job. While discussing buildings the members will recall that we had quite a discussion about a year ago because of the collapse of one of the ice arenas - I believe it's at Powerview - where there was some construction difficulties. As a result of what happened then I met with the Advisory Committee of the Municipal Association and asked them if they would kindly develop within their own areas of responsibility a greater effort to liaise with the department staff and to make sure that on every occasion that a building that was going to be used by the public was under construction, that prior to doing that that the plans would be submitted to the Director and staff of our Department of Mechanical Engineering, and that has been pretty religiously adhered to to the satisfaction of all concerned. I might say also that this has applied in the area of fire prevention in that the plans are also scrutinized by the Chief Fire Inspector to see that the accommodation for fire prevention are part and parcel of the plan.

Now when we were discussing the matter a year ago, I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge raised questions about high-rise apartments and like buildings in respect to fire. I hope to be able to give some information to my honourable friend when we come to the item dealing with fire prevention.

I think that, Mr. Chairman, generally deals with the questions posed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that the boards have been set up, they are functioning, they seem to be getting along reasonably well. I say reasonably advisedly, because of course I'm not in attendance at the meetings but the information that comes to me indicates that. I do know that on a couple of occasions there were differences of opinion between representatives of the employees and employer, but I believe that they have been ironed out reasonably satisfactorily now, and that the bill will be proclaimed this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I have a question while we're under that section. I believe last year the Minister indicated to the House and promised that there'd be some changes in the way of inspections in respect to safety of some of these buildings. I think it was determined that it was after some of the recreation facilities that have been constructed, and after they've been finished, the construction was finished, that they were inspected, and this is something that the Minister said he would undertake to change and perhaps have more staff in his department. So my question is: Has he secured more staff? Has the inspection procedures now been changed? Has he got a different set of guidelines for the inspection of these facilities so the same thing doesn't happen again? I believe he made that commitment last session, so I would like to hear, have those procedures been implemented now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia will be pleased to know that the answers to each of his questions is yes. Instructions have been issued to the effect that, as I indicated a moment or two ago, that plans have to be submitted for observation first. The department has undertaken to inspect the buildings, not only at the completion of the buildings but during construction period, which isn't our real responsibility but buildings of the nature of the Powerview Arena are inspected progressively as the building is going up, and the information that I have, there was an increase of four in the particular area, and it's my understanding that the inspections promised last year by the Minister are being carried on, and I would appreciate if my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia could indicate any deficiency, I would be pleased because I'm sure my Deputy would agree with me that when the order was issued it was a pretty straightforward order.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the hour of adjournment, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. (Wednesday)