



Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

30 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXIX No. 31A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 1981

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 5 March 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the Minister advise whether or not there have been any further developments pertaining to any negotiations involving the proposals that he had received in connection with a helicopter plant in Gimli, whether there's been any progress made since the time of his Estimate review in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANKLIN JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, Mr. Speaker. I think I made it very plain in Estimates where we stood on that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether there are any negotiations presently under way?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker. We made it very clear, unless they had the funding and unless the Federal Government believed that the project was a good one, that the Province of Manitoba would not be involved and I explained during my Estimates that the information on the report that was made regarding it, it did not look like a favourable project and the Federal Government as a matter of fact, are not enthusiastic and they are the experts on aerospace which we take advice from and we don't intend to do anything in Manitoba unless those things are favourable with the Federal Government. If the company wants to come in with their own funds, etc., we have said the buildings are there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with regard to the question of oil pricing and oil product pricing in the Province of Manitoba. Does the Minister have any concern about the results of the federal study on price fixing by the giant oil companies and does his department have any specific information on the matter of price fixing or any restrictive trade practices whatsoever, pertaining to the petroleum industry and the retail trade of that product in the Province of Manitoba?

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

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, obviously my department is always concerned about affairs that pertain to consumers in our province and I can confirm that, courtesy of the Federal Government, copies of the report which they issued yesterday were delivered to my department this morning. My staff is reviewing them but the matter is under discussion at the federal level and it involves federal legislation and at the moment that's where it stands.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker, but I would ask the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs whether he and his department would be prepared to examine the problem as it exists in the Province of Manitoba, knowing full well that there is certain federal jurisdiction and certain federal studies about to take place. But nevertheless, would he undertake to engage in a provincial study to see what impact this is having now on consumers in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. FILMON: I will say that our department would be happy to co-operate with the Federal Government in whatever way that we can to assist them in whatever studies they intend to undertake. The matter that's being dealt with, that of supposed collusive pricing practices, is one that clearly comes under federal jurisdiction and I think that, firstly, we don't have the legislative authority to deal with it; and secondly, we would not want to duplicate efforts that are being currently carried on by the Federal Government.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's observation that to a large degree this is federal jurisdiction but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, without getting into a debate on legalities, that the Province of Manitoba does have some responsibility and certain jurisdictions even if it is only relating to the taxation thereof. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister whether he and his staff are prepared to do something right now to help counteract a situation whereby it seems price fixing is still going on and the consumers of this province are still being ripped off, right here today.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Member for Brandon East that our government and my department are just as concerned, if not more so than the members on his side of the House, with anything that it is to the detriment of consumers in this province. If he wants us to deal with the aspect of taxation perhaps my colleague, the Minister of Finance, would have comment to make on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to ask a question of the Minister in his mood as an advocate defending the consumers. Can he tell the

Thursday, 5 March 1981

House what results he had in using his good offices and reasonable and careful persuasion with the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, to continue to provide their customers with the service they have always provided them with and which formed part of the basis upon which their rates were set by the Public Utility Board?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I would use my offices to force the gas company to continue to provide the services that they always have. I mentioned at the time that the staff that the member talked about were in strike and obviously I couldn't suggest that they hire other people nor could I suggest that they force those people to come off strike or pass back-to-work legislation. I suggested that I would discuss with the gas company at the appropriate time, what measures could be taken to deal with the consumers' concerns about not receiving service or having to pay elsewhere for the service that they were being given, and I still intend to do that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the appropriate time be in February or in August when the service is needed, because the Honourable the Minister indicated to the House that he would discuss it with them. While he is discussing it with them, I wonder if the Minister can tell us whether the Public Utility Board in setting its rates, agreed that the gas company starting March 1, 1981, would be able to charge 19 percent interest on overdue accounts — which they are now doing over the amount of \$15.00 — whether that particular increase in rates, namely a 19 percent interest charge on overdue accounts, was one of the things that was permitted by the Public Utility Board.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and bring back the information.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and when the Honourable Minister takes it as notice, would he find out whether the gas company, in charging 19 percent on overdue accounts, intends to give 19 percent on overpaid accounts which they are charging when they are estimating gas consumption rather than reading the meter and charging people accordingly and demanding payment and demanding 19 percent interest on outstanding payments, when they have estimated more than what the customer has used.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, without accepting any of the preamble to the question, I will take it as notice and bring back the appropriate information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Back in January I had provided the Minister with a copy of what purports to be a contract between a local security company and a so-called contractor who I suggest in reality is an employee and who I understand, has been so designated by that security company under The Private Investigators Act when dealing with its bonding, can he now advise as to what action he has taken to ensure that employees

of that company will in future, receive the benefits of minimum wage legislation, Canada Pension, Workers Compensation and holidays with pay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Member for Rossmere Monday or Tuesday of this week and told him that our department was finalizing their position on it and we felt at that time, that in fact our opinion would be the people involved in that particular agency or that particular corporation, our position would be that they are in fact the employees, not contract people.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could the Minister advise as to how many employees were involved and as to whether you determined how much the average person was receiving per hour in wages?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got that information at my fingertips. I can get it if the member wishes that.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, I just have one question then for the Minister of Highways. He recently received a letter from the Chamber of Commerce in Flin Flon dealing with the road to nowhere up near Flin Flon. Can he advise as to what his response was?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): I haven't had the opportunity to respond to that yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. At the present time, is there any holdup or delay in the processing of applications for liquor vendors permits?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer that question but I wonder if the member is referring to new liquor vendor agencies or transfers of vendors' permits?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, new and transfers.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to review that matter with the officials from the Liquor Control Commission and advise the honourable member.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Telephone System. In view of the fact that the Minister presently is lightly putting together the 1981 telephone directory for distribution in June, would he place the Gouvernement du

Thursday, 5 March 1981

Canada listing in its proper alphabetical position? Because in the present book it follows Government of Canada, whereas I'm certain that he would agree and the Minister of Education would advise him so, that the letter "u" precedes the letter "v" in the English alphabet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: I'll have to check the order in the present telephone directory and I'll assure my honourable colleague that we will deal with that matter post-haste and in all seriousness.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: There is a difference, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Economic Development. Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise the House, and this is in reference to the television commercials that we are all watching with devotion on our television sets boosting Manitoba, would he tell us whether those people who appeared in the commercials stating their reasons for loving to live and work in Manitoba, were each paid for doing so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: They were not paid anything by the province, Mr. Speaker. They were paid according to the regulations or I believe the union scale which is demanded that they receive and that had to be done, there is no choice.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask them according to what scale they were being paid. I'm aware of the fact that there is an association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists. I'm asking who paid them, Mr. Speaker? The Minister did not answer that question. The question was, who paid them, were they paid, who paid them, how much were they paid?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member is asking sort of a foolish question, trying to trap me. I quite frankly could think of nothing worse happening to me, but the people were paid by the advertising agency.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: The people were paid by the advertising agency, Mr. Speaker. They in turn bill it to the province and we have to pay that amount of money.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm that there are many public service announcements on television in which the participants are not paid? Did he make any attempt to have this broadcast as a public service announcement, Mr. Speaker?

MR. JOHNSTON: There will be occasions, Mr. Speaker, when the station will use them in a space

that they have available. We contract for so much time and it's played on television. If the television station wants to put it in a spot that's available, they have every opportunity to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for air ambulance and yesterday you will remember, I attempted to get some straight answers from the Minister, but failed as have numerous other parties who have attempted that same task. What I would like to know from the Minister today, and we're asking for specific details, is if he is prepared to table the tenders that he put out for the removal of the MU-2 from the area in which it was damaged, for the repair of the MU-2, for the purchase or lease of any replacement plane for the MU-2 and for the charges for a test flight of the Citation, which was brought in I understand by the government to test its capabilities and its advisability as an air ambulance plane.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: No, no and yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, either the Minister has trouble counting or he purposely left out one. There were four requests for tenders, he can check Hansard, I got three answers from him and I still haven't gotten any straight answers in that respect. The question has to be asked of the Minister as why he is hesitant to provide us with those tenders. Why is it that he would not want the people of this province through this body, the Legislature, to know how they went about tendering for the replacement and how they went about tendering for the repairs of the MU-2?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, first off the province did not tender for the repair of the MU-2. The MU-2 was insured by an insurance brokerage firm, I would assume that would be a proper description of them. When the MU-2 had its hard landing and had damaged the undercarriage and the wing, we contacted our insurance company and told them where the plane was and that we wished to have repairs undertaken. From that point in time on, Mr. Speaker, it was the responsibility of the insurer, not the province, to undertake removal and repairs of that plane.

MR. COWAN: The question that follows is, can the Minister provide us with the name of the insuring company, and while I'm asking questions on this subject I'd ask him if he has been informed that, by experts in the field of medical evacuation, that they are opposed to the continued use of the Aztecs, that they want a replacement immediately, and they are opposed to that use because they consider the Aztec to be an unacceptable aircraft for the type of medical evacuation which it is now being used for?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, first off I believe the insurance firm which carries the policy on our

Thursday, 5 March 1981

government aircraft is Reed Stenhouse. Secondly, certainly concerns have been expressed to my department about the suitability of the Aztec for medical evacuation. We have never maintained and I have never maintained, Mr. Speaker, that that was the ideal aircraft. That is why today we are in the process of finding a replacement for the MU-2 which has at least the capability and hopefully superior capabilities to the MU-2 for the purpose of medical evacuation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Following up on the question just asked the Minister of Highways, I would like to ask him why the government has delayed to this point in finding a suitable replacement aircraft which could have been used on an interim basis while he's going through the process of actually purchasing a new aircraft?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion on the part of the Members of the Opposition about the process by which one would go through the replacement of the MU-2. As I've indicated on a number of occasions, we have two back-up aircraft which, even by our own departmental standards, are not equivalent replacement aircraft for the MU-2 and are not, in the long term, satisfactory for that purpose; but we do have two aircraft which are doing the job of medical evacuation right now, despite their inadequacy to do it in a comparable fashion to the MU-2. One of the problems in searching out aircraft for replacement is the problem of immediate availability of a suitable aircraft. There are American registered aircraft that are available tomorrow, except for the fact that you can't fly them in Canada because of the registration. There are a number of problems which you don't immediately come to grips with. We did have some time ago, an aircraft in Winnipeg, which was advised to be suitable for medical evacuation, but when tried it was not. We are operating the service with two aircraft, one in Thompson, one in Winnipeg. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, after reviewing the advice of many experts on the capabilities of their aircraft for the purpose of medical evacuation, that we will have an aircraft to replace the MU-2 of equal, if not superior, characteristics.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister suggesting that another aircraft, similar in capacity to the MU-2, was not available to the government from any source in the time period following the crash of the MU-2 that the government owns?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I didn't indicate that.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister why he has allowed the people of Northern Manitoba to go with improper service over the past several weeks while he's been irresponsibly delaying the acquisition of a suitable aircraft for Air Ambulance Service.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I would suppose that when one lives in a socialist dream world, taking care and consideration in spending taxpayers' dollars to find a replacement aircraft, is being irresponsible, as the Member for Rupertsland would indicate. However, that may have been the mode of operation, that you go out and buy the first thing that comes into sight. If during their administration, the first plane to fly into Winnipeg was the one I should have bought, according to the Member for Rupertsland.

Mr. Speaker, we are responsible for all Manitobans when we make purchases on behalf of the taxpayer of Manitoba. We are attempting to do that in the best possible fashion, replacing the MU-2 with the best possible aircraft that we can get at the best possible financial arrangements for the people of Manitoba. If that, Mr. Speaker, is being irresponsible, then God help us if we ever return to the kind of responsibility that we saw in eight years of NDP administration.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Minister in his answers to the Member for Rupertsland indicated that they had brought a plane in which they had anticipated might be suitable as a Medi-vac plane. I would ask the Minister if he can table the report which they should have gotten, that would indicate to him or that he used to base his decision that the plane was, in fact, not a suitable aircraft for medical evacuation in this province.

MR. ORCHARD: I would find it somewhat difficult, Mr. Speaker, to table a report on the unsuitability of that aircraft because there was no report made. The cold hard fact of the situation was we couldn't get a stretcher inside the plane and it would hardly suit to be a medical evacuation aircraft if we couldn't get a stretcher inside of it.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. One would have anticipated that the government would have tried to determine if a stretcher would fit in the plane before they brought it to Manitoba for testing, so it just shows not only irresponsibility, but a total inability to deal with this problem.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour a question in respect to the bankruptcy of Lambair and his efforts, or efforts which he has indicated he has undertaken in regard to the wages which are owing the employees of that operation; can the Minister now inform the House as to what action he has taken to ensure that they have wages that are coming to them being made available to them?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the last comment, or whatever it was by the Member for Churchill, deserves some reply. First of all, Mr. Speaker, we did not request that aircraft to come in. A firm owning that aircraft found out we were in need of a medical evacuation aircraft and brought that craft into Winnipeg for Air Division to take a look at it; to test fly it to determine if it would be suitable, at their own cost I might add, Mr. Speaker, and unsolicited by my department. If that is the kind of irresponsibility the Member for Churchill is referring to, then he is in the same category as the Member for Rupertsland.

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

Thursday, 5 March 1981

MR. COWAN: Not wishing to continue the debate, Mr. Speaker, which only confirms the government's lack of responsibility, I would like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Showing an unwillingness to take part in the debate, I wish the honourable member would proceed with the question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was to the Minister of Labour and the question was if he could provide us with some report as to his undertaking to ensure that the workers of Lambair were going to receive wages which are owing to them?

I would also ask the Minister, as I have to combine two questions in one session now because he did not answer the first one, if he can indicate if a committee has been set up as he has suggested in the papers, and if so who is on that committee?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there was no hesitation on my part to answer the question and never has been to answer any questions that come from across the way.

Yes, a committee has been established; and yes, documents have been signed to fund that particular committee; and yes, they've been meeting in Thompson the last two to three days. A representative of the Federal Government; a representative of my department; two employees from Lamb's; two people from Lamb's management; a Mr. Brian Campbell in Thompson has been selected as the chairman of that particular committee. They have made several enquiries, of which I'm supportive of all of them; they are enquiring now of the Federal Government, because it is the Federal Government's jurisdiction — Aviation is that, just that, the Federal Government's jurisdiction — they are enquiring now, of them, the formula and procedure which they'll work through to get at the wages which they have coming to them. They have also applied, again with my support, to the Federal Government again, in an effort to waive the waiting period for UIC benefits.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. I would like to ask him if he and his department have had a chance to review the findings of the inquest into the death at Alpha Metals in Transcona, last fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch all of that question. I think he is referring to the inquest that was completed at the end of last week. I am awaiting a copy of the recommendations from that inquest at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like to ask the Minister if he would also try and determine why, at the end of a provincial inquest, the Canadian Armed Forces have

announced that they are going to conduct a further inquest into the matter. I would have thought that a provincial inquest would have been sufficient to provide all the evidence and findings necessary for this type of accident and I would like to ask the Minister if he would undertake to find out why the Canadian Armed Forces feels it necessary to conduct a further inquest.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will try to obtain that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. SPEAKER, I want to ask a question to the Attorney-General concerning the recent decision of the Winnipeg Police to adopt what has been described as a less humane bullet as a result of a judge's recommendation on an inquest. Does the Attorney-General have any concern or interest about this decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am always concerned.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Attorney-General hasn't been affected by the decision, I would ask him whether this matter might be a subject of review by the Manitoba Police Commission given the fact that this is apparently a less humane device — and that's how it's been described by the police as well — that it may result in greater damage and may possibly necessitate some change in police procedures. Would this not be a logical item for the Police Commission to review?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it might be.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Attorney-General whether he would in fact refer this matter to the Commission?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to firstly review that matter with the Chief of Police, prior to making any decision on review by the Manitoba Police Commission and review the concerns that the member has expressed and other comments that have been made about this particular decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (BUD) BOYCE: I wish to thank the Attorney-General for sending me a copy of the draft bill of the Federal Government on "Young People in Conflict with the Law", and ask him if it is his intention to refer that draft bill to the committee that was established a couple of years ago on juvenile offenders.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that draft of The Young Offenders Act to which the member refers is under review by my department and by other departments and officials. There is also to be firstly,

Thursday, 5 March 1981

meetings of officials from the Federal Government and Provincial Governments to review various aspects of that bill and then it is anticipated that there will be a meeting of the Federal Minister and Provincial Ministers involved for a final review of that Act.

MR. BOYCE: Since this is federal legislation, is it the government's intention to make public their position vis-a-vis that Act, so that the public will have an opportunity to make presentation on committee, on second reading, should they find this necessary to do so?

As the Attorney-General is quite aware of, that there are some profound shifts in the philosophy of this new Act, and how does the Attorney-General intend to deal with it prior to it being considered in the House of Commons, because of its impact on provincial legislation? Is it the intention of the government to make a public announcement or set a policy prior to it being considered on second reading in the House of Commons?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm given to understand that the Federal Minister will not be proceeding immediately in the House of Commons on that bill until provincial officials and administrations have had an opportunity to fully consider it and for there to be meetings between federal and provincial officials respecting, particularly in respect to financial implications of the bill. Once we have completed our own internal review among our own departments and officials, I would expect that that may very well be about the time that my Estimates may be under consideration, or the Minister of Community Services who is also involved in the implications of that bill and I'm sure either he or I or both of us would be prepared to make our views known at that time.

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

MR. BOYCE: One final question, Mr. Speaker, there is a trial presently taking place in Sacramento, California vis-a-vis, it's the creationist's position relative to teaching evolution in the school as a matter of fact rather than theory; and because the educational textbook industry is primarily based in the states and any influence such as judgments as will proceed from this will have an effect on educational textbooks, I wonder if it is possible for the Attorney-General to have someone in his department monitor the case and perhaps to the extent that he will get transcripts of the trial which is proceeding at the present time.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can certainly undertake if it would assist the member, in obtaining whatever information we can about the trial for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Economic Development. Several days ago I asked a couple of questions about the closing of Bata Shoes and the Glenella Creamery in Manitoba and I would like to

ask the Minister whether the head office of Salisbury House has been moved, as indicated in this brochure from the Leader of the Opposition which was distributed into my constituency some time ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in December of this year, Salisbury House was purchased by Steinbergs, a company in Quebec. The head office of Salisbury House is still here in Manitoba and there remains the same amount of employees.

MR. GALBRAITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a further question of whether the head office of Grey Goose has been moved from Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again as I mentioned in December in the Throne Speech Debate, Mr. Speaker, Grey Goose was purchased by Laidlaw Transportation. The head office of Grey Goose and all the employees are still in Manitoba and Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to refer to that particular pamphlet and ask the Minister whether it's true that the Tribune, Swifts, Transair, Massey-Ferguson and other businesses have closed in Manitoba during the Conservative Administration's term in office?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Tribune closed, the Sun is here, we have been replaced very . . . ; Swifts have closed, Centennial Packers have opened, Mr. Speaker; Transair was purchased by PWA and have more employees in Manitoba than they had previously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can't hear myself through the applause of the Government House on news that the Tribune had closed. I'd like to ask the Minister if he can confirm a statement by Howard Pawley that since 1977 the rate of growth in Manitoba is not even 30 percent of the national growth rate; can he confirm that, in fact, is true? I'm not paid ACTRA like the Member for Dauphin is.

MR. JOHNSTON: As always, Mr. Speaker, I take those questions of figures that are pulled out of the air as notice. I will have them examined and answered tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister what good news he can come up with for bankruptcies. Our pamphlet clearly indicates that bankruptcies are up almost 50 percent; does he have any good news to counter that?

MR. JOHNSTON: As explained, Mr. Speaker, the bankruptcies in Manitoba per 10,000 businesses,

that's the only way you can look at it, is fifth in Canada. We are fifth in Canada, we are not the lowest but for 10,000 businesses we stand 42 percent which is fifth in Canada, the same as B.C., Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, so the Minister is confirming that. I would also ask him whether he can confirm that the Chimo company in Selkirk went bankrupt yesterday?

MR. JOHNSTON: I haven't been aware of that as yet, Mr. Speaker, but I would only announce that we don't like to have these bankruptcies in Manitoba and we will take a look at it very closely. We're very proud of the fact that Griffin Steel in Transcona constituency which I would have thought the Member for Transcona would have known about are spending in excess of \$10 million on an expansion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired; before we proceed with Orders of the Day I should like to announce to the House that I have had a request from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for a change in seating plan. I would like to have a meeting with the Opposition House Leader and the Government House Leader to discuss changes in the seating plan for the rest of the session.

Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, firstly, let me indicate the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations will meet on Tuesday morning at 10:00 a.m. to further consider their report on the Constitutional hearings and would meet again on Thursday morning at 10:00 a.m. if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment; and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in the Chair for Labour and Manpower.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Lloyd G. Hyde (Portage la Prairie): 3.(d)(1)(a) — pass; 3.(d)(1)(b) — the Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Again, just the expenditures when we have an opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(1)(b) — pass; 3.(d)(2)(a) — the Honourable Minister.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Employment Support and Counselling Service. The objectives of the Employment Support and Counselling Services Program is to enable special needs individuals and northerners to take advantage of employment opportunities and to provide summer employment opportunities for northern youth. The Employment Support and Counselling unit provides a flexible manpower service including counselling, referral and relocation programs in co-operation with other agencies. Currently three location programs are being administered in conjunction with northern mining employers. The northern youth corps component provides summer employment for youth in northern communities where other agencies are not involved. The program provides wage subsidies for youth employment on community improvement projects.

A review of procedures for the relocation programs has recently occurred to review and develop greater consistency between programs and to allow for greater liaison with Canada Employment Centres in the north. Efforts have been undertaken to increase relocation numbers through discussions with Mines. One project has, via formal agreement, endeavoured to double numbers relocated. A job readiness training program has been piloted to assist in ensuring successful relocations. Surveys and evaluations have been undertaken to determine program effectiveness for both the relocation program and the Northern Youth Program.

With respect to staffing, there were 27 staff man years in 1980-81; we're requesting 28 staff man years for the coming year, an additional one. The additional one will be added to the Thompson office to perform administrative management functions within the Employment Counselling and Support Program areas.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(2)(a) — pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: While we're on the generalities of the subject, I wonder if the Minister could explain the no-sum item either last year or this year and why it's there. (Interjection)— Well, there's an item here with no dollars on it. Could you explain that?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, it's a technical thing. There is 80 percent in Northern Affairs, you know, that Northern Affairs runs the Northlands Agreement and we utilize funding within it and 20 percent is in the Department of Finance Enabling Vote. The member may recall last year the Finance kept a portion as an Enabling Vote and gave the Department of Northern Affairs X-amount for each departmental project. Now if I can explain that Northern Affairs has the entire Northern Agreement, and I require a portion of it; Resources requires a portion of it; everybody requires a portion of it. It's in their Vote, in their Estimates. I can assure the member that funds are there. If he wishes, we will scurry in a hurry and find out what there was last year and what there is this year, just so you'll know what kind of money we're spending out of Northern Affairs Budget this year for that program. I'll get those figures for you.

If I can get it in the book. The \$992,600, does the member see that figure there, on Page 86, halfway

Thursday, 5 March 1981

down in the section we're dealing with. \$992,600. This year, there's \$1,114,300.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: I'm still not completely clear. Some of the other departments that we dealt with already had the figures from The Northern Development Agreement within their Estimates. I guess some do and some don't. I wonder if the Minister's staff is aware who does and who doesn't.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm advised everything that is in Northlands is in Northern Affairs. Now, I don't know what the other departments have done.

MR. McBRYDE: So to make it clear, Mr. Chairperson, the amount here of \$1,114,000 is money that the Minister is going to spend this year, plus 20 percent and that amount will appear in the Northern Affairs Estimates, 80 percent of that amount.

MR. MacMASTER: Northern Affairs will have 80 and the Department of Finance has 20.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could explain this amount under The Northern Development Agreement when the agreement expired, for this fiscal year. How can we have an amount here from an agreement that is no longer in existence?

MR. MacMASTER: I've attempted to explain that on several occasions, I hope successfully. We are in the midst of negotiating a new agreement and because time limits are what they are, and precisely the question of the Member for The Pas, the front and centre issue for today that we're trying to resolve with the federal people is that whatever agreement they eventually come up with retroactivity is in fact a real part of a new agreement. I can't second-guess what the outcome of those discussions will be but if I would tend to believe that the Federal Government is reasonably sincere in their negotiations, I know we certainly are. If in fact we are, both parties are, and we see that time limits are being what they are, then we should agree that be it five weeks from now or four weeks from now, hopefully sooner, but whenever the case may be that in fact retroactivity is the real thing. You to that with union contracts on many, many, many occasions when the deadlines facing you and you both agree that there's going to be an agreement, there's no question, then retroactivity and an extension over the date is, in a lot of cases, quite acceptable to both parties.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder if the Minister could outline what role he and his department have in those particular negotiations, or if he could give me some idea of the key people responsible for carrying that out in terms of departments and responsibilities and what role his department has within that.

MR. MacMASTER: Our programming has, as the Member for The Pas knows it and as I know it and as we go through our Estimates, have all been placed in my eyesight as pretty high priorities; I'm sure the other Ministers have established the same. It's Northern Affairs themselves that are doing the negotiating.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how long he and the Provincial Government thought it would take to negotiate a new agreement.

MR. MacMASTER: There's really no answer to that particular question. Discussions have been taking place for a good period of time and I don't know how many months that's been. You're always hopeful when you start negotiations looking forward to the expiry of something that you're going to have them negotiated in time; that's the objective of the exercise. It doesn't always take place.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I guess this is one of the areas where, in my point of view, and it applies to when the Minister had responsibilities for the Northlands Agreement, that everyone knew the expiry date of the existing agreement. People should have known that such negotiations with the Federal Government takes a long time and yet the seriousness and the full preparation and the full negotiations I don't think really got under way till last fall, which doesn't leave enough time to carry out this agreement, to carry out the negotiations for the establishment of the agreement; an agreement, Mr. Chairperson, that's very important to Northern Manitoba in terms of getting those cost-shared dollars for the development of the north and for the employment and training that's necessary up north. This is one area where this Minister and the government have fallen down in terms of their responsibility and their planning and getting things done.

MR. MacMASTER: I think we'll wait for the outcome of the agreement to determine whether my determine whether my department or myself or the government has fallen down. I would respectfully suggest that the Member for The Pas should wait, if he will, to see the final outcome of the agreement and he may find quietly within himself that he's pleased with the contents of the agreement, or at that particular time, if there's something that isn't there that he wishes was there or there's things that's in it which he doesn't think should be in it, then of course it's his right, as it is today if he wishes, to chastise the contents of the agreement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for the Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I wasn't talking about the contents of the agreement, I was talking about when it's going to be agreed to and when it's going to be signed and when the province can have the guarantee of the funding that's necessary for this program. It's March, Mr. Chairperson, and the fiscal year starts pretty soon; I'm pleased that the Minister is optimistic that they might have an agreement pretty soon. I guess my experience with the Federal Government says that he's probably overly optimistic; my experience with these kind of negotiations says that he is probably overly optimistic. That's why I believe that the work necessary for the new agreement should have been started long before it was to ensure that the north isn't deprived of this important program. That's all my general comments on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated in his opening remarks that this department was involved in programs that were providing employment opportunities or at least outlining and trying to assist in the gaining of employment opportunities for special needs northerners. I wonder if he could be more explicit at to what target group this program is being directed towards.

MR. MacMASTER: Members of the northern communities, all persons that live within them.

MR. COWAN: The Minister also said that surveys and evaluations have been done during the last year on the three programs. Is he able to provide us with copies of those surveys and evaluations.

MR. MacMASTER: They are being undertaken, I don't know whether my words were that they have been done, like finished; we're undertaking surveys and evaluations. When they are complete, the same as the material that I promised the member a year ago and I know how he likes those reports and surveys, we have followed up with what we've said; when we have completed our surveys and our evaluations there will be no hesitation of forwarding them to the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Well, how far along in the process are these evaluations currently? Can the Minister give us some indication of when he would expect to see those surveys completed? I know as much as I like to see them he doesn't like to give us dates because it's, from time to time, not possible to comply to expectations. However, he could provide us with some general idea, another month or another year or six months.

MR. MacMASTER: Sometime in the next three or four months I hope to have certainly enough put together to make it meaningful.

MR. COWAN: But currently these programs are part of the programs that are being negotiated under the new negotiations for the Northlands Agreement; is that correct?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates that is correct, however, at this time they don't have the surveys and evaluations done. Is the Minister satisfied that these programs are in fact fulfilling their purpose and for that reason should be made a continuing part of the negotiations? Does he have statistics or data which would support that?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't think we'll find the Northlands Agreement is signed without these programs in it.

MR. COWAN: I'm certainly not suggesting that it should not be signed without these programs. However, I would ask the Minister if he has some data which can be applied to test the effectiveness of these programs at present because they are currently being negotiated, and one would think if one was doing a number of surveys and evaluations that one could do it for two reasons. One, would be

to improve the program and that is certainly an alternative; but the other would be to test the effectiveness of the program so that when going into negotiations if any changes were necessary, they would be able to come forward with those changes during the negotiation process and they would be able to come forward with data which would support the need for any possible changes, and that to me would appear to make the negotiation process that much easier. So I would have expected that the surveys and the evaluations would have been done already and would have been made a part of the negotiating process. The question to the Minister is, why is that not the case?

MR. MacMASTER: I suppose it depends on what you think you need to arm yourself with when you go to the negotiating table and how receptive those across the table are to the particular proposal that you're talking about.

I've tried to tell the member without getting into any great details that I don't think there'll be a new Northlands Agreement signed without these in them. So what he can gather from that is that I'm adamant enough, convinced enough and so are the people on the other side of the table, I don't see any problems with these particular programs being renegotiated and implanted in the new agreement.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister indicate how many persons, how many individuals were part of this program during the last year and if we could have comparative figures for the year previous it would be beneficial as well?

MR. MacMASTER: In the year 1977 there was 45; in the year 1978 and this is ending March 31st the fiscal year there was 57; in the year ending March 31, 1979 there was 81; in the year ending March 31, 1980 there was 136 and as of January 1st, it's obvious I can't give you March 31st yet, but as of January 1st past, there was 184.

MR. COWAN: That's a significant increase in the number of total participants in all three programs. Does the Minister have that broken down into specifics for the three individual programs that he had mentioned earlier?

MR. MacMASTER: In the last year there was, up to January 1st; 63 in Leaf Rapids; 98 in Flin Flon and that's one we made reference to where there was a doubling up, negotiations took place, and 23 in Thompson.

MR. COWAN: Will you be talking specifically to the Tawow Program in Leaf Rapids? Is that correct? And the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting effort at relocation into Flin Flon and Thompson's efforts? Why does Thompson appear to be so far behind in respect to participation in this program? Has the Minister had conversations with Inco there and I would assume, he may correct me, I'd assume that we're dealing only with Inco in respect to the program and if so, can he advise us as to what action he has taken to encourage them to become what would appear to be greater participants or a need to be greater participants in the program?

MR. MacMASTER: There's no action taken by myself in relationship to either one of the three for

pretty real reasons. It appears that in the Leaf Rapids-Flin Flon situation every person that comes out of the communities seems to be involved in a program; in the Thompson situation you sometimes find a program such as this and it's either ideal or not, whatever side you're looking at; but the people that are coming through the program are themselves setting examples for many many others who come in on their own. I'm informed that there are a large number of people coming in from the outlying areas into the community of Thompson who are going directly to the employment office who, in fact, are getting themselves employed and who, in fact, have very little interest, if any at all, in the particular program that's in place there.

MR. COWAN: Does the Minister have any statistics to substantiate that information? In other words, one would have to look at the number of persons from the outlying communities as a percentage of the total work force and, if indeed, it was a case that Thompson had a percentage that was near to, equal to or greater than the other percentages, that assumption could be accepted. However, without that information it's difficult to be able to make an assessment, so I would hope the Minister would be able to provide us with specific details as to the percentage that those persons who are relocating from the different communities in Northern Manitoba occupy in the three different workplaces which he has mentioned previously.

MR. MacMASTER: No, I haven't got that percentage and we've been sort of through this and around this a couple of times before. I don't think there should be percentages of work forces as it relates to any particular nationality.

MR. COWAN: We're not asking the Minister for a quota in this respect, although I certainly wouldn't rule out quotas as being a mechanism that can be utilized from time to time, as the Minister has done, and we've had that discussion, as he says, on different occasions and we'll probably have it on other occasions. What I'm asking specifically for is an analysis of the work force, not to superimpose criteria or goal on the employer, but as a check of the program. We have three programs, one which, with a large work force providing 98 participants in this program; the other which, with a smaller work force, providing 63; and in Thompson, with what is either the greatest or the second largest work force, providing only 23 participants to the program. There is a discrepancy there. The Minister tells us that discrepancy is perfectly acceptable to him because he has been informed that there have been a number of persons going directly into the work force. What I asked him for was some substantiation of that information. The other question of course, is who has made that information available to him?

MR. MacMASTER: I've gathered that information myself. If you walk the streets of Thompson and talk to enough people, people themselves from other nationalities and from other backgrounds, in conversations I've had, tell me how they became employed with International Nickel.

MR. COWAN: So the Minister is saying that he has not been informed per se by any outside party, but

he has made an assumption on the basis of his own observations which are, he's telling us, an on-the-street canvas in respect to the number of persons which are informed. It's a very informal mechanism and perhaps it is a mechanism which would be substantiated by a formal mechanism, but I would suggest that it is not the type of survey or evaluation upon which major decisions should be made and based, and major statements should be made. The statement was that there is no need for a greater participation in the program in Thompson, because there are other mechanisms at work that are fulfilling the need of this program.

Now, I'm not certain that that's the case. The Minister told me it was the case a few minutes ago and upon further questioning, I'm not certain that the Minister can be certain that that is the case because he just doesn't have the evidence available to him if he's basing his decision on subjective conversations that are held on street corners and in cafes; it's not a proper methodology. I don't see how he can support, or attempt to change a program in Thompson, if he's not going to be more detailed in his investigations. The program in Leaf Rapids, the Tawow Program is run — well perhaps I should phrase that question differently.

I understand that these program goals are run differently in the different areas, perhaps the Minister can indicate a general outline of the program in Leaf Rapids; a general outline of the program in Flin Flon and a general outline of the program in Thompson. By general outline I would mean who is involved in funding the program; what is their percentage of funds available; who is administering the program and what other agencies and persons are involved in the administration of this particular program in those three different areas?

MR. MacMASTER: Well there are an awful lot of questions and an awful lot of detail that the member is asking. Generally speaking, all three of them work in conjunction with the mining companies; they make field trips; they do some pre-employment counselling; they counsel the people once they are into the centres on budgeting and setting up a house or a home or apartment, whatever the case may be; they have alcohol councillors, if that requirement is necessary. Each one of the companies has a person specifically employed to concern themselves about the on-the-work problems that sometimes arise when you are dealing with these programs, by and large, that's generally the way that it works. If the member has a specific sort of question relating to any any one of them I would try and get that specific answer.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps it is unfair to bundle a whole series of questions together like that and expect the answers so we can go through it one by one. Can the Minister indicate who is employed in the three communities under this particular funding, not by names, but by positions? In other words, in Leaf Rapids what positions are provided for by funding for this particular item?

MR. MacMASTER: In Flin Flon there are three relocation councillors and a home advisor; in Thompson there is a two home advisors and two relocation councillors; in Leaf Rapids there is a manager who does other things, and a home advisor

Thursday, 5 March 1981

and two relocation councillors, so by and large there are similar numbers in each area.

MR. COWAN: I apologize I was trying to mark those numbers down as the . . .

MR. MacMASTER: Four in each, generally speaking two home advisors and two councillors in each area, in each particular community.

MR. COWAN: And the four that are in Leaf Rapids are dealing with 63 persons which is a client relationship of 15 approximately or 16; the ones in Flin Flon are dealing with approximately 25 each and the ones in Thompson are dealing with approximately only six each if my quick arithmetic is accurate. It is not always accurate but I think that would give an idea of the discrepancies as to the number of clients per individual in those different communities. I would like the Minister to comment on that discrepancy which is wide-ranging and appears to be one which would deserve some comment.

MR. MacMASTER: Again we know in the Thompson situation that they are in fact dealing with others who are not in the entire program but friends of friends of people that are in the program; example, a couple may say well we know we're doing fine, you've helped us through this tough spot but we do have some friends across town who need a little bit, particularly. Well the alcohol problem is a problem I think in all areas and in all three communities we think we're having a great deal of success. The AFM is working very closely with us and there is a lot of counselling done through them and a lot of referrals back and forth. We think that we're doing well in that particular area.

MR. COWAN: I'm certain there are referrals in Thompson, but I'm just as certain that the referrals are the same nature in Flin Flon and that there are a lesser number of referrals due to the population base but still a number of referrals of the same nature in Leaf Rapids. So that does not explain away what is an obvious discrepancy and I would ask the Minister if he can be more explicit as to any justification for that sort of, a different client-employee relationship.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I've tried to explain and the member obviously doesn't want the explanation or wants another one. Everybody seems to come through the programs in the other two areas and all the people in the north do not seem to come through the program in Thompson; now that's good or that's bad. Now talking to one of the Metis and treaty friends I have in Thompson, some of them feel that it's working just fine. They can always call on our people to go see their friends and that seems to be working well. I just want the thing to work and it seems to be working well in slightly different ways in all communities and I don't know whether we should regimentalize the thing; I think we discussed this last year, so it to be precisely the same in each community. You have to take into account the flow of people and the desires of people and the needs of people and it's difficult to precisely say that everybody needs this per type service.

MR. COWAN: Is there any other funding which supplements this particular service? In other words

are there any subsidies made available to companies for persons who are involved in these specific programs?

MR. MacMASTER: No, I don't know what the next question is because it seems to me the member's leading to something. I know of no funding going to any company if that's the last question?

MR. COWAN: Well, the next question was and the Minister is absolutely right I was leading to something. The next question would be; if there was funding then one could see a reason for different companies pushing more people through the program because it provided a subsidy to them but if there is not it still doesn't explain the discrepancy now and the Minister says I don't want the explanation. I certainly do want the explanation, I just don't accept his explanation, that's the crux of the matter and I am not certain I'm going to get a different explanation from the Minister. There may be different explanations available but I'm not certain that I'm going to get it from the Minister. I would ask the Minister if his staff can provide him with specific statistics as to the number of field trips which were made through the different offices.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Jim Galbraith (Dauphin): The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll try and get that, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that precise thing at hand.

MR. COWAN: That is an important statistic and I would hope that he would be able to come back to us with it fairly shortly. I travel a fair amount through the different communities and I know I see in a number of communities the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting poster — they have a poster which is part of this program or part of the relocation program I would imagine and you see it all over the place — you see it in the Island Lake area; you see it in the northern areas; I don't if there is a reserve community or a Metis community that I have been to that I haven't seen that particular poster. Now that's an outreach mechanism which is probably one of the reasons for them being able to have 98 people participating in that program.

I also know that they go out and they do some counseling right on the reserve before having people come through that program. The question of course is, why are they pursuing this program in such an active way, and it appears on a per capita basis or on a per worker basis that Sherritt-Gordon Mines would be doing the same and yet Inco in Thompson does not appear to be participating in the program as fully? I don't know if it's a question the Minister can answer. I don't know if it's a problem with the corporation or if it's a problem with the office there but I think that there is a discrepancy there that has to be addressed. I would hope that the Minister would be able to find out if in fact the percentage figures of the Inco operation in Thompson compare favourably to the percentage figures of Flin Flon, the percentage figures of Sherritt-Gordon and Leaf Rapids because that's the test.

This program has been designed, if I understand the program correctly, to provide support mechanisms for special needs northerners; and by

special needs northerner I'd imagine we're talking about northerners who have not had the opportunities that many people have had to gain access to the labour force and access to jobs, so this program is designed to provide support mechanisms for them. If they are in fact getting that access to the jobs without the program, then that is one matter and one could understand what is happening in Thompson and one would only have to question whether or not a couple of those persons from Thompson should be relocated to where the workload is obviously heavier — that's a decision the Minister has to make and the department has to make — but if in fact the statistics do not indicate that Inco is providing that access through other programs; or is providing opportunity through other programs; or through just a general difference in philosophy, tactics and mechanisms, then one has to question this program in that area and one has to question the corporation and that's a point to which I am trying to direct my remarks; that the low number of participants in that area would seem to me to necessitate surveys and evaluations that would indicate whether or not the goals of this program are being accomplished outside of the program; and the Minister has been unable to come forward with that sort of information.

I would hope that they would be a part of the surveys and evaluations and I guess this will be the appropriate point to ask the Minister if he can indicate if in fact those sorts of percentage analysis are being undertaken in the surveys and evaluations which he said should be ready in a quarter of a year or so.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Lloyd G. Hyde: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: From what I know of the surveys and evaluations taking place, we're talking about the satisfaction of people that are employed, those that are relocated, what dissatisfactions they may have, what ideas they would have to make the program work better, how they are reacting to the transition, a lot of that is day by day, you just gather it and get it.

The retention rate over a period of time I think is important. We believe that knowing the clientele reasonably well, the retention rate is reasonably good. We want to define that so we can spell it out just how well we are doing on a long term on a retention basis.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, does the Minister have figures that show what communities these people are coming from that are involved in the relocation programs for the Thompson one, for the Flin Flon and the Leaf Rapids program?

MR. MacMASTER: South Indian Lake, Crane River, Cross Lake.

MR. McBRYDE: Do you have numbers of those, like for the Flin Flon project?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, but what happens is we keep running into them later. If you want me to try

and gather up some of them, I could. I can give you the communities now and I'll try and get the numbers from them. We'll just add them up and give them to you but if you want the names of the communities now, I can give them to you and then we'll add all the South Indian Lake ones, all the Cross Lake ones, Granville Lake, Nelson House, Brochet, Pukatawagan, Cormorant, Pine Dock, Duck Bay — I'm looking for new names — Mafeking, Moose Lake. We even have one from Leaf Rapids to Thompson. I don't know whether the Member for Churchill likes that. Norway House, Fisher River, Barrows, Camperville, Grand Rapids, Pequis, Mallard, we even have one from Winnipeg that went north. Yes, we have a couple from The Pas, another one from The Pas, another one from The Pas, Barrows, Waterhen, Winnipegosis, Dallas, Hodgson, Grand Rapids — I think I said that before — Crane River, Mafeking, Fisher River, Wanless — that's one I hadn't said before. Okay. Gods Narrows, Ilford, Swan Lake, Thicket Portage, Shamattawa, Herring Bay and we'll get you some totals.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, what would be useful is like for each of the three projects, where are they drawing people from and the other of course important statistic and I don't think the Minister indicated this when he gave the general statistics, like out of the 23 people that came into the Thompson project, where were they from and how long did they stay or are they still there? Is that 23 of the people that are still there and there was 60 came in initially? I think the Minister is well aware and I'm not trying to be critical in this one regard, that there is going to be a certain number of people that don't stay in the urban centre, they go back to their own communities and that was understood when the program started. I know when Tawow was first under way there was a pretty detailed breakdown in terms of who came, who left and even some follow-up interviews as to why they left and why they didn't stay with the particular program, and that kind of information would be very useful if it can be readily put available by the Minister's staff. I suppose it would be useful while we're discussing it.

Another question for the Minister, I think he gave my colleague some breakdown as to the staff. Initially the projects were fairly separate projects, in fact not considered sort of regular staff positions when these programs started out, at the time in Thompson, for example, there was a contract with the Thompson region of the Manitoba Metis Federation to deliver this service. I wonder if the Minister could just bring me up-to-date in terms of the administrative structure for the relocation programs, the three relocation programs.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not sure if I understand the member's question. I gave the titles of those in the various areas. Yes, we still have an agreement with the Metis Federation in Thompson. That's two parts to probably a three or four part question if he could be more specific about the other portion.

MR. McBRYDE: What I was interested in was in fact what was happening at Thompson with that particular agreement. The other part of it, I'm not as familiar with the Flin Flon arrangement as I am with the other two although it was being negotiated at the

Thursday, 5 March 1981

time of the change in government or just getting under way at that time, I wonder if the Minister could indicate, for example, in the Tawaw project does the Sherritt-Gordon provide certain amount of staff time or do they have a full-time person related to the project; the same with Thompson, does Inco have somebody assigned to work with this project? At Flin Flon what is the company's obligation in terms of making sure this project works in terms of staff time? Then how do these relate administratively to each other; people that are employed by the company but assisting with the program; and people that are employed by the province that are working on the program; how do they relate to each other administratively?

MR. MacMASTER: I'd mentioned it before, I guess maybe the Member for The Pas didn't hear it, but each company has a specific person hired to deal with basically on the job but certainly works very closely with our staff off the job; each company has a specific person hired now working for them. That was not the case at one time. I think the member would concur when he was involved with this that that was part of the problem. We like to believe we're improving on it. That certainly was a need that was found wanting, was somebody specifically assigned with some authority by the companies to work with these people on the job, to make sure that frustration didn't get to the point on the job where they were quitting because of not being familiar or whatever with their workplaces.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes. One of the problems that was encountered by the program was the on-site foreman for people that come from the more remote communities to work in the urban centres in the mining industry; I wonder if there's still ongoing programs or whether that's still a problem area. There was a little bit of work done in terms of training on-line supervisors. I wonder if any of the companies in these three projects are still undertaking that or whether it's left to see what happens when somebody ends up under a particular foreman or how it works out.

MR. MacMASTER: I know that the word from all three companies is that the programs are there, they're real, they're to be worked with, they're to be accepted, the program, that there is to be no problems with the employees under this program. The individual in each case, with each company, I don't know where his direct line is, but I know it's past the foreman and the general foreman in the mines, he has a great deal of authority. We have not encountered in the last few months, to my knowledge, any on-site problem with a particular foreman. I know exactly what the member is saying; it doesn't have to be an Indian or a Metis person; there are people in the supervisory capacities in society who are less than understanding towards all kinds of nationalities. We've watched that pretty closely and we think, well it's past the point of thinking, we know that the three people who are working for those companies have a great deal of authority. We just haven't had that on-the-job problem that I think the member is referring to and I can agree that those problems are created in some employment conditions and situations in our country

but we just haven't had a specific problem brought to our attention. These people on the job have pretty good access and they're constantly being talked to by the on-the-job fellow, our off-the-job people are the on-the-job gentlemen and fellows and the women work well together and we don't think that problem exists.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes. On the same line I think the Minister is aware and I've mentioned this before when this type of employment project was first starting out, not in the form we have now but even earlier in the late Sixties. I'm sure the Minister would be aware of that time.

One of the follow-up studies in Thompson that traced the people that had stayed and people that had left at Inco, at Thompson, found that most of the ones that stayed happen to work for the same foreman. It was quite easy to trace to fact that that foreman was willing to work with them in an effective way that lead to their staying on the job; whereas people that were less fortunate ended up with a different person in charge of them as supervisors didn't stay with the job with Inco at Thompson and that came out of the very early days of the study. I know that when we had the program set up there was some effort being made at Leaf Rapids by the company where they were negotiating to do some training of their foremen in terms of their attitudes and approach to dealing with people, especially people from the remote communities. I'm not sure, I can't recall whether those programs that they were talking about ever were carried out and whether they were effective or not, in terms of helping to assist those people to use a more positive approach in dealing with the new workers from the remote areas.

I wonder if the Minister has any comment on those.

MR. MacMASTER: No more than I've said.

MR. McBRYDE: Okay. First of all, that'll be my first question then, is it a signed formal agreement with the Thompson region of the MMF?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes it is.

MR. McBRYDE: Who exactly, within the department, negotiates that agreement and with whom do they negotiate and who are the signatories of that particular agreement?

MR. MacMASTER: The staff within my department worked on it. My signature is on it.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes. What is the administrative structure for ensuring that it's carried out, short of the checking of the contract, checking that the MMF Thompson region is doing its job as agreed to by contract. Where does that responsibility lie for making sure that the full conditions of the contract are met?

MR. MacMASTER: With the office in Thompson.

MR. McBRYDE: Could the Minister be more specific? Would the Manpower office in Thompson oversee it? What level of supervision, what would be the position level of the person that's responsible to see that the agreement is carried out?

Thursday, 5 March 1981

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the people with the Relocation Program in Thompson work very close with the Manitoba Metis Federation in Thompson. I have had absolutely no complaint, or my staff hasn't had any problem with good cooperation with the particular group there.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I apologize for not making a note of the exact figures that Minister gave. In the contracted positions, in the contract with the Metis Federation, how many positions are there and what are exactly those functions?

MR. MacMASTER: There are two people and they're relocation counsellors, that's what the MMF calls them.

MR. McBRYDE: There are two persons who are relocation counselors. Could the Minister indicate the exact yearly amount of that agreement?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm guessing at the figure. I can get that further on, but I think it's in the neighbourhood of \$55,000.00.

MR. McBRYDE: I'm assuming then, Mr. Chairperson, that there is probably some administrative funds in that as well as the salaries of the relocation people.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, certainly the bulk of it's for their salaries and some of their administration costs. I can't just remember the details of it, but I think a bit of it's for their own office overhead.

MR. McBRYDE: I guess there's, in my mind, Mr. Chairperson, considerable curiosity in terms of the Minister's attitude and approach to the Manitoba Metis Federation and the Conservative Government's attitude and approach to the Manitoba Metis Federation where, in fact, they've cut funding for the Corps Program for the Manitoba Metis Federation, I think largely under this Minister's initiative through the Minister of Northern Affairs. They've cut also, Mr. Chairperson, the education funding for the Manitoba Metis Federation. I believe then that this would be the only program that has any connection with the Manitoba Metis Federation that is still funded by the Province of Manitoba; that Manitoba has reneged on any obligations to the organization except for this particular contract, which for some strange reason happens to be in the Minister's own constituency. All other assistance funding support for the Manitoba Federation has been done away with, pretty well entirely for political reasons by the Conservative Government. I just can't understand how this one has been able to survive when all the other programs have been done away with. I wonder what Mr. McIvor's had to do at Thompson in order to ensure this survival; what he's had to do for the Minister; or if he's had to buy a Conservative membership card; or how he's managed to ensure that the program survived when all the other programs of the Metis Federation are being cut off by this government. So that's the speculation that makes me very curious as to the survival of this one particular program.

The other part of this item is the Northern Youth Employment under The Northlands Agreement and I wonder if the Minister could outline for us some

detail in terms of this program, it's function, it's staffing, etc.

MR. MacMASTER: While they're digging for a description of that, I should clarify the record, because the member was less than accurate in some of your previous statements. There is more money going to Metis people for education funding today than there ever was in the past. The way it was originally set up, and the figures are rough, there was \$20,000 going towards scholarships to help needy Metis children by the MMF and there was \$40,000 used by them to administer the program. I believe there is \$40,000 or \$50,000 - and I don't have those figures - going straight into scholarship funding for the young people in the Metis communities. I would wish that the Member for The Pas, who has an obvious and I think a reasonably real interest in assisting people within his constituency, a lot of which are Metis and Treaty people, would have a look at the actual funding that is now going towards that very worthy cause. There is more funding now actually going to help young people in their scholarships and their educational funding than there ever was before. That's the first point.

Second point; the program itself in Thompson, the relocation program, is working very well and that's why it is still working. It has nothing to do with whether McIvor is an NDPer, which he's been I understand most of his life, even though he might not have agreed with the Member for The Pas when he was Minister of Northern Affairs, I suppose he had lots of people who didn't agree with him. But nevertheless, he is doing a reasonable job; his people are doing a reasonable job in there; they're working hard at it. It's a very meaningful program and I think it's working very well.

On the Job Creation Program for the youth in remote communities, we asked that projects be established which offer opportunities for students to gain meaningful work experience. They're working on a whole host, a variety of things, home repair service for the elderly; they assist with minor construction projects; they participate in community public works projects; they are the types that are funded under this program. In '79 there was, so the member can have the comparison, 38 projects; in 1980, there was 49 projects. In '79 there was 252 students; last year there was 303 students. The supervisory type, and I'm sure the Member for The Pas is familiar with how that fits in, there was 28 in 1979; in 1980, there was 36

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I know that the Minister, in his earlier comments, was very careful to use the words "the funding going to the Metis people", because there's no way that he can argue with the fact that the funding has been cut for the organization that represents the Metis people, the Manitoba Metis Federation. I know that he doesn't want to deal with whether that decision was a political decision or was based somehow on how the funds were spent or the organization and administration of those funds, which is clearly not the case. I don't think at this time I'll get into a long argument with the Minister in terms of the development, in terms of Metis people and Native people in Manitoba under this government and what has happened to that kind of assistance. That's quite

Thursday, 5 March 1981

a long subject for this particular item under discussion. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairperson, it still makes me very curious as to how one particular operation managed to continue when we have seen this government's attitude and approach to the organization in general.

In terms of the Northern Youth Employment Program the Minister mentioned 49 projects -- I'm assuming that these are all summer projects -- and since there are 49 projects I wonder if the Minister could just bring me up-to-date in terms of whether the Federal Government still has some youth employment projects in place, for reserves especially; and in 49, that means that most of the nontreaty communities would be covered by a program and I don't think I'll get the Minister to list all 49. Maybe he could tell me which communities didn't have the project. It might be quicker than telling me which ones did have the project. But if he answers the question in terms of Indian bands, whether there is an Indian Affairs or Federal Government program for the bands, a similar program then I'll get a better idea in terms of what communities were not covered.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, the Federal Government had a fairly extensive program going, similar to ours last year. I think they've had one for several years. I don't remember exactly when theirs started but they did in fact have one last year.

MR. McBRYDE: The figure then that the Minister used of 49 projects, I'm assuming then that if we're talking about within the Northern Affairs area and if there are any outside the Northern Affairs area, then the Minister could tell me. I'm assuming that just about every single community was covered, even the fairly small communities, that a project of some kind or other, small communities like Dauphin River or Mallard, probably those communities, that nearly every non-treaty community and remote community receive this program. What was I going to say now? Were some of these projects within the more urban centres? Did the Thompson, The Pas, have these projects last year and what was the nature of them if they were?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Snow Lake had one; the Town of The Pas had one. Those are the only two major centres I've seen to date. The Pas had two, that's within the town. Lynn Lake, the LDD of Lynn Lake, the Town of Leaf Rapids, yes, Thompson had one, Wabowden, the LDD of Churchill; so Churchill, Leaf, Lynn, The Pas and Thompson.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, I wonder if the Minister has in his book there any detail in terms of the urban programs, what they were, the projects?

MR. MacMaster: Just generalize what they were? Repairing recreation facilities and senior citizens homes; dismantling old community halls; working on park and playground development; clearing public reserve areas; constructing road signs; playground equipment; clearing park area; repairs to hall and church and pensioner assistance; repair to community halls and groundwork; renovate old school for drop-in centre; brush community hall and office property; paint buildings; construct outdoor facility; park development; picnic shelters; painted

the rink; construction at a concession; beachwork; construct log playground equipment; fence cemetery; operate community snack stands; park and greenhouse development; church repairs; repair senior citizens' homes; repair community halls, tot lots; again recreation community rink, hall, ball parks, senior citizens; painting assistance to elderlies; cemetery repairs, maintenance; supervise a beach area; church repairs; seeding a particular area. I'm trying to find some different ones. Most of the rest are just - construct garbage stands; work in an arena; work experience with the fire department, the police department; assisting the elderly and the handicapped; cutting firewood; fencing elderly citizens homes; fire hall repair; reserve profiles Data collection; backstops, community clean-up; working around the nursing station. That is generally, I think . . . In Churchill they had a tourist information booth and library work. So that's by and large the list.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, before the Minister puts his list away, one that sounds interesting was working for the fire department and the police force. I wonder if there is any detail in the book that says what that is. He didn't mention repair of fire halls in one case, that was separate. He mentioned some actually working with the firemen and one working with the police. I wonder if there is any more detail on that project?

MR. MacMASTER: That was The Pas band, Joe Ross was the Administrator of the program. It was in the native education department. Work experience, it said, with fire department, police department and working on the arena. That's what I did. Do you want some more details on what they were doing with the RCMP and what they were doing with the . . . I don't have it with me but I can get that and forward it to him, if the member would like.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I don't think it's that crucial to the passing of this particular item. I'm just kind of curious as to what they would be doing in that case. I wonder if the Minister could double check some specific communities there. There are a number of communities within my own constituency which always run into problems because they are not in the Northern Affairs boundaries but they are basically non-treaty communities or Metis communities. There is The Big Eddy Metis Settlement, The Umperville Metis Settlement and the LGD of Grand Rapids which includes of course a large number of Metis people, basically except for those working for hydro.

MR. MacMASTER: We had one from Umperville. I thought we had one from Grand Rapids but I'll check. But we certainly had one in Umperville, develop recreation area and seed grass, six people.

MR. McBRYDE: In that case, it seems in the other communities the community council or the town is somehow involved in the application and approval of application; in the case of Umperville and Big Eddy, if they get one next year, the Big Eddy Metis settlement, I'm wondering how that's done administratively since they are under the LGD of Consol. Is Consol involved in any way or do they administer, as a non-legal community entity some way do they administer those funds?

Thursday, 5 March 1981

MR. MacMASTER: The one in Umperville was advanced through the MMF regional office in your home town, The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I was aware of the project; I wasn't aware of how it was administered. I'm just wondering then what is the general course? Is it normally the community council in a non-Treaty community?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes.

MR. McBRYDE: Okay. The other question, is the extent that this program is in fact on reserve and for reserve students? I was surprised that the Minister mentioned specifically that The Pas Reserve had their own project. I wonder then, out of the 49, how many would be on reserve and basically for Treaty Indians?

MR. MacMASTER: Now there is quite a mixture between the federal program and our program; we work with them to attempt to cover as many areas as possible. I found four bands, the Big Eddy Metis settlement had a project; one more band, I think that's five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven; eleven were bands.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I hope I'm not going to get the Minister in trouble with his colleagues and the Premier because 11 out of the 49 projects are taking place on reserve with Treaty Indian people and the approach of the government has been to say that all programs related to Treaty Indian people should be paid for, totally the responsibility of Indian Affairs. I think the Minister has some idea that's not always possible especially where the community is half Treaty people and half non-Treaty people living within the same community. It's just easier and simpler and more effective to have the band administered in some cases than to have the non-Treaty council administer it or perhaps the band is much larger and has a structure whereas the other community might be fairly disorganized.

My thoughts on it are that in those areas where we are not doing something that the Federal Government should be doing and it's clearly their obligation to do and that's agreed to with the Treaty Indian people, then it's all right for the Province of Manitoba to provide some type of assistance; it's going to help in the development of reserve communities.

I am a bit surprised, in light of even a resolution that it will probably come up for debate this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, in terms of that the Treaty Indians should be entirely the responsibility of the Federal Government; that this department is in fact involved with the reserves. As I said, I hope I don't cause the Minister any problem that he will be forced to review the program for the upcoming year to ensure that reserves don't qualify for it.

I don't have any more specific questions on that particular program. We did talk under this item about the three relocation projects. I'm assuming that the rest of the Minister's Employment Support and Counselling Service comes under this and I wonder if he could bring me up-to-date in terms of how and where their offices are and what, in fact, they are doing these days.

MR. MacMASTER: There are offices established, as I think the member knows, in The Pas, Flin Flon, Thompson and Leaf and we have one person in Churchill. They deal with a variety of assistance: Apprenticeship, New Careers, Private Sector Youth Program, Relocation, the Youth Programs, some are referred to the Selkirk plant, your Hire-a-Student Program, Northern Summer Education Program; they also deal with the volunteers in Public Service, Northern Travel, Step-In Government. Those are generally the things that those people are doing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(2)(a) — pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, is the Item 2.(d) the item what's left of what was sort of basically a placement program, is that still part of the function of that section? Am I on the right item in terms of when there was in fact an employment officer in Cross Lake, in Norway House and several of the communities? Would this have been the section under which those people would have been and is there still a placement function, as such, being carried out by his department under this or any other section?

MR. MacMASTER: The areas that I named are where the offices are. I just named them to the member.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister name those offices. My question was, is this the section where those offices would have been or should I be looking somewhere else to see if there is an additional placement function or is this, it?

MR. MacMASTER: This is it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Okay, and within those few offices that are left — I'm not sure what titles the people would have, I think in the past they were called employment officers in the more remote community, I'm not sure what titles they would have now — would their work involve placement; would they be actually assisting people to work for Hydro, if there was any; would they be doing any placement? Maybe I'd get more specific with the Minister with a couple of examples. If there were a contract awarded in Cross Lake would his department or any of these offices assist people to get a job with that contractor at Cross Lake or have any involvement in terms of talking to that contractor to see if they'll employ people at Cross Lake?

MR. MacMASTER: If there is a major contractor of some type taking place such as the road that was built into Cross Lake, our department would certainly involve themselves in that, to attempt to assure ourselves that the people in Cross Lake were certainly given an opportunity to work on that project. Yes we would involve ourselves. I should say that we work very closely with the Federal Government who have 11 people, I think they're called Outreach, I'm not sure what their terms are, that work in various communities and throughout communities in Northern Manitoba and we work very closely with them. I think the member would appreciate that that's very necessary.

Thursday, 5 March 1981

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, one more specific. The province has just about completed a new jail and courthouse at The Pas. My understanding is from local people that there was almost no Native people, in fact hardly any local residents employed in that project at all. I wonder if the Minister is aware of that and whether his office had any role in trying to get people into that project. I think what happened was that unless the province is pretty strong in terms of its requirement, then the contractor doesn't worry that much about it. In this case it was a contract management agreement and it looks like it didn't work very well in terms of providing local employment, either to trades people or to labourers. I wonder if the Minister is aware if his office had any role in trying to place people on that job and, if they did have any role in trying to place people on that job, whether they had any luck doing so.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not aware of the numbers of local people that were employed in that particular project. I'm sorry I just haven't got those numbers. If I can say one other thing. I'd mentioned before that the Federal Government has 11 people, I meant they had 11 communities in which they have 28 people — I'd used the wrong numbers, I said 11, I meant 11 communities; they have 28 people in 11 communities in Northern Manitoba.

MR. McBRYDE: Just for my clarification, I know the Minister is talking outside of his area here but the 28 people, are those the people that would be, for example, in The Pas they have certain people that are federal civil servants in their office and they have some people that are on a contract Outreach Program to the Manitoba Metis Federation at The Pas; would these 28 all be Outreach workers on contract with organizations and other groups?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, I understand they are. That's the 28 that the feds apparently are funding in 11 different communities and I understand the number of people they're funding is 28.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. In terms of this particular section of the Minister's department, for it to work well, for the people that are working in the department to take full advantage of the projects, of the work that's available in their area, requires a lot of co-operation, not only from the mining companies where the co-operation does seem to be coming from what the Minister's comments have been and I know was there in the past to a certain extent, but I believe that since there is so little happening in some of these communities that not a single job opportunity can be lost without hurting many of the communities. I know that the Federal Government, when dealing with reserves now, I mean it's very clear the project is basically a reserve project run by the reserve and they're pretty fully involved in whatever goes on so they can ensure and make some guarantee that their own people are employed in that project. I'm not sure if that applies that well because I'm just not that familiar with any new federal construction, for example, of a school or that kind of facility or a new nursing station.

But in the case of the Provincial Government it was a problem; even when we were in government when it was a clear government policy to employ

local people, and in some agencies such as Hydro, in certain aspects we're not very co-operative. I would like the Minister, I would urge the Minister to be fully aware of the problem that in fact unless there is some pressure put on by other agencies, his agency isn't going to be as effective as it could be. That is unless the Department of Public Works makes it very clear to a contractor that they're expected to hire local people on any project that goes into a community up north, then that contractor is not going to do it. His placement, the Outreach worker for Canada Manpower or for the Federal Government, who's paid by the Federal Government, can do all he likes to try and place people there, but unless the contractor is willing to hire them and makes some effort to hire them, then I think the Minister is quite well aware that it's not going to work. We have all kinds of stories and I'm sure the Minister has them in the past with people applying for a job and under one excuse or another being turned down for the job, people who were local residence.

So I would like to urge the Minister to have his staff pretty carefully monitor that kind of situation. I would see that as a responsibility of the Minister's staff in the field that when the jail and the courthouse were constructed at The Pas that somehow it could get to the Minister's attention that, in fact, there weren't local people being hired to the extent of the jobs available and that somehow their system be worked out so that could come directly to the Minister's attention so then that he could down the hall to his colleague, the Minister of Government Services, and find out what the heck's going on. Why is there a project going on in this particular community and the contractor's bringing in outside people. I think that is not that easy to do because you have a field worker at the field worker level and say, well gee I can't get anybody placed on that project; but then he has to go to his supervisor, who goes to his supervisor, and by the time it gets to the Minister the project might be finished or the Minister might not be then clearly aware of the problem that's being faced. It requires a system where it could get to the Minister quite quickly and that he could then get after his colleagues to make sure that people in the local community are hired.

It's much clearer of course if it's a clear government enunciated policy that that's going to take place and then the Minister, whoever is responsible for Manpower has no problem leaning on his colleagues to get them to go along with the policy direction and the policy initiative of government. If it's not a clear policy then his job of persuasion is a lot more difficult to try and convince his colleagues that they should build this in or that they should make an effort to employ local people. I think it's basically a matter of (1) of the government saying that's the direction we want to move in; and (2) then the Minister being able to have a system so he knows when it isn't happening because this is his responsibility as Minister of Manpower to know when it isn't happening and try and make it happen.

The example that I found very irritating at the time but it's just sort of a clear example how one section can foul up what the next section is doing is a simple job that took place in the community of Cormorant where the job was to landscape around the school,

as they need labourers to rake the rocks off and assist the machine to level it and then to lay sod. It wasn't a job that there wasn't a number of local people couldn't have done, couldn't have been employed at. What happened in that case, because of a ruling by management committee that the Department of Public Works, who was carrying that out, was not allowed to hire anybody new. What they had to do was bring in a crew from Brandon who had finished a similar job in the Brandon area into Cormorant, put them up in the Cormorant Lodge, which is basically a lodge that caters to Americans so I imagine that their prices are not as low as you might find in other areas and put them to work on the job. That is the kind of the situation where a mechanism should be existing within the department so that somebody could get very directly to the Minister in saying here's what's happened. The Minister could run down to the Management Committee and say, you guys are ruining a whole program of employment, of helping people to get jobs in the north by that kind of a policy; get it reversed and changed around. I think eventually it was changed but not because it came to the Minister's department or that kind of a system because it came from the opposition.

I wonder if the Minister thinks that that kind of an approach is worthwhile and whether he thinks that he'll be able to initiate and get the government to adopt (1) a policy that the priority goes to local people when there's a job that the Provincial Government is involved in, or a Crown agency is involved in, and then that there be a system within the department basically so that this department monitor and ensure that that policy is carried out so that we don't miss as many employment opportunities because there are few enough, Mr. Chairperson. There's not that many left and I don't think the figures have changed very much in some community where there's 75 percent unemployment. So one job in that community is very important and 10 jobs in a government project is even more important. I wonder if the Minister would be willing to pursue that policy direction. What is he able to do in that regard now? What does he think he might be able to do in the future?

MR. MacMASTER: I guess I'm in a similar position to what the member was a few years ago when he was in government where we felt, by and large, that's taken place. I know that I wasn't in office very long where we changed around, for example, the building of winter roads in Northern Manitoba where we took it away, not without some screaming but we certainly took it away from contractors and I'm told the Native people in the north, Native, Metis and others that are living in the north, that they had to come in reasonably competitive and we'd give them first a crack at it and keep it that way for a period of time till they really got on their feet and knew what real prices were and if they could do the job well they could get those particular jobs. That I think was as big an indication that I had, that I have given, that I do want northern people to get a real good fair crack at the job.

Again, most of — and I'm sure the member has an example or two where it didn't work — but most of the jobs that I'm aware of that are going on in the north, northern people projects that are going on,

northern people are getting a good fair shot at employment on them. We think we have a pretty fair idea the things that are going on and, by and large, we think that the northern people are getting a good opportunity to work on those jobs, not all entirely, that I guess will always be the case, but generally speaking I think they're getting a reasonably good shot at employment from the projects that are going on, particularly within their communities. The Cormorant one is an interesting example and I don't remember the details of that.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Maybe the Minister doesn't understand the situation as well as I thought he did; because of the way things are, a reasonably good shot probably isn't good enough. People I suppose have had a reasonably good shot, that is there was nothing preventing them, but for some reason it always turned out that most of the jobs didn't go to local people. I guess I would like to know from the Minister whether there is a clear policy of the present government that where there is a government project, that preference will be given to local people. Is that a policy or is it not a policy?

MR. MacMASTER: That's a policy that we've been following since we formed the government. Again I say you may find isolated situations where you don't feel as adequately administered. We may find that five years from now or five years past, but by and large that's the policy, that local people are to be given an opportunity to work on the projects that are taking place within their communities.

MR. McBRYDE: Does the Minister see any way that enforcement or the living up to that policy could be improved?

MR. MacMASTER: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, everything can be improved. If I was to say it was running absolutely excellent, that would be incorrect. I think you continue to observe and continue to assure yourself that that policy by and large is being carried out. There are exceptions to every situation, but we think by and large that policy is being carried out.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, one of the reasons why I raise that specific example of The Pas Jail and Courthouse is, that I was able to question the Minister of Government Services and he isn't as clear in his mind as to the policy as the Minister is. He did not give any indication that there was a policy of preference to hire local people. He said that there was a contract manager and that was an efficient way to carry it out and that's the way it would be done. So maybe the Minister wants to, since the Minister is fairly new to that portfolio, to let him know that there is such a policy so that that doesn't take place again.

The other way, Mr. Chairperson, is to have some sort of mechanism to check. In some departments, it's not a problem. Like in Northern Affairs, if they build a community hall, where the Council's involved in the decision they make sure that local people are hired as much as possible. When there's a larger project like a school or a jail and a courthouse or something like that, when the Government Services department doesn't have all that much experience in

Thursday, 5 March 1981

terms of the north is involved, then they don't give that kind of emphasis to the project. I mean, they're just worrying about getting in the lowest priced contractor. But even with that, it's still possible to tell the contractor that that's an expectation you have of them and not let it just be a chance mechanism. It almost has to be outlined within the contract, so the contractors know when they're bidding that that's an expectation that the Province of Manitoba has. I would like the Minister who's responsible for the Employment Support and Counseling Services, to attempt to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, Committee will rise for Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 31 of the Main Estimates, Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment, Resolution No. 37, Clause 2, Consumer Affairs (a) Salaries — pass.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we were talking about food pricing and other matters and we will go back to that again at some time later in today's proceedings. The reason I'm about to change the topic is because my colleague, the Member for Churchill wishes to participate in that debate and has to be in Labour Estimates for the next few minutes, and has indicated his intention to return. So I'll go on to something else and then we'll come back to that other matter when he does.

I wanted to talk, Mr. Chairman, about the question of the government's policy respecting children's advertising. I wanted to know whether the government had any position on that subject, whether they were doing any monitoring, whether they were privy to any public reports on the subject, and I'd like to know whether we might expect any action from the government in this very important area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. FILMON: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I missed the opening sentence as to which area the member is referring to.

MR. CORRIN: The opening sentence was just to advise, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister that we are going to continue the debate on the question of unit pricing and the universal product code, but that matter is in abeyance on request of the Member for Churchill who wants to participate, who was here yesterday throughout and doesn't want to miss any contributions because he wants to get involved in the discussion. So he'll be back in a little while, he's in Labour Estimates and when he returns we can go back to that subject.

Having said that I presume the Minister heard the question I tendered with respect to the advertising to

children. I suggest we all plug in our earphones. I thought, Mr. Chairman, it was quite obvious that the question had to do with whether any policy was being contemplated by the government with respect to the question of children's advertising, and I asked whether the government was privy to any public reports on the subject of children's advertising, was doing anything to monitor the effects of advertising on children within the province, and whether any initiative would be taken or contemplated in this regard by the government in the forthcoming year.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the answer to that at the moment and in view of the fact that my Deputy is not yet here I'll have to wait until he comes.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, it's hard not to be somewhat sarcastic but if the Minister of the Crown doesn't have the answer, who does? That's I guess a bit of rhetorical question but I'll pose it to the Minister.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of returning in kind, perhaps the member is unaware that I've been appointed Minister for something in the range of six weeks, and that there are many many areas that may or may not come under the jurisdiction of my portfolio that I may not be totally informed about. The purpose is obviously for him to bring forward the question and I will attempt to give him the answer from within the resources in the department but if I were to ask him a question that had to do with any aspect of law, any aspect whatsoever, perhaps he could tell me what particular section and a particular statute said right off the top of his head — being a lawyer he may have total and complete knowledge of every statute that's ever been passed in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think that I'd better make a statement at this point, that we are now under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment and the side conversations and debates really have no bearing on this subject, and I would ask the members to please stick to this subject.

MR. CORRIN: Yes. With respect to this item, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, first of all I note that although he is new that there is continuity in government. I think it's safe to presume we all operate on the basis of caucus discipline to some extent so I presume that whether a Minister is new or whether he is old in terms of his post and position, he is familiar with the government or the government's position relative to various items — I presume these matters are always continually coming up for discussion and debate. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would note that the some two seats to the Honourable Minister's right, the former Minister is seated, I presume that if he wishes he could have recourse to the Minister to ask what policy in the department is, the former Minister what policy was and is. If that's unsatisfactory there is certainly continuity with respect to the administrative staff and the senior staff are present before the Minister — perhaps he could consult with one of those people and give us some idea of whether the government is doing anything in that particular respect.

Thursday, 5 March 1981

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I propose to do for the member. When I suggested that, that the information could be obtained when members of my department arrive, he suggested that I was to have known all of these things. I have now had an opportunity to do that and I can say that our department is not doing anything currently with respect to children's advertising, and that's the answer to his question.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that answer begs another question and that is why the department has chosen not to become involved in this particular public policy issue. It's one that is quite topical amongst consumer associations, among people who are involved in lobby groups and organizations concerned with consumer affairs. I would like to know why the Government of Manitoba has not evinced a similar desire to deal with this very important matter and why it rates such low priority.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer is rather simple. It has never been presented as a public policy issue in Manitoba that I am aware of in this House. Of course I've only been here for about 16 months but I don't recall from my readings or my following of the events in the Legislature that it has been raised as a public policy issue in this House. If it had been then I'm sure it would have been dealt with and our department would have looked into it and developed a position on it, but if the member would like to present a position on it that we can deal with we'll be more than happy to have it.

MR. CORRIN: I certainly accept the invitation of my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is a very important matter and one that should be addressed by government. Mr. Chairman, I think we can all agree that children are extremely susceptible and vulnerable to media advertising and communication. I think we can also agree that children, particularly of tender age, receive a rather distorted impression of the consumer world — if I could put it that way — through various advertising approaches put forward through the media and particularly television.

I feel that, and I dare say that probably my concern is shared by some in the House, that there is reason now for governments to take some sort of action to cope with this particular problem. I'm basing this on my own observations and on material I've read, I think that there is reason to believe that children, and their parents as the actual consumers of products, are being subjected to exploitation tactics by retailers, manufacturers and advertisers of products. There are other lines of argument. I've heard the argument made and I think it has some substance that a lot of this advertising also adds to the decay of the moral fibre of our people in the sense that children are taught to be materialistic and greedy. I'm not sure whether that is true, but I can tell you, being a representative from a working-class riding — this I've had discussions with parents about — that it is most difficult and I guess demoralizing for people who don't have a lot of disposable income to be confronted with exaggerated needs put forward by their children, which are essentially created by advertising techniques and methods that are designed to exploit the innocence and the naivety of young minds.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be accused, I don't want to stand accused of making a self-serving argument. There is evidence and I want to refer to a report that was prepared by the Federal Trade Commission in the United States who has done an extensive amount of research into this subject. The Federal Trade Commission did considerable investigation of the General Foods cereal operation. They've been doing that for the years since 1972. They've been investigating the "big four" as it were of the cereal industry and in having established that General Foods and their so-called competitors spent a disproportionately high percentage of their total expenditures on advertising, I think that — (Interjection)— yes, one-third. They established that one-third of the overcharge for most processed foods in this area was due to excessive advertising. They revealed something called "Children's Copy Policy for 1969". This was something that through their subpoena powers they were able to obtain from the General Foods' administration. This document was prepared by the administration and it was basically a targeting strategy for penetrating the children's markets with respect to cereal products.

Here's something and we're talking about a product called "Sugar Bear" and we're talking about a caricature, a fictitious figure, called "Sugar Bear" who appears on television advertisements for this company. Here is what the company said "Sugar Bear" was going to do and I quote, his mission as it were: "The primary copy point in the advertising will convince kids that "Sugar Bear" eats super Sugar Crisps to make him powerful, thereby implying that if kids eat the product they will be provided with extra energy. It is our intent that children will believe that eating super Sugar Crisps will now make them strong and that it tastes good." Well, Sugar Crisps unfortunately in the same study came off rather poorly in terms of its position in the spectrum of children's cereals and cereals generally. It was found not to be a very nutritious product.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, and it was a finding of the Federal Trade Commission in the United States that this sort of approach is indeed quite exploited. I think, Mr. Chairman, that one can suggest that it's certainly not the sort of approach that one normally associates with high ethical standards in the marketplace, nor is it the sort of approach that's associated with the protection of consumer interests.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I think that there's good reason for governments everywhere in pursuit of the protection of public interest to look to this sort of advertising and decide what sort of policy it's going to implement. There have been other surveys done and I think that most of the surveys have been done with respect to toy advertising and if you have children, Mr. Chairman, or any members who either have young children or have had young children will know and will realize that children are particularly susceptible to this sort of advertising. They are very vulnerable to it. I guess it's every child's wish to have playthings and they are easily misled in terms of what they should have and when they should have it, particularly significant that this is equally the case whether a child is poor, middle class or from a wealthy background.

Again, tangentially I want to reinforce I think the fact that a lot of this advertising is particularly

Thursday, 5 March 1981

perverse because it's disseminated to children of "lower class background" whose parents simply can't afford to provide them a lot of these sorts of conspicuous consumer items such as toys anyway. So what it does is it distorts these kids' perception of society in that it dangles before them things that they can never hope to acquire, things that they can't have and it's a real problem. I veered to that before earlier; I talked about people in my constituency and I think it is a real problem. I think it puts parents in a disadvantageous position and I think it's questionable that we, as legislators, should allow the commercial sector to set these sort of economic priorities on the expenditures of families. You know, there are indeed better things that families can spend precious income on. These are indeed the most disposable, in some cases, the disposable items in a family's budget, but it doesn't seem that way if your children are being continually bombarded by McDonald's, by Mattel, by General Foods, by Kelloggs and so on and so forth. And, you know, they can't say no and they can't understand why anyone else would want to say no to these, seemingly their most fundamental desires.

The first thing, and I'll never forget it, one of the first words my child said was "McDonald's" and you know we were driving along one day and he had never before spoken in a full sentence. He seemingly at that point of his development hadn't able to put together all the things that children have to put together to speak coherently. We were driving along one day and he said, nobody can do it, and I thought he was talking nonsense, and he was pointing. I thought, gee, what sort of nonsense. Here he's trying to put together a sentence. What does it mean — nobody can do it. I looked up and there was the golden arch and you know, really, I think that it's significant. I've spoken to my friends who have young children and they all agree. These children are virtually steeped in the commercial ethic by the time they're three years of age. They're already in a sense conspicuous consumers. They're materialistic. They've been materialistically oriented. They're put along that path and it's very difficult to draw them away from it. You can't use logic and say well, you know, your mother thinks these foods are more wholesome or more nutritious. You should eat this and that's very expensive food. You, know, that hamburger, french fries and a shake is a very expensive lunch.

So, what happens is people, in order to gratify the wishes of their kids and in order to retain peace in the household in fact do start to dispose of their income in that fashion but it's an issue which should be addressed by government, just that simply. Somebody should say, well, it's not quite fair. It's a form of undue influence. The children are not capable of discerning truth from untruth, true representations from a fallacious one and somebody has got to do something.

Now, obviously it can be done in a variety of ways. But I think, first of all, my own feeling is since the Minister asked, my own feeling is that there should be an attempt by the department to monitor the effect of this on Manitoba families. I think that Manitoba should do very much the same sort of thing in this area of media policy as Ontario did with respect to the effects of violence on children in

television. We all remember that the late Judy LaMarsh chaired a commission into the effects of television violence on children. I'm not sure it was restricted just to children, but certainly that was one of the main concerns of the Commission of Inquiry and they had some pretty astonishing findings. We're not going to go into that but they simply, I think that they affirmed, they confirmed the suspicions of many people. That children were in fact disposed to be more violent when they saw popular figures performing violent acts on television. I don't want to go into it in detail, I said, so I won't. But generally, they're normal responses to violence were dull. They were blunted, their sensitivity to violence and the effects of violence were dulled and therefore they were more susceptible to becoming violent. It was a more acceptable way of resolving conflict of a variety of sorts.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, I suppose as a parallel, that we have the same sort of problem with respect to children's advertising. You know, if a child really believes that happiness is every Mattel toy, going to McDonald's whenever he wants, and that that's a good meal, if that sort of consumerism is inbred from a very early stage in life I suggest that it's going to have dramatic effects in terms of the type of people we have. I, of course, I think many of us, would prefer to have consumers, people in society who would consume on a discerning conservative basis, and we use that word now in its best sense. We live in a society, Mr. Chairman, when the need to conserve, where the need to conserve is becoming dramatically evident and important. So really, I don't think we want to teach kids that it's a good idea to — and here I'm not intentionally being facetious but I suppose it's the truth — we don't want to live in a society where we teach kids that it's all right to consume trees in order to make paper to wrap McDonalds hamburgers in, to consume cows who have to eat valuable foodstuffs that could be fed to the starving people of the world. We don't want to teach them that. We want to go in the other direction, Mr. Chairman. It's important that we teach people that the resources of this planet are finite and that they be made aware of that from their very earliest experiences in life. I say we are going the wrong way. We are letting it all slip away. It's senseless, and I think that there should be something done about it.

Also I think rather interestingly some surveys that were done by the Canadian Consumer Magazine and I think that's a fairly reliable source of information. I think they are doing good work in association with Canadian Consumer Information, certainly spreading enlightenment on a variety of consumer problems. They have done some surveys, that very recently, August of last year, they found that parents, parents of children concluded that product advertising on television generally was more dishonest than product advertising targeted at kids put through other forms of media. The parents felt after watching a variety of samples, drawing on their own experience, that television as a format, was particularly compelling to children and created situations where it was very easy to entice and mislead people, mislead children, on the qualities of a particular product. Interestingly, 87 percent of the Canadians who responded to that particular survey said that television represented the

most dishonest form of advertising in this regard, which is quite interesting.

So the people, when we say that nobody, when the suggestion comes from the opposite side that this isn't an issue, I suggest that 87 percent of the public can't be wrong. I think that's a very representative sample and I think we should address that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the Minister whether he agrees that something more than simply considering this matter should be done, but rather whether the matter should be effectively monitored and I suggest the best way is through a public hearing process so that we can have the evidence of experts. I would like to hear child psychologists. I'd like, indeed, to hear people from the advertising industry justify their somewhat cynical approach. We've heard the FTC's findings with respect to the General Foods Corporation and their market strategies. I would like to hear from a cross section of our consuming public on this very important issue. I think after four years in government, frankly, it's time for this government to pick itself up and get involved in consumer affairs. I know that it's been oft repeated in the House and in the media for that matter, but it's true. The government simply has done nothing with respect to the important area of consumer affairs and you know, if I'm wrong I stand to be put in my place and I'll be told what initiatives this government has brought in the past four years.

With respect to a very few amendments last year to The Consumer Protection Act and I think they were all encompassed within the space of two pages on the Bill, I can't remember very much. It's been pretty quiet. I think it's important in some respects that legislators show the way. You know, that's why we're elected in some respects. We're presumed, and I think we must be presumed, to be representative of the public and to have some sense of what people want us to do. That's why I'm involved in a party of some 20,000 people who meet regularly and have policy discussions, so that we can bring these matters forward to the floor of the Legislature and if you're fortunate enough to be in the position of government ministry, have initiatives taken, reforms made. I would like to know whether the government has any intention at all to take initiative in this particular area, and if so what initiatives they will take.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll endeavour to present some views on the rather wide range of topics that the member covered in his discussion, but to suggest that to control advertising directed at children would solve all of the problems that the member sees in television and in persuading young people and shaping their minds, seems to be more than a little far-fetched. Firstly, I agree wholeheartedly that there's a very distorted view of real life and the values that we uphold in life presented on television, but it's not just presented by paid advertising by any stretch of the imagination. In fact, I suggest Mr. Chairman, to the member opposite, that you could get rid of all paid advertising on television and you'd still find that 87 percent of the people, or whatever figure he quoted, would object to the kind of view of life and the kind of values, both moral and economic that are presented on television today, by all these inane

programs we have. I talk about the situation comedies. I talk about the soaps. I talk about the cops and robbers, the programs that are designed to present views of police departments and the justice system. They are also distorted, they are also inaccurate, that they bring forth values that none of us I think, agree with, on television and none of them have anything to do with advertising. If we're to select advertising and say that's the big bugbear, that's the big problem, that's what causes all — I think that we're deluding ourselves. It's absolutely ridiculous. The emphasis that's shown on sex and violence and all those things in television has nothing to do with advertising. The kinds of distorted views that we're presenting to our children have very little to do with advertising.

The suggestion that he's brought forward about the big conspiracy by General Foods behind the sugar bears and what that's done to people by virtue of their marketing strategy, is a question between whether or not nutrition is more important than good taste and whether children should know more about nutrition. That's a job of education that we require. That's a job that rests with the educational system, with parents and the family unit to tell children the difference between what's good for them and what may be tasty. We had that all the way along. I can remember in my earlier days growing up and eating candies and all of the things that were bad for me seemed to be the things I wanted to eat. I don't think that's changed. I don't think you're going to change it by bringing forth some form of censorship, because if you're going to start by censoring advertising toward children, you'd better carry it on and censor it toward adults and you'd better carry it on and censor it in all the television that we watch, because that's the only answer; then carry it on to the reading materials and everything else. If he's advocating censorship, then I think that it's a policy he's welcome to bring forward as a member of this Legislature, because he's got to take it the full distance if he's going to have any effect whatsoever, but it seems to me that to suggest that government — and government is the only agent that can enter this field and control all these things and rectify all these things — that he's taking away all of the responsibility for developing moral values, economic values, senses of responsibility and attitudes in our society from the family unit and saying that government is the only instrument for change, government is the only instrument to control all of these things and correct all of these evils in society. I suggest to him that he's on the wrong path.

We currently do, in a variety of areas, restrict advertising even in this province. I think it's probably designed so that it won't be available at times that children might see it. I'm thinking in terms of liquor advertising not being permitted until after 10:00 p.m. on television, or not permitted on billboards or some of those judgment decisions that have been made in the past, but those are minor ways. When you start to get into saying that everything that is aimed at children ought to be expunged, ought to be purged from all of our media, then you're getting into a whole kettle of fish that I think takes away all sense of responsibility from individuals for their own actions, for the actions of their children and their families and so on. I suggest, as they say, that he's barking up the wrong tree.

I think if he suggests that the sugar beets or sugar bears or whatever it is cause children, you know, the advertising causes all the children to eat sugar bears, it seems to me that Popeye in all of his exposure didn't change everybody over to spinach, didn't convince too many children to eat spinach. I never did when I was a child, in fact I still don't enjoy spinach today, despite all of the Popeye that I've watched.

So this isn't the answer and surely we're not at the point where we have to have government regulate, control and decide on everything that we're going to present in our society today. Surely we're not going to turn everything over and take away all responsibility from individuals to develop their own sense of what's right and wrong, their own values, moral, economic, what have you. I don't think that's the answer and I think the member is leading up a blind trail.

More to the point, what's happening within our department today is through our Consumer Information Program. An audio-visual presentation is being developed on children as consumers. The point of that program to be developed is to teach children to be more discerning consumers, to teach them how to cope with all the advertising, all of the things that they're exposed to today and to be able to make valid and rational judgments as to what's good and what's bad, what has value and what doesn't have value, not to shelter them from the undesirable advertising to which they might be exposed, but to teach them to make the kinds of judgments and instil in them a sense of value by making them better and more discerning consumers. That's a program that I subscribe to and would say has value today, not censorship.

MR. CORRIN: Concluding my points on this particular subject, I suppose by way of rebuttal Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Minister to take note of the fact that government does in fact, have certain responsibilities. Government doesn't come out of the air. This is something we so often go through, it sometimes seems to be a part of the ideological dynamic of this Assembly, but it seems to me that we can all accept the fact that the process that brings us here in fact, affirms the desire of people, people we all represent and from which we come, to have something done about certain vital concerns. We're not tyrants. I don't think that any Minister of the Crown should perceive himself as being a cruel despot, or see himself in that sort of invidious light. I think rather, Mr. Chairman, that we should understand and appreciate that we have a responsibility, that we are charged with this responsibility by the people we represent and our job is to structure government in such a way as to enhance and better society. I think in doing that, obviously we address it as a result of our political philosophy, somewhat differently, but nevertheless I think we can agree that our job is to support people.

The Minister says, well, we don't want to interfere with people's personal affairs; the child's parents can discipline the child and they can teach the child and instruct the child and so on and so forth and we don't want to interfere in that. That's a bit specious, Mr. Chairman, I think that's a bit specious, because the child's parents need a little support. We have probably scores of programs designed to support

families and I'm just saying that we can have another one.

One of the things we did, I think it was one of the most affirmative things that's been done in this province and most other responsible jurisdictions, is the injunction against life-style advertising of liquor products. I think that was a major breakthrough. I think that, speaking now as a parent, confronting that sort of advertising with young children, I think it makes instruction very difficult if you're saying one thing, but the football player on the television set is telling little Mike that there's nothing wrong with having a brew after the game. It's a different story. I'm willing to admit that I don't have the same charisma as Mean Joe Green and I watch a lot of that American garbage that comes up on the tube. I watch the men who are indeed the heroes of many of the youngsters of this country and the United States, I guess crassly, commercially, cynically, advocating the use of this sort of product. I just don't think that we can be naive about that and we responsibly, Mr. Chairman, responsibly interceded in Manitoba and we said, no way. They may allow a member of the Pittsburgh Steelers to do that, but we're not going to allow a Winnipeg Jet or a Winnipeg Blue Bomber to do that in Manitoba. We know how that works and we know the sort of perverse psychology that's being employed. We know what's going on; we're not naive.

What I'm saying is that we have to employ the same sort of approach with respect to children's advertising in certain sectors. I'm not suggesting that we shouldn't allow advertising. I see nothing wrong with advertising of certain products, even toys, but I think we have to set a code. We have to say that we expect and demand, by regulation, certain standards. We're not going to let you put misleading "life-style-type advertising" on with respect to toy products, or with respect to cereal products. We're not going to allow General Foods to create a fictitious super-hero who tells kids that eating their product is going to make them super-strong and invincible in sports or something like that. That's not going to wash in Manitoba. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. I think by analogy, what we did with respect to beer advertising we can do with respect to other products too. I haven't seen this government yet, Mr. Chairman, move to rescind the policy that was put in place by the former government on life-style beer advertising.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, hearing the Minister speak, I really wonder whether there's any real will to become a consumers' advocate. I perceive the job, I perceive the role of the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs principally as being that of consumer advocate, consumer advocate number one, the person who's most concerned about consumer problems, the person who's willing to take bold initiatives, the person who's willing to do things that are reformative of the system. I don't hear that, Mr. Chairman. What I hear is a person who has been appointed to the post telling us and this is really again, just repetitive of the theme yesterday on unit pricing and the universal product code, telling us that everything's all right and the market takes care of itself and if we just won't interfere, everything will work out, because consumers have discretion, we educate them and ultimately, because they're

Thursday, 5 March 1981

reasonable people, they will act logically and everything will work out, but I guess I see it in more macro-terms. I think that we have to, or I think we're going to be led into — I think we're already probably engaged in a fool's paradise. I think as the debates and discussions go on in this particular section of the departmental Estimates we're going to deal with other things that I feel and I think other members feel that the government should take responsibility and certain initiatives with respect to. So, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister feels that the do-nothing, wait-and-see approach is satisfactory, that's fine; ultimately these all become political questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I have just one basic question to ask of the Minister, although I realize that this too may not fall entirely within the jurisdiction of his department but it's more at the federal level. This deals with the matter of safety of electrical appliances, but I would think that in his consumer protective role he would probably want to concern himself about this matter. What prompts my question and my comments to the Minister is an article which appeared in last night's paper about a fire which had erupted within an electric clothes dryer. Now if the fire was a result of improper operation of the unit, well, that's one thing. Then I suppose one could say, well, that's the owner's fault or the operator's fault but even in that case if it arose as a result of improper operation because the owner wasn't aware of certain things that he or she should have done and if those instructions weren't clearly given to the owner of the machine, then I suppose the manufacturer has to take some responsibility for it.

Now, I don't know what the cause of that fire was, but it raises this question in my mind that I would suspect that as time goes by there is likely an increasing number of automatic electric appliances on the market, stoves and dryers are two that come to mind. What concerns me is, do we have sufficient assurance from the Canadian Standards Association, I believe that's the organization that does all the tests on the safety of electrical appliances, such as stoves, automatic stoves and clothes dryers are constructed in a sufficiently safe manner that even if something were to go wrong with the unit that there is no danger of them overheating and causing a fire. Now, apparently that did happen or used to happen in years gone by with the portable electric heaters that if you tipped the heater over; well, the inevitable was the result. But apparently that was taken care of, I understand that the portable heaters that are being sold now that if the heater should tip over and thus reduce or restrict the proper circulation of air that there is some mechanism or some switch that will automatically shut the power off and that's the end of that, hence, it if not eliminates at least reduces the danger of fire.

But as I said to the Minister the incident reported in yesterday's paper raises the question in my mind whether there is sufficient assurance in the CSA that no defects or that nothing could occur to electric stoves, clothes dryers that are presently in use, that nothing could occur of a nature that could give rise to overheating and hence cause a disastrous fire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, occurrences of this nature would be of interest to and come under the jurisdiction of the Mechanical and Engineering Branch of the Department of Labour where if they were unsafe products they would be dealt with in that manner. If they were defective, then obviously that would be pursued through the Canadian Standards Association and to the manufacturer. We would be interested from a warranty viewpoint to ensure that all the, you know, if a replacement were to be made under the warranty and so on, but in dealing with standards, since most of these products are not being manufactured here in Manitoba and being distributed and manufactured elsewhere, we're involved of course with the Federal Government. We wouldn't stand aside and do nothing; we would be dealing actively with them to ensure that consumers in our area have the right to be protected and the products be safe and ensure that they get their money's worth and defective products are replaced and so on, but it wouldn't be a matter of setting it aside but certainly between us and the Department of Labour people who would be judging on what's safe and what isn't safe, we would be involved to that extent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps this very incident which occurred within the past day or two might be something that the department might want to check into or consult with the Fire Commissioner's Office. I don't know if anyone will be doing any sort of investigation or not, and perhaps also consult with the Department of Labour and with the federal authorities to satisfy ourselves that those who do inspect electrical appliances do the types of checks to assure the users, the purchasers of the units that if something were to go wrong with the stove, with the dryer, that there is no risk of overheating.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I know that when the electrical appliances are checked, I'm not quite sure what it is exactly that they look for. Maybe if they check out an appliance and maybe all they look is to see whether the wires are properly insulated, but that type of check might not be adequate. What if a thermostat should go on the blink, what will happen then? Is there some device that will shut off the power once it heats up beyond a certain point? I think that's the type of protection that I think we should be looking for and that the Consumers Bureau should be interested in seeking out, and those authorities charged with the responsibility of seeing that protection is offered, should proceed to see that is done.

MR. FILMON: I know that there could be a wide variety of reasons why something like this could occur. Oddly enough with a brand new dryer in our own home just this summer we had a fire occur because a switch was defective and the element didn't shut off, but it was a reputable product that had all of the standards and approvals and so on. But in this particular case I'll have my department officials check with the Department of Labour to see whether they have checked into the incident that was noted in the paper and whether there is something that we should be involved with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted next to talk about the situation that I suppose has presented to many Manitoba consumers over the last year or two and I guess that was most dramatically depicted in the case of the persons who had bought products from Ollmann's furniture store. As you will remember — I'm sure we all remember — there were, I think, several dozens of people who had purchased products. I think I'm probably falling short, I think there were even more than that who had bought products from Ollmann's prior to its insolvency and then found that they had lost their deposits when the company declared bankruptcy and that they were unable to obtain rebates of those deposits from the trustee in bankruptcy. Now we know from the stories that were reported in the press that many of those people were fairly harshly impacted by the loss of those deposits. Some of them lost a couple of hundred or many hundreds of dollars. It has occurred to me, as I'm sure it's occurred to many people, that this is an area that recommends itself for government initiative. It's topical; it's clear that Ollmann's is not alone. It's one of several retailing outlets that's gone into bankruptcy in the past year.

There was another major — Western Sound I think it was called — retail chain that left a lot of consumers in exactly the same position, and I'm sure without exhaustively enumerating all the cases that there are many more throughout the province. I'm wondering what efforts the government is making to address itself to this particular problem, whether the government sees itself as having a responsibility in this area and if so, what they will do to repair this particular situation from reoccurring, prevent it from reoccurring.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the problem here is one of priorities of claims under bankruptcy proceedings that comes under federal law and even if we were to attempt to pass legislation as a province that would try and alter those priorities it would be ultra vires and that we would be in a situation of not being able to effect the desired result. So, consequently, it's not something over which we have control at the moment. I would be more than willing to discuss it with my other provincial counterparts to see whether if they are having difficulties with this type of occurrence and if there is some agreement whether or not the Federal Government should be urged to change its legislation in this regard.

MR. CORRIN: I recognize that the Provincial Government can't rearrange the credit priorities set out in The Bankruptcy Act, Mr. Chairman. Obviously that's beyond our power but, Mr. Chairman, there seems to me to be other ways of going about this. This is a cat that can be skinned in different ways. For instance, I would wonder why we couldn't set up licencing requirements that would require that all commercial retailers maintain bonding that would in effect guarantee the deposits that were pledged by consumers prior to the time that they received their goods. So if I gave a particular company \$100 down as a deposit for a chair or a television set I would know that because this was a licenced firm that

there was a bond in existence that would come into play should the firm go into liquidation prior to the receipt of my goods, so I could recover my \$100 from the proceeds of the bond.

Now this is done, Mr. Chairman, in a variety of other contexts in commercial transactions. One that I have some experience with is construction. You know, contractors are always required to post and pledge bonds for the performance of their agreement and it's quite common for this particular format to be adopted. It's a common business practice and I see no reason why it couldn't, by extension, be used in the commercial retail sector as well. I'm wondering what the Minister's response is to that suggestion, whether he thinks that this would be within his jurisdiction and I believe it would be, and whether he would be willing to implement this sort of format to protect consumers.

MR. FILMON: It's something we could take a look at, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Again, Mr. Chairman, one doesn't like to press too hard because the Minister, as he's often told us, is new but everyday there is the announcement of a bankruptcy, a liquidation and insolvency. During the Question Period today we heard several more and in some of these cases we're dealing with retail outlets; we're dealing with retailing merchants; and I think rather than simply take the matter under consideration and advisement I think it's incumbent on the Minister to start making some decisions and quick. Those people that are losing those deposits are indeed taxpayers and they are unable to foretell which merchants are going to go under. We can't expect them through some sort of telepathy to be able to divine which particular merchant is solvent and which is not. If someone would have asked me for instance about Western Sound, I would have said a fine, reputable, old, venerable firm. I would have said solid as a rock. I think all of us probably would have had much the same response. We would have recommended that people deal with them because they've been around so long and they seemed to be so prosperous, but often the appearance belies the fact. I think as in the case of these many companies that are now declaring themselves to be insolvent, we have a responsibility to intervene on behalf of the consumer and do something affirmative. It's a small thing to do. It's so simple just to say create a piece of legislation or maybe we can even do it by regulation, I don't know the nuts and bolts. (Interjection)— My honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose, says that they've done this with respect to the automotive industry. I'm sure that he's going to share his knowledge in that respect so that we have some insights into how it's been done by government in other areas.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I can say that it obviously is not a complex matter. It's just a question of really of prudence and common sense. The government says that as a condition of a licence you shall have bonding to a certain limit and if you don't have the licence you can't sell goods commercially and presto you have bonds; you have protective bonds in place.

Now I'm not going to suggest that it's the panacea for the economy, nor am I suggesting that it's necessarily going to replace common sense in the marketplace, but, Mr. Chairman, it would be an attempt on the part of the government to address a real problem and one which is affecting hundreds of people across the province.

I think, and I think I can say this without being accused of hyperbole, that a lot of people are avoiding or delaying purchase transactions because of this sort of concern. I think there are a lot of people who say, gee, I don't know whether I should put down \$200 or \$300 or \$400 and wait for a product that I've ordered. Reading about this really alarms a lot of people. They become apprehensive, they don't want to be in the same position, they figure that if it can happen to a big outfit like Ollmann's, it can happen to anyone. I mean that's the same firm that advertised every morning on CJOB for God knows how many months — the advertising campaign was monumental in its scope — a very expensive extravaganza. So it can happen, and on television as well, yes and for that matter in the newspapers, full page advertisements every week; so we're dealing with a company that appeared to be prosperous and viable.

I'm suggesting that if we're going to reinforce consumer confidence rather than doing it by extolling the virtues of cheap Manitoba housing and clean air through Economic Development advertising, we might well do it by taking some affirmative consumer protection policy steps and here's one that recommends itself.

I want to hear what the Member for Ste. Rose has to say about what's gone on and transpired in the automotive industry. But I can say that I expect the government should seize this as at least an opportunity to say that they'll do something. It's rather pathetic to hear these tragic tales of woe on television and radio every day on Peter Warren or wherever, you hear people phoning in and saying what can I do, what can I do; the answer is unfortunately there's no legislation that protects your interest. It seems to me that the government should take the initiative now and strike while the iron's hot and get in there and wrestle with the problem, get involved, help people. But as I said I will defer for the Member for Ste. Rose, I'd like to hear about the automotive industry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the reason I said that we would take the matter into consideration and discuss it with the department is simply because it isn't a simple . . . without knowing anything about the potential suggestion of the member, to suggest that just with a stroke of the pen we require bonding of every commercial operation in the Province of Manitoba bears a little bit of investigation, because you'd have to be bonding them in relation to the volume of business they did and whether or not they're doing things on a basis of taking deposits. It seems to me that you wouldn't require everybody in the province to carry a \$100,000 bond if some people only do \$50,000 worth of sales in a year. It seems to me that there would have to be some who were bonded to the extent of \$5,000 or \$10,000 or \$100,000 and even then you don't insure protection. Once you get into that, then you're in the situation of forcing them to file annual returns that verify what

their volumes are of business every year, and you get into the aspect through that method of regulation, getting into annual returns from each and every commercial business in this entire province. I don't think it's as simple as suggesting that well, we're interested in helping the consumers and we might be eliminating all the competition in this province because only the big would be able to survive that kind of bureaucratic suggestion if that's what he's suggesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass.

I'm at a bit of a loss. I usually recognize members as they stand at their place and I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has that place.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: On that point, Mr. Chairman, if I was in the other committee I could sit anywhere around the table and I would be recognized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a matter of discussion. The rules of this Chamber have been of that nature in the past and I would ask the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose please don't embarrass me. If you wish to speak I'd be very happy to acknowledge you at your place.

MR. ADAM: To accommodate you, I know that I have the right to stand here but I'll move over there.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on that point there is provisions I believe in the statutes of the province to provide for bonding of the automotive industry. Now it was a very small bond requirement, I believe only of about \$5,000 which is not a very great amount. When you consider the price of one unit today, you may have a car that may be a \$40,000 car or a \$15,000 or \$12,000 is not out of the ordinary I guess today for an average automobile. Now this has been increased. I'm only speaking off the top of my head now, but I think it's been increased to \$15,000, but it also affected a lot of other people in business. There are numerous businesses in the Province of Manitoba who are selling trailers, horse trailers, and because of the increased cost of bonding some of them have had to . . . there wasn't enough volume that they could go into the increased bonding, but I would say because of the downturn in the economy that we see not only in this province but maybe more aggravated in this province than elsewhere, but we see it all over now. We have seen major financial institutions and trust companies, we've had another two that have gone out of business. Maybe we should have some kind of consumer protection in that area.

My colleague wanted to know just how this legislation works, I'm sure it's in the book, it's in the statutes and if the Minister wants to look at that it's there. I'm not sure just the amount of the figures, but I believe that that is what my colleague is referring to, the Member for Wellington. He wants a similar type of legislation to protect the consumer when they go in and make a deposit. We have provided that for those consumers who go in and buy an automobile

and put a deposit on an automobile. There are so many, let's say a lot of automobile lots, second-hand vehicles that are sold and there is a need for it there, but it's obvious that there's a need for it in other retail industry as well because we have had numerous business failures.

We've had Chimo going out of business over the winter in Dauphin. Did any people lose any money? What happens if they had made a deposit on something in that store and the store goes out of business — Chimo's out. Beaver Lumber closed up over the winter in Dauphin. Beaver Lumber is a pretty big outfit; they closed up this winter. Now we heard today that Chimo in Selkirk went out. Maybe there are some people who are getting hurt. So maybe it's time that, because of the downturn in the economy in the Province of Manitoba it seems to me that we should be concerned about this and protect some of those people out there who go in and trust these people. It's unfortunate. I'm sorry to see so many people going out of business in the Province of Manitoba, but nevertheless that's what's happening and it seems to me that it's time that we do come up with some kind of protection for people who have no protection. They go into a store in good faith, lay down \$100.00 or \$200.00 deposit on a chesterfield and first thing you know the store is out of business and the \$200.00 is lost. Mr. Chairman, I think it's time that we do come up with some protection for the people of Manitoba in this respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'd like to bring the committee back to the discussion on standards and computer pricing if possible and would like to ask the Minister if he is prepared, or even if he is able, to table any studies or any analysis which has been completed by his department for the purpose of monitoring the introduction of computer pricing and standards into Manitoba workplaces. You will recall that last year when we discussed this item with the previous Minister that that Minister at that time indicated that he was going to be monitoring the situation and would be able to report back from time to time as to the results of that monitoring. A year having passed or at least nearly a year having passed, I think it is an appropriate time to ask the new Minister for copies of those studies and evaluations which were promised to us, which were in fact were promised to the people of this province last year.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, my department is monitoring the UPC systems that are in place from a viewpoint of consumer acceptance and they've undertaken discussions on a number of different occasions with people who represent consumer groups and also with the various retailers who are involved with the installation of the UPC in their particular stores, but not from a viewpoint of its effects on the workplace, and I don't think that was implied by the previous Minister because I know that that's not what the department is doing.

MR. COWAN: I don't think it was implied by the previous Minister either and I certainly didn't intend to imply it in my remarks, although perhaps I

inadvertently did so. The Hansard will be the judge of that. However, what the Minister did indicate was that he was going to be monitoring the situation generally and that would be of course, as Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs from the perspective of the acceptance by the consumer or the nonacceptance by the consumer. The Minister has indicated that monitoring has not taken the form of a study but in fact that monitoring has taken the form of a number of meetings with consumer organizations as well as a number of meetings with manufacturers and with corporations who are responsible for introducing the system. The question to him then must be, can he provide us with a list of when those meetings were held and whom he met with on those occasions.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I can't provide a list of what meetings were held and when they were held but I can confirm that as part of the ongoing discussion and monitoring that we're having, we have discussed with the various stores that are using the UPC scanning system, what things that we believe should be part of their operation to ensure that as much as possible consumer interests were being protected and achieved agreement on a variety of different things. The stores, for instance, agreed to group into one area all of the various products that were of the same type but of a different variety. You know, that in traditional supermarkets, I'm sure that like myself, the member does do grocery shopping from time-to-time in a variety of different stores, whether they be large or supermarkets and oftentimes they group all of the so called white label products into one area of the store. Well, that doesn't lend itself to price comparisons, given the fact that the UPC only has the prices on the shelves and not on top of the items. So they've agreed that people should have similar products of different brands all in the same area. They have agreed for instance that a much larger price display should be on the shelves in stores where they have the UPC. They have agreed with other things that will make it much more in the consumer's interest to be able to take advantage of this system and not be disadvantaged in any way by the UPC system. That was part of the ongoing discussions we've had and we've been able to achieve agreement with the various stores in Winnipeg that use it. And I repeat, that there are only three of them. So this kind of information is available, has been made available by the Minister for instance, to anybody who has asked the department, the previous Minister, who wrote to the department or expressed concern to the consumers' groups. This kind of ongoing discussion and monitoring and the results of it have been made available in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Well, that doesn't answer the question. I think the question is an important question and that is, what consumer groups have been participants in the Minister's program or the previous Minister's program and what other groups have met with him in respect to this situation. I'd ask the Minister if he has received or is still receiving complaints from citizens about the removal of item

pricing because that is the crux of the issue. There are many persons in the province who have come to myself and come to other members of this House, especially senior citizens and suggested that they are dissatisfied with this program because it in fact does remove the necessity for item pricing and in fact, in the stores where standards are used, item pricing is not the practice any longer. So I would ask the Minister if he has received complaints in that, if he can give us a general background as to the specifics or the general details of those complaints and is he still receiving complaints in respect to that problem.

MR. FILMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, during the six weeks that I have been in office I have not received a complaint about the UPC, that the discussions that have taken place in the past have been with the Consumers Association of Canada, Manitoba Branch, and with various different senior citizen groups and none of that has taken place in the past six weeks that I have been the Minister responsible.

MR. COWAN: Does the Minister know if his department has been advised of complaints in the past six weeks and can he as well, ask his departmental staff who are of a longer seniority with the department if they can indicate if those complaints are continuing, if they are falling off or if they are in fact increasing.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they are declining because they haven't received any such complaints in the past six weeks.

MR. COWAN: Six weeks is just such a small time frame in the overall problem but we're going to have to accept the Minister's newness to his portfolio. The fact is that notwithstanding how long the Minister has been in the department, or how long he will be in that portfolio, there are going to be problems with this and there are going to be complaints, in fact there have been complaints. And when we spoke to this issue last year we spoke to it from several different perspectives. One of the reasons that was provided to us by not only the government but by also other persons involved, an expert in this area, was that the introduction of the universal product code system in the scanning machines in different stores did in fact lessen the bill to the consumer, that there was a savings on the part of the employer in respect to wages, in respect to the operation of their store and that was going to be passed on to the consumer. We had delegates, representatives, come to the committee meeting last year and they suggested that they felt in the Manitoba context that they were going to save 7 percent on labour costs. Now we know the figures from the States show that labour cost savings in areas where universal product code system is being used amount to anywhere from 10 to 15 percent on interest, or on general, excuse me. We also know that on the overall cost of operating a supermarket the savings for putting in universal product code systems amounts to about 1 to 1.5 percent of the total grocery bill of any consumer. So last year, we went and visited those stores in an attempt to find out if in fact those savings were being passed on to the consumers. We found last year that it was actually cheaper, we compared three Loblaws stores — one at Roblin and

Dale, one on McPhillips and and one on Henderson Highway and we compared them for a list of ten items. We checked the prices for hamburger, one pound of it, for price per pound, for frozen chicken, price for bread, one litre of homogenized milk, soap, cereal, juices, vegetables, canned vegetables, laundry bleach, some sweets, some cookies, some soup, margarine and eggs. Now that is not a comprehensive survey and at that time, I admitted last year, that it was not the type of survey upon which I would like to base any long term predictions or compile any extensive analysis but it does give us some idea of what is happening.

I just had some one go out and repeat that same survey this year, today, and what we found was that the price had gone up. Yes, the Member for Rossmere says, no, obviously he hasn't been shopping since the last time I gave this speech. The price has gone up significantly and that should be of some concern to the Minister responsible for consumer protection in this province. We found that the price of milk had gone up significantly as well and that should be of some concern to the Minister. But those are aside. What we did find was exactly the same situation that we found last year. It's cheaper to shop at the Henderson Highway Store which does not have the standards. It's cheaper to shop there and let me give you an example. Last year, or excuse me, this year and I can't make the comparison stream last year and this year directly because some of the shelf items have changed and we couldn't get the same brand names, so that's just a general statement that the prices had gone up and one which I believe will not be contradicted by anyone, as a Minister who does shopping from time-to-time, the prices go up each time, or it appears that the prices have gone up each time one visits a store. But the fact is that this grocery list would cost some one \$17.15 today at the Roblin Store. It would cost someone \$17.01 today at the McPhillips Store and at the Henderson Store which does not have a standard and it must be said the other two do have standards, it would cost somebody \$16.91. So it's significantly, no perhaps that's an overstatement of the case, it is cheaper to shop at the store without the standard today than it is to shop at the stores with the standard.

I want to be totally fair to the Minister in giving him this information. There was one item, the cookies, which were on sale at the Henderson Store and were not on sale at the Roblin Store and the McPhillips Store, and if you use the regular price and not the sale price, and I'm not certain how a statistician would have you use it, you will find that the price increased from \$16.91 to \$17.07 at the Henderson Store which means that it's cheaper to shop at the Henderson Store than the Roblin Store, but it's more expensive to shop at the McPhillips Store than the Henderson Store. Does that make sense? The point that has to be made is there is no savings on general that is being passed on to the consumer because of the introduction of Universal Product Code System in the Province of Manitoba in respect to these three stores. The Minister tells us that two of these stores are 66 percent of the stores, supermarkets at least, or grocery stores which are using computer pricing in Universal Product Code System in the province.

Thursday, 5 March 1981

Now, the reason for the suggested savings in shopping at stores that embrace the Universal Product Code System was that they didn't have to item price. In other words, because they didn't have to price each item, they saved on labour costs; those costs would be passed on to the consumers. So of course we had to check, because perhaps these stores which were utilizing the Universal Product Code System, were in fact, item pricing as well for the benefit of the consumer, and believe me that would be for the benefit of the consumer. But they are not; they do not item price at Roblin and Dale Loblaws, and they do not item price at the McPhillips store.

This simple survey gives rise to a number of questions, and I would hope that the Minister would be prepared to go out and do a more extensive survey in order to determine if in fact consumers were benefitting by the introduction of this system, and if they aren't, why they are not being made the recipients of the savings which are being accrued to the stores by the introduction of this system. I would like his comment on the survey, and his comment on his analysis of the situation in general.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to listen to the comparison shopping. (Interjection)—The Chairman, would like to know what brand of cookies were on sale — he's getting hungry — digestive; good.

I too, like the Member for Churchill, enjoy grocery shopping and invariably on a Friday evening with my children go to the supermarkets and make the price comparisons and find out where the bargains are and try and bring home a bag of —(Interjection)— I openly admit that from the time I've been married that —(Interjection)— yes, I'm a liberated male. I have done the majority of the major grocery shopping in our family. I need to have a very carefully itemized list of course because I openly admit that — and I follow aisle by aisle and stroke off each item and it's indeed an enjoyable experience. But, I have to tell the Member for Churchill that he obviously has not done this for a great length of time because one of the things that he mentioned in his list is a very very variable item in terms of geographic location within the city, and that is the price of hamburger.

MR. COWAN: Exactly the same in all three stores.

MR. FILMON: In that case then, I won't use my argument.

It's a known fact that the price of hamburger and the price of steak . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill on a point of order.

MR. COWAN: I have to help the Minister out of this situation. He is a new Minister and we should be as kind to him as we can.

Last year, for his information, when we did that comparison, the price of hamburger was \$1.19 a pound at each store, and it is an item that can be one of variable prices according to location of the store, however, it was not in last year's survey. This year's survey, it was \$1.25 at the two stores with the scanner, and \$1.29 at the store without the scanner,

and it is an item that would not naturally be assumed to be one that would be affected in regards to universal products scanning.

So those two factors should convince the Minister of the weakness of this argument and should hopefully prevent him from getting himself in any deeper, in respect to that particular line of logic.

MR. FILMON: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, was that some of the products that he named are, having shopped in the stores that use the UPC, some of the products he named are ones that are not used with the scanner. In fact, I doubt that the eggs were run through the scanner and I'm sure the hamburger wasn't, because I know that that's the way it normally works. They have separate pricing on those items.

But the price of hamburger can be very variable, of course, depending on the economic characteristics of the people who live in the area. Hamburger is normally priced higher in low income areas and priced lower in high income areas, and vice versa for steak. That's a strange situation, but it's one that I found — and you know why it is, of course, because it's in relation to what's normally been bought in an area.

Nevertheless, getting back to the whole argument of UPC, I'm glad to find out that there is competition on the marketplace and that there wasn't identical pricing across the city. That's an interesting thing and it proves, of course, that the market place does work in the way it's supposed to; but the other thing is that I have to correct the member when he says that either members of the government or members of the grocery, retail grocery industry said that the UPC would drop prices in their stores.

In fact I'm informed, and it's confirmed for me what I recall, that that was not an argument and in fact they denied it. They suggested that there would be other types of efficiencies that would result in better things for the consumer, but they didn't use that as an argument, and if they had used that as an argument, I would suggest that there would have to be a period of payout of the equipment, because my understanding is it's in the range of a couple of hundred thousand dollars per installation, and that if it was going to have an effect on the prices, that effect couldn't be expected to be felt until after the payout period, whatever that would happen to be for an installation. So I'm not surprised at the findings that he's brought forward. They confirm everything that I've understood about it in the past.

MR. COWAN: I'm going to resist the temptation to get in a discussion with the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs about why it is that hamburger costs more in lower income areas and less in higher income areas, and the reverse is true for steak, but I think that's a sad commentary on the system as it stands today and I hope the Minister for Consumer Affairs would agree with that. He says he does agree. Now I hope he would do something about it, but I'm not certain that he can do anything about it. But that's a side issue, and I've never been known to get involved in side issues during these estimates' proceedings, so I will continue on in a fine tradition of the past number of years.

However, what the Minister says, and he says that this does prove that the marketplace system does

work, is not acceptable to me. I think this proves that the marketplace doesn't work.

I think what it proves is that the stores can make a savings on this particular process and they don't pass that savings on to the consumer. That they keep that savings for profit for themselves, and I don't think that's the most efficient use of our resources, and I don't think that's the most effective way to build a equitable society. I think that's exactly opposite of what we should be working towards. Protection of the consumer, and I think that what we have here is a situation where there are widespread complaints about the system, and that the system can't even justify that it provides any benefits to the consumer.

The Minister may try to justify it, but it's certainly not a savings cost and if the Minister says that being able now to keep itemized statements for a period of six months or three months to check bills is an asset to the consumer, I would suggest that he has a better filing system than I do, or then most people do, because that's just not what happens.

I think there are a lot of reasons for introducing this system, but I don't think any of them are for the benefit of the consumer. I know the Minister or the Minister's department, in the past, to be more accurate, has received complaints.

A November 12th letter, which went out far and wide around this province, from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment, said, "After the introduction of the universal product code system in three Winnipeg stores, I began to receive a number of complaints from citizens about the removal of item pricing, and request that the government introduce legislation which would compel industry to retain individual item pricing." The letter then goes on to say, and I'm reading excerpts from it and if the Minister wants to read the whole letter into the record that's his prerogative, but I'm trying to hit the highlights of the letter.

It says, "I invited Industry and Consumer representatives to meet with me." Now he may well have done that. I will point out one oversight on his part. It is my understanding that he did not invite representatives of the largest union to represent supermarket workers to any of those meetings. Now why should he do that? Well, because their members are the members who work those scanners day in and day out. They are the ones that spend eight hours a day on those scanners. They are the ones that would be able to best recognize any problems, and they are the ones who are the front line recipients of any complaints, or if the opposite is true, of any compliments on the system. It would seem to me that that would be an area that should be investigated; that that massive well of expertise and experience in respect to the use of these systems should have been utilized and it was not, so I take him to task with that and hope that in the future he will make those representations to the unions involved in the supermarkets that are using these systems and ask for their advice and their opinion.

And what that report goes on to say is, "It seems therefore that item pricing cannot be discontinued, unless there is an alternative pricing system such as universal product code standing and computerized

check-outs." Absolutely true. Absolute true. It can't be discontinued and we see that universal product code system being used in a number of stores, and we've seen at least two out of the three, and I don't know about the third and therefore can't speak to it, that the item pricing, individual item pricing has been discontinued.

The letter goes on to say on page two that, "One of the benefits of this is that the time spent at a check-out has been reduced and customers are now in receipt of a sales slip that shows them what they have paid for an individual item."

Now there may be some benefit to that sales slip. I don't think so. There may be some disagreement as to the benefit of that sales slip; I think there is, between the Minister and I and between different groups, as well. But I have yet to see any substantive evidence that the check-out time has been reduced, and I would hope that the Minister or the previous Minister has done a study on that, so as to be able to confirm what appears to be an observation of his and give us the statistics and the evaluation which shows that it has in fact been reduced.

But this is the important part of what the Minister said. The Minister said, "Nevertheless, I was persuaded that other consumer objections were valid and should be dealt with by the industry. Consumers express a suspicion that the stores were not interested in their problems and demands for compulsory continuation of item pricing by law persisted. In response I introduced an amendment to The Consumer Protection Act, which would enable the making of a regulation setting forth the manner in which a product prices shall be disclosed."

Now there is an expectation that is created by that statement, and the expectation is that we are going to see the regulation. Otherwise there would have been no reason for the Minister to make that sort of statement. He did introduce the amendment; we did discuss the amendment; debate the amendment; and our objection to that amendment was that it was by regulation and provided the discretionary power to the Minister, and we felt, or at least I felt, and I shouldn't speak for others, I felt that in fact that regulation should be forthcoming immediately. It is not forthcoming now and yet there are still complaints, and the Minister is using that amendment as a justification for his lack of action to date, and it just doesn't make sense; it's not a rational or logical argument.

So I would ask the Minister if he prepared to follow up on the statement of the previous Minister and bring that regulation forward, or if he wishes to contradict the statement of the previous Minister and explain to us why that regulation won't be forthcoming?

MR. FILMON: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to contradict the statement, but I do wish to carry on reading the remainder of that particular page from the letter, which says and I quote: "When introducing the amendment I specifically stated that I did not intend to proceed with the regulation immediately. In the first place I was and I remain convinced that the industry is capable and now willing to deal with this problem without the necessity of government action at taxpayers' expense." He has in brackets, "Any regulation requires enforcement by departmental staff."

Secondly, if a regulation compelled item pricing of all in-store products, this would not only require the stores to item price products that are not currently stickered out, but more importantly, since the regulation would apply to all merchants in Manitoba, it would cause unnecessary cost to small independent urban and rural merchants. The result for these merchants would be severe financial loss and perhaps even disasters. This would clearly be a step backwards in that it could ultimately reduce competition and consumer preference.

So I suggest that the member — but to get back to the point, to get to the point that the member — (Interjection)— the member can read the next paragraph if he likes and I'll read the other parts that he doesn't want to read, so it's as simple as that.

I'm sure that members opposite have copies of the letter, just as members on our side do and I'm not sure of the point he's making. Before he suggested that I took as confirmation that the marketplace was working, the fact that the UPC store grocery list that he shopped was more expensive than the one that didn't have the UPC in it.

What I was saying was that there were obviously differences in prices amongst the various stores that he surveyed. And that obviously there is price competition, not only amongst stores do and do not have the UPC, but amongst all other stores and that is what I suggested to him as evidence of the marketplace system working.

I repeat to him, even though he ignored the statement, that it was not stated that there would be a savings by installation of the UPC, and even if anyone could deduce, and perhaps he is concluding that because of some implied labour savings that there should be savings reflected in the ultimate grocery prices in those stores. It could not possibly happen until there was a payout of equipment. It couldn't possibly be reflected until the equipment payout was in there. So that is the whole principle on which I would refute that argument.

But I repeat to him, just in case he isn't aware, that that was not used as a justification for the UPC system, that it would result in cheaper groceries.

MR. COWAN: Certainly, I don't need to tell the Minister that pricing or that cost of putting the standards in could be depreciated over a period of time, and savings could be passed on. In fact, studies have shown that it takes about three years to pay off the capital investment on those in savings, and that's all, three years.

If the Minister is making a statement now, that will be on the record, that the prices are going to go down in three years, I hope to be able to read that statement back to him in three years. Or that in fact it's going to be cheaper to shop at these stores in three years then it is to shop at their stores that don't have the standards in three years.

I'd like to read that back to him in three years, because I just don't think it's going to be the case.

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

MR. FILMON: I did not make the statement that's being attributed to me. I said if the member believes that the prices would go down, then it couldn't possibly be for three years, but I don't accept his premise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: It's an interesting discussion, Mr. Chairperson. I rather enjoy it, but I want to go back to the letter that the Minister read from and I want to begin with first that part that he read.

He said, "When introducing the amendment, I specifically stated that I did not intend to proceed with the regulation immediately." Again there is an expectation that the regulation will be forthcoming. He could have said I did not intend to proceed with the regulation until such a time as I've had time to evaluate the system. He could have said any number of statements, which would have been more accurate if what the Minister is telling us today, was the philosophy of the previous Minister when he wrote that letter. But I want to read the next paragraph that the Minister didn't read. And that says, and this is from the previous Minister, "This does not mean, however, that stores should discontinue item pricing without regard to how buyers are disadvantaged." And yet we see the stores are discontinuing the item pricing. (Interjection)— I'm sorry.

The Minister says none have discontinued since the introduction of this legislation. The fact is that whether they discontinued before the introduction of this regulation or after the introduction — excuse me, not regulation, amendment to The Consumer Protection Act, they do not have item pricing now. Now if he wants to play with semantics, I think that's perfectly acceptable as part of the process, but I don't think that the consumers who receive this will accept that sort of nit-picking and attitude; I don't think they will at all.

One of the areas which deserves greater attention is how these systems are being used now to change prices. In other words when there was an item label on each item, a person could go through the store, and I'm certain that the Minister has done as much shopping as he says he has and as I have, he knows that from time-to-time if you look at the labels carefully you will find a price that is an old price and you will find a price that is a new price, and the old price usually being cheaper than the new price, except in the instance of a special. With the way the pricing is now, you don't find that any more. And that was a small advantage to the consumer, but it was an advantage nonetheless that has been, or at least would appear to have been eradicated by the introduction of universal product code systems. And that is perhaps why the companies are looking at it so eagerly and developing more and more scanner systems to put into different stores.

And the Minister knows that is a problem. And one of the statements which the previous Minister made in his letter was that he hoped that the stores would refrain from increasing prices during open store hours, because they could do that if they so wished. At worst, all they would have to do is change one item.

I see my time's up, Mr. Chairperson, so I'll look forward to continuing this conversation and debate with the Minister after 8:00 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 4:30. I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return to committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR
ADJOURNED DEBATE ON
SECOND READING
PUBLIC BILLS**

MR. SPEAKER: We are under Private Members' Hour. On Thursdays we deal with bills first.

Bill No. 17, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan (Stand).

Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan (Stand).

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILL

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Stand).

We will then proceed with Resolutions.

**RESOLUTION NO. 5
ASSISTANCE TO NATIVE PEOPLE,
WINNIPEG'S CORE AREA**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews has seven minutes left in closing debate.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, when this Resolution was last called in Private Members' Hour, I was speaking to the amendment proposed by the Member for Rupertsland and I believe I had covered most of what I wanted to, and I might take this opportunity now to summarize quickly.

1. That I believe, and I was encouraged to hear from most members in this House when they made their contributions, I was encouraged to see that most of them agreed with me that there is a problem. It would probably be inaccurate to term that a native problem, because it's not simply a problem of native people or Indian people, it's a problem of all of us, a problem for our society, but there are some physical ramifications which reflect directly on Winnipeg's core area and on the City of Winnipeg. And I was encouraged to see that most members, the Member for Wellington being the exception, he seemed to believe that there wasn't a problem. However, most members who spoke and made a contribution, regardless of which side of the House they were on, tended to agree that there is a problem here. The problem . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I was incorrect in saying the member is closing debate. Actually he's speaking on the amendment. The honourable member may continue.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The effect of the amendment is to change drastically the intent of my motion. My motion calls upon the Federal Government, or my resolution calls upon the Federal Government to take up its responsibilities, and I believe that there is a role for individuals in solving this problem and coming to terms with it. I believe there is a role for the private sector of our economy. I believe there is a role for this Provincial Government, and I'm not foolish enough to suggest that this government has done a very good job. The previous government didn't do a very good job either.

And I suspect that if you look hard across all of Canada and all the various jurisdictions, you won't

find any government that's done a very good job in coming to terms with this problem because the problem has grown worse. And the problem threatens to eat away at the very fabric of our city and of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that in this matter, the Federal Government has the constitutional authority, and they have the financial capacity, the fiscal capacity, to show some leadership. And they should show leadership. That's not to suggest that there is not a role for us as individuals, or that there is not a role for major employers and companies in this province, because we've all failed the native people; we've all failed to give them the proper opportunities, the proper training. But I believe the Provincial Government does not have the resources, and it's certainly not our responsibility to be the leaders in this matter. It's the Federal Government that must take the lead. There's a role for the Provincial Government, but it's not, or shouldn't be, as the amendment suggests, that we should have to take all the initiatives, because we don't have the resources, Mr. Speaker, we are one small province.

This problem is not a problem that is isolated or is simply a Manitoba problem. It's a problem shared certainly by all the western provinces in Canada, and I believe to a lesser extent by the provinces west of Manitoba, too.

So Mr. Speaker, in summing up, I just want to say that I'm going to oppose this amendment, and I would urge other members to join with me in defeating the amendment, because the amendment destroys the thrust of my argument, which is that the Federal Government has the responsibility for coming to terms with this problem. It lies mainly with the Federal Government, they must show leadership, and if we adopt this amendment, we alter my resolution. We take them off the hook because they are the ones who are responsible, they are the ones who should show leadership and they're the ones who should help all of us establish the framework and the programs under which all of us, as individuals, as corporate people, or as politicians at the provincial level, civic level, so that all of us can come to terms with this problem and do something about it so that 20 years from now when people are speaking about this in the Legislature, we're not going to hear speeches that sound similar to mine; we're not going to hear people saying, well, it's got worse and worse and worse. Because I genuinely want to see some progress made because the waste in terms of human beings is immense. And if you're not concerned about humans, the waste and the lost opportunities in terms of our economy and our country, and our opportunity for growth, is also immense.

So Mr. Speaker, I would ask members here not to cloud the issue, not to confuse things, but to defeat this amendment and then to proceed with and support my resolution which calls on the Federal Government to show leadership and take some action.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The question is the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the resolution be amended by omitting all the words after the first WHEREAS and substituting thereafter the following words:

The Manitoba and Federal Governments have failed in their responsibility to provide adequate education and training and marketable skills to the native people of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS the Manitoba and Federal Governments have failed in their responsibility to provide economic development opportunities to native communities and reserves in Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS because of the failures of the Manitoba and Federal Governments, native people are forced to migrate to urban centres in search of employment and improved living conditions;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba and Federal Governments have failed in their responsibilities to provide adequate assistance to native people to make the transition from native communities and reserves to the urban centres of Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Government accept its responsibility to the native people of Manitoba and urge the Federal Government to accept its responsibility;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba and Federal Governments consider the advisability of establishing programs to deal with the needs of native people in the native communities and reserves and the needs of native people migrating to urban centres.

QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, McBryde, Miller, Parasiuk, Schroeder, Walding, Ms. Westbury.

NAYS

Messrs. Anderson, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17, Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

We will now proceed with the main resolution, the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this issue because it is an issue of great importance, not only to all of the members in the Assembly today but also one of great significance to the Indian and Metis people whom are addressed in the resolution itself. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is of the

greatest significance to all Manitobans because if we are to test a society, and if we are to test the government which is in power in that society, we must apply that test fairly to all sectors of the population.

So this issue, the issue of the provision of services to status Indian people, to treaty Indian people, is one that is worthy of the debate which has been initiated by the resolution by the Member for St. Matthews, one that is worthy of the attention of the government. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I think that attention and the responsibility of that government has not been lived up to in the past, and it is one that is worthy of the attention of all members of the Assembly, in fact all citizens of the province.

The Member for St. Matthews, when introducing his resolution, suggested that he had introduced it in the most non-partisan way possible, that it was not a partisan issue, that he had done this out of a respect for the problem and out of an honest and sincere attempt to deal with the problem. And I'm not going to impute motives, I'm not going to suggest that he did not do that.

However, the wording of the resolution and the remarks of the Member for St. Matthews would have us believe that there is some partisanship involved in the introduction and the debate on this particular resolution, and that is as it should be. There are no issues that are entirely non-partisan. But this issue, Mr. Speaker, has to be partisan in a certain respect in that there is a difference between the philosophies of the Member for St. Matthews' party and the New Democratic Party in respect to the problem which the resolution attempts to deal with.

We approach the problem from differing historical perspectives. Not only historically, because there have been historical differences in our approach to this particular problem, but also currently. So if the philosophy does in fact differ, which I would suggest that it does, then the approach is going to differ as well. And that is why we must discuss the issue in perhaps a less partisan way than usual, but we still must acknowledge that there will be partisanship arising in the debate.

And that is why we brought forward the amendment which was just defeated. And the Member for St. Matthews said that he could not support the amendment because it in fact changed the intent of the original resolution. Well, that was the intention of the amendment; it was meant to change the original resolution because we believe that the original resolution was inadequate. We believe that the original resolution does in fact reflect the attitude of the government, but we still believe that it was less than it could have been. So what we wanted to do with that particular amendment was to bring forward a positive change to the original resolution, not to destroy what the Member for St. Matthews assures us was his intention, not to work against what he assures us was his motivation, but rather to assist him in bringing about a better and a more equitable society for all Manitobans. I'm somewhat disappointed that it was not accepted in the way in which it was brought forward. However, the amendment having been defeated, it is necessary now to direct our attention to the resolution as it was originally introduced.

Thursday, 5 March 1981

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the original resolution only points out half of the solution, and only acknowledges half of the problem. Certainly the Federal Government has a responsibility to all citizens of the country, and certainly it has a special responsibility to the native people, or to the treaty Indian people of this province in respect to treaty obligations which were entered into and accepted hundreds of years ago. However, we believe as well that the province has a responsibility in respect to treaty Indian people in this province. And we believe that as a government, we dealt with that responsibility as best as we could, and that is not to say that we solved the problems of 100 years, and that is not to say that we were able to erase the inequities in the system, but we at least approached it in a sincere and humane way and attempted to do our utmost. Given the limited assets, given the limited resources of a Provincial Government, as the Member for St. Matthews pointed out, we acknowledge that we couldn't do everything we wanted to do. Believe me, there was far more that perhaps could have been done, there was far more that certainly should have been done, but one does have to recognize the limit of resources of any Provincial Government.

But that does not mean that a Provincial Government has to run away from its responsibility to the treaty Indian people of this province. And I would suggest to you, as has the Member for The Pas and the Member for Rupertsland, that the Provincial Government, in many ways, has run away from its responsibility to the treaty Indian people. And they brought out a couple of specifics. One of the specifics of course, was the government's decision not to allow treaty Indian people to participate in the Community Economics Development fund. And that was a matter of great debate before this House when it happened, it was a continuing debate, and in fact we did convince them of the inappropriateness of that approach, and convince them of the inadvisability of that action somewhat. We were able to convince them to go back on their original decision somewhat, not enough, but somewhat. So they in fact, acknowledged, in that instance, that they had, to a more or less limited extent, not lived up to their responsibility.

But as well, the Critical Home Repair Program, which is a program that was brought forward by the — the discussion of the program in this debate was brought forward by the Member for The Pas during his participation. And that is one where I have had my own constituents approach me in respect to their being denied access to that program. And they approach me in this way, Mr. Speaker, they say, we had access to the program under the previous government; we no longer have access to the program. So what we see is a differing philosophical approach to the problem. What we see is the government saying, and I think the Minister of Finance said it specifically, that they are not going to accept any responsibility for services on reserves to treaty Indian people. Yet we did, because we felt that those persons should have access to those programs which were accessible to all other Manitobans, and we saw no reason to deny them that access. Yet this government saw reason to deny them that access, and they did so.

And I just received a letter from one of my constituents in one of the reserve communities in Northern Manitoba the other day, and he enclosed two pamphlets, a CRISP pamphlet and a SAFER pamphlet. And he pointed out, and I forget exactly which pamphlet contained the excerpt, Mr. Speaker, but it was one of those two, that those programs do not apply to treaty Indian people living on reserves. Now those are new programs brought forward by the government, and again they have refused to acknowledge that responsibility that was acknowledged by the previous government.

So there is partisanship in the debate. There has to be because we approach the problem, we approach the situation from different philosophical perspectives, and the Member for St. Matthews should be aware of that.

The Member for St. Matthews also, in his laying out of the resolution, created certain assumptions, implied assumptions at that, created certain expectations which I feel have to be addressed, and I believe the Member for Wellington addressed them quite well in his speech and we've heard the Member for St. Matthews since that time get up and either attempt to discredit the remarks by the Member for Wellington, or attempt to at least substantiate his own argument.

And one of the Whereas' that I think the Member for Wellington took offence to, and one which I took offence to, is:

WHEREAS the uninhibited migration of unskilled native people to the core area of Winnipeg is putting an intolerable strain on the fiscal resources of the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba. Now that can imply only one of two, or perhaps both of two, assumptions. One is that any one who moves into the city puts an intolerable strain on the city, or it can imply that because they are coming in unskilled and unable to find employment because the employment doesn't exist, and believe me, the government has to take some responsibility for the fact that people in this province can't find work when they want work, but that's a different argument, for a different time. But what it implies is because they can't find work, they are going on welfare, or they are in fact over-using the welfare system, and that is placing "an intolerable strain". I think those are his words, "an intolerable strain" on the fiscal resources.

Well, the fact is that there is migration from reserve communities to the city, there is migration from the city to reserve communities, there is migration from different communities outside of the province to the City of Winnipeg, there is more migration by the way, from the City of Winnipeg to different cities outside of the province, but that's another argument for another time as well. But the fact is that the Member for St. Matthews has singled out this particular migration as being one which is placing an intolerable strain on the fiscal resources on the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba. And the suggestion is that strain is increasing, and the suggestion is that strain is unusual when compared to other migratory patterns, and he has given us no evidence of that. As a matter of fact, when it was suggested that he should provide us with evidence of that, he said, I just can't get the figures anywhere. (Interjection)— He corrects me.

He said he never said that. The Member for Wellington said he said that, —(Interjection)— he says it's in Hansard. I could, I guess, look at Hansard, but I won't take the time now. I think in his first speech, and I was here, and I was listening to that speech, he implied — and I'm not going to quote him directly — but he implied that he could not find up-to-date figures in respect to his resolution. But the figures in fact, are available. And the figures are such: That the percentage of registered Indians, treaty Indians, receiving social assistance on and off reserve in Manitoba, is in fact, decreasing for those off reserve persons. And let's look at the figures. It shows in 1972-73, the fiscal year, to 1978-79, and what is shown is that in 1972-73 to 1975-76 there was a fairly steady increase in the percentage of registered Indians receiving off reserve social assistance. But from the fiscal year 1975 to the fiscal year 1979, there has been a steady decrease in the number, or the percentage of registered Indians receiving social assistance who are living off reserve.

So if there is a problem — and I'm not denying that there isn't a situation here that demands some analysis and some programs — but if there is a problem, it is a problem of decreasing magnitude rather than increasing magnitude, and actually I resent the implications of that Whereas. I think that Whereas is written in inflammatory language that cannot in fact, be substantiated. And I think that we have been able to show through the course of our debate that was inflammatory, and that it in fact cannot be substantiated.

So we have to take some objection to that, but that is not to say that there is not a problem, a very real problem, a very significant problem, and a large problem in respect to services and treaty Indian people in this province, in respect to the types of conditions that they must face throughout their lives, some of it is because of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, and let us not deny that. There is discrimination that exists in this society. And the government must live up to its responsibility, to attempt to, wherever possible, combat that discrimination, to attempt wherever possible to eradicate that discrimination, and I'm not saying that they don't do that, but I'm saying that is one of their responsibilities and they must do that, as must we all as members of this Assembly and as well as members of the society in large.

On an aside, Mr. Speaker, while I was presenting that portion of the debate, the Member for Wellington went through the transcript of the Member for St. Matthews' remarks when he first introduced the Resolution on Wednesday, February 11, 1981 and it's page 594 of the Hansard for those who wish the notation. And what he says and I'm quoting directly from the Member for St. Matthews is: "Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to acquire a lot of detailed research on the problem. The matter is not even being studied very much but the Institute of Urban Studies did this over the course of the last year". So what he's saying that he's not been able to acquire a lot of detailed research on the problem, I think that is what I had attributed to him in my remarks just a few minutes ago, so I would hope that the Member for St. Matthews will accept the chastisement as it was intended.

But to get back to the problem; the problem is one of such great magnitude, Mr. Speaker, that we must direct all our resources to the development of programs, policies, philosophies and principles to deal with that problem. We can not do it alone, and we will not have to do it alone because the Indian and Mtis people of this province and this country are doing all that they can to combat historical discrimination, to combat the inequities, to bring themselves forward and to bring their families and their children forward, but we must assist them in that and if we attempt to isolate the Provincial Government from the Federal Government and say that this is a responsibility alone of the Federal Government and this is a responsibility alone of the Provincial Government, and if the Federal Government won't allow Status Indians to participate in the CEDF Program, and if the Federal Government won't apply the Critical Home Repair Program to Treaty Indians living on reserves or if they won't apply the CRISP and SAFER programs, or one or the other of those programs to people living on reserves, then we are doing a disservice to the Indian people, we are doing a disservice to all people and we are doing a disservice to the future.

That is what this Resolution suggests, but we find ourselves in a difficult position. We find that for all the inadequacies of this Resolution, inadequacies that we attempted to deal with by amendment, which was voted down by the Government, we still must support the Resolution for all its faults, for all its warts, for its failings it is something, and even if it is a request on the Government to urge the Federal Government to do something, there is obviously an inadequacy in what the Provincial Government is doing today or there would be no need for that request. What the Resolution is saying is that they're not doing enough, so this Legislature direct them to do enough.

Well, if this Resolution is going to help the Provincial Government do enough, then we're going to vote for it, but we certainly would have liked to have seen included in the Resolution some mention of their responsibility; we certainly would have liked to have seen included in the Resolution some acceptance of their responsibility and that is why we have the amendment, and because they do not accept that responsibility, because they do not want to acknowledge that responsibility, they in fact voted down the amendment. That's to their discredit and I think that the fact that we were able to stand if necessary and vote for this Resolution even although it is totally or at least significantly inadequate is to our credit, that we are going to help them in whatever way we can to live up to whatever responsibility they wish to assume and at the same time we will try to encourage them and convince them to take on that responsibility, which they should take on, but if they refuse to do it, we're certainly not going to discourage them from doing a little Federal Government bashing. If that's the intent of this Resolution, and that's all that we can see coming out of it, then we will assist them encourage the Federal Government to do what they will and we will, during the meantime and all the time, try as an Opposition Party to encourage them to take on the responsibility which is theirs. So, we would have far preferred a different situation but we accept what we

can get because we know the problem is one that demands action, and we intend to help the government in whatever way we can address that problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews will be closing debate.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to join the debate on this particular Resolution, having been acquainted with our native population since the age of five years old. Mr. Speaker, I was raised in close proximity to a Indian reserve, so I believe I can speak with some authority on the problems that do face our native population. I can say at the onset, that I, without hesitation, say many of my closest friends are people of native descent and some of whom I was raised with for many, many years when we were out in close proximity to one particular native Indian reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I look at this Resolution and I get the impression, I get the feeling after reading the Resolution that the member is trying to create the impression that he has a great concern for our native population, but as I read through the whereas's and the different sections of this Resolution, I suddenly realize, Mr. Speaker, that he also seems to have greater concern for the impact on the City of Winnipeg and the core area and these numbers of people are coming into our city, what it does to the city and also to the Provincial Government. So he emphasizes that, in my opinion, to a greater degree than his concern about the unskilled native people that come in from reserves in Manitoba and Northern Ontario, and he seems to place a high emphasis on what the cost is and the cost involved to assist these people once they do arrive in an urban environment, an environment which is foreign to them.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I agree with my colleague for Churchill and others that have spoken that there is a problem. There is a problem which I'm sure everyone recognizes, and it's a problem that's been longstanding and it's a problem that will continue to face native people, Mr. Speaker, in this province and in other provinces, unless we come to grips and analyze what is causing these problems.

Now, in my opinion, this Resolution, while it suggests some emphasis be placed on assisting native people, Mr. Speaker, it's too simplistic, it's far too simplistic. We have to go far beyond simplicity in addressing ourselves to this problem, and I can give you some examples, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much aware of and in fact that I have in my files today, some of the problems that face our native population who live on reserves, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, Sir, that the major problem is that the native population do not have sufficient land base, they do not have land. They lack the equity in land, and the land that they do own is owned collectively and they don't even have title to it, Mr. Speaker. It is owned by the Dominion of Canada, held in trust for the native people, and Mr. Speaker, if a native wants to go into industry, regardless of where, he has no land as equity to go to a bank and borrow money. That is denied him, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't have it. And at every instance, Mr. Speaker, when a native has tried to

apply for Crown Land, and I see the Minister of Finance who was the former Minister who was responsible for Crown Land, Mr. Speaker, now he pounds his fist on the desk, Mr. Speaker, he pounds almost every occasion when a native who tried to start an agriculture operation, a livestock operation and applied for Crown land that was owned by the Crown off the reserve, he was denied. He was denied on almost every occasion, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a longstanding problem. I've been involved with it, I know of it, and I have a letter in my file at the moment, and I'll be happy to table it maybe tomorrow. I don't have it before me, but, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to table it. This letter deals specifically with that problem and that is that the native people do not have access to land, and until such a time that they have equity of some kind where they can go in and have access to finances so they can do something for themselves, they will always be faced with this problem.

So, what do we do, Mr. Speaker? What do we do about it? They are handicapped. They are deterred from trying to do something for themselves. So, what do we do about it? We come up with a simplistic Resolution that says, well now they're creating a problem for the City of Winnipeg, so let's bash the Ottawa Government and say, look, why don't you look after your people, Mr. Speaker. We often hear, and I hear it from time to time, complaints about natives, why can't they assimilate and how come they don't get involved and do like we do and get into the mainstream of things, Mr. Speaker. What happens, we have it right here today. There's a suggestion here that you can't make it in the city, get back to your reserve. That's the implication of this Resolution, Mr. Speaker. That is the implication of this, by implication that's what this Resolution is suggesting, Mr. Speaker. You can't make it in the city, get back to your community. That's what it says, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't say that specifically, but that's the implication that we get from this Resolution.

It says they're here, it's no use of them going back, so look Ottawa these are your kids; these are your people, these belong to you and these belong to us, and now you want to segregate people you know, and that's been the big problem right from Day One, as they have been segregated. They have been segregated, they have never been able to assimilate into the mainstream of things, Mr. Speaker. We have on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, have seen where people have attempted to obtain Crown land to start farming and start livestock farms and they have run into almost a blank or solid wall, concrete wall, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have made some changes and we undertook those changes back when we were in office. (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you should have seen what happened when one particular block of land which had been held by a non-native person had let go of this lease, and when the fellow let go of this lease some of the natives tried to bid on this lease. Well, my God, Mr. Speaker, you should have seen the turmoil that we created here at the Land Branch Office. Here are some natives apply for Crown Land, you know. How dare they, how dare they apply for Crown Land.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this had never been done before. Something new was happening, Mr. Speaker.

Here, here, how dare they apply for Crown land? That's the attitude, so let's change that, Mr. Speaker; so we did change it, Mr. Speaker, we did change it, we saw to it that they had chance to bid on some of this land and have access to some of this land, so that at least some of them that were able to, even though they remained on the reserve, Mr. Speaker, that they had access to land off the reserve and that they were able to create a viable operation for themselves and be productive citizens in our province and be productive citizens in our country and self-sufficient, Mr. Speaker. That's what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, but if he's very very very far and few between, when the occasions do arise that they have access to land. I only know of a couple of instances that has taken place, Mr. Speaker, and I received a letter here just the day before yesterday from a native person who has applied for a piece of land, and there is no way that he got it; it was given to a non-native, Mr. Speaker. I intend to raise this matter further at another time perhaps, maybe on the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker. But I say we do have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, if we are not able to provide a land base for people so that they can develop themselves in this country, that we have to find other ways of doing it, if that's not the way that we are going to proceed.

They have land claims, Mr. Speaker, and those claims have not been settled yet in many cases, and so do the Metis. They have land claims and they were here this week in Winnipeg, and they have been done out of their land holdings many many years ago when this province entered into Confederation, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that here when the Minister of Agriculture is here. We had a very lively debate in the Department of Agriculture in regard to a training program. We pleaded with the Minister, if we could only provide a training program and an apprenticeship program for natives, so that they could acquire the skills to work in the vegetable fields, Mr. Speaker. That's all we were asking, Mr. Speaker, that they set up some kind of a program that would assist these people to acquire the necessary skills to obtain employment on the vegetable farms in the Portage area, because we are bringing off-shore workers to replace these people.

Do you know what we got from the Minister, Mr. Speaker? We finally got from the Minister that we 200 or 300 of them working out there, so we are doing a good job. That's the impression that he wanted to tell us. But he also said, Mr. Speaker, — and the Member for Gladstone echoed his sentiments, Mr. Speaker, at that time. The Minister, while he was making his glowing comments about the good training programs that he had for natives coming from Amaranth, natives coming from Fairford, natives coming from Peguis, natives coming from all the reserves around Portage and so on, while he was making those glowing reports he said — I guess he tripped over himself, and said — there's a lot of work there, but some people don't want to work. That is exactly what they say, Mr. Speaker. There's all kinds of work there. That's the impression that the Minister of Agriculture left when we pleaded with him for a training program for native people. He said it's no use, there's all kinds of work there but they don't want it. It's hard work to go out in the field and bend down, it's stoop labour.

I remember very well the Member for Gladstone saying, oh it's stoop labour, they don't want that kind of work. Why should they do that, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, we say that there has to be a different approach in the attitude of this government. They refused to set up a training program to provide the necessary skills that the Member for St. Matthews says these people do not have. We asked the Minister to set up a program, and I am sure it probably would cost him practically nothing to do this, Mr. Speaker. There would be very very little money involved as far as the province is concerned. He refused to do it. He leaves the impression that they are unwilling to take jobs that are available. That's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. We say that the province must get involved in universal programs such as Medicare — they have to be covered; education — they have to be covered. They have to be covered on many programs. This government has removed the natives right to vote at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, somebody said line number 35. I don't know which member it is that said that. But, Mr. Speaker, in the last Session they removed the franchise for native people to vote in local elections. That has been removed. Again it says, get back to your reserve; don't get involved in community affairs. I am sure that I recall that when we were in government that we brought in legislation that allowed them to sit on school boards — (Interjection)— Pardon? Powwows? Mr. Speaker, I would tell you that if I could I would. If I knew how, I would, and I'd be proud to do it. I'm not like the Member for Rock Lake who's ashamed to associate with Indians.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The hour is 5:30; when this subject next comes up the honourable member will have three minutes left. The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn and return in committee at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).