

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 19, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 25 people of the Adult Basic Education Group of the Red River Community College. This group is directed by Mr. Harvey. This College is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan, the Deputy Speaker. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Normally the Chair doesn't indulge in any of the things that go on in the Chamber except to rule on procedure, but today since I have been donated a cigar by the Honourable First Minister, I'd like to extend felicitations and congratulations to him. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may also have the permission of the House, as I suppose the old grandpa of the House, the opportunity of following your congratulations to the First Minister.

It isn't too often that I have found in the history of this great province of ours that a presiding Premier has produced, or aided in the production of another citizen for the Province of Manitoba. I understand that this morning somewhere along the hour of 3 o'clock in the morning my friend and colleague and our Premier was awakened - and I'm not going to say "rudely awakened" - but something was kicking around at that particular time with the net result that "our Ed" as we affectionately call him had to get up and take his good wife Lily to a hospital. And I guess it's a good job that settlement was made priorly insofar as the nurses were concerned. Then somewhere around about 4 o'clock this morning, so I am informed, Eddie became once again the proud father of a son. We wish to, I say particularly to Lily and to the new offspring, every success for the future. I understand that they are doing very well. As far as the father is concerned I leave it to you who can observe him as how - on my left - and use your judgment as to how he has rebounded from the fact that he is one of the very few Premiers of the Province of Manitoba that during his office has become the father of an additional member in his family.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I could, take this opportunity on behalf of the Government and Caucus, and I am sure with the good will of all members of the Assembly, to present to the new father a little rose as an indication of our affections towards him and our affection towards his wife and his family. And I don't know, and history will record, not me, I don't know whether or not this will be the last occasion that we will be able to extend our congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Schreyer as to their productive capacities or their desire, but I do, Mr. Premier, want to present to you on behalf of all of us this little rose in a token of appreciation of the fact that you statistically have increased the population, through your wife, of the population of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would like to follow the Honourable Minister of Labour. There are not too many occasions, Mr. Speaker, in which there is agreement on this side with the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Labour, and while I would say that there would not necessarily be agreement on the way in which the congratulations are conveyed and there are some statements that he made that we would probably not make on this side in congratulating the Honourable First Minister and his wife, I would like to on our behalf express to him and to his wife congratulations for the blessing that they received. As the Minister of Labour so aptly put it, there has been an increase in the population of Manitoba, and as the First Minister knows the blessing is followed by the additional blessing of another tax deductibility, and in these days of high taxes throughout Canada I think that this is an additional welcome blessing. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank

## ANNOUNCEMENT

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . you, sir, and honourable members of the House for allowing the normal proceedings to be temporarily deferred in order to make reference to the fact that my wife and I were blessed with the arrival of a son early, much earlier today. I guess what has been said by my colleague and by the Leader of the Opposition has some double entendres to it, I attach some amusing significance to the fact that the Minister of Labour was the one to intercede in the discussions here. But while he is one to have ministerial jurisdiction over many things I didn't think it extended so far as to include that kind of labour, sir.

I would very very quickly like to thank honourable members, the Leader of the Opposition for their remarks and advise the House that I'm well aware of the Leader of the Opposition's penchant or inclination for statistical analysis. I was going to say statistical manipulation but I'll stay with statistical analysis. I suppose he attaches some significance to the fact that the second last born arrived at 6 lbs. 9 oz. and today's born arrived at 9 lbs. 9 oz., so that inflation is affecting everything. I know that usually it's the custom if passing around cigars to pass around a note indicating whether it's a son or a daughter and the name, but we have some problem with the name. It was intended to call the boy Luke Stuart Lawrence, but since today is St. Joseph's Day we may have to revise that slightly. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for assisting me in my brief departure from the rules. I think inflation set in with the speeches as well to what I said.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Health and Social Development for the year ending December 31, 1974; and also the Annual Report of the Manitoba Lotteries Commission ending March 31, 1974. And I might inform the House that copies will be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Guidelines for Development of Public Library Service in the province by Professor Harry E. Newsom. Copies will be made available to all members of the House. And equally table an Order for Return of the House No. 96 dated March 15, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statement or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 3, The Extra-provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act; and Bill No. 13, The Fatality Inquiries Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should have mentioned that the Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill recommends it to the House.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate why the Manitoba Medical Association were not advised until March 13, 1975 that the Government had undertaken a study beginning in July of 1974 of geriatric services in Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it is the custom of letting the public know every time you're starting on a study. I might say to my honourable friend that prominent members of the medical profession have assisted us in this study.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister can tell the House whether the Manitoba Health Services Commission had approved the recommendations made in the study?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like my honourable friend to be a little more specific because there were different studies made and I think my honourable friend will have to be a little more specific.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position at least to indicate whether the Manitoba Health Services Commission have approved the recommendations in the study and the announcement that he has made.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know if it's required that there should be a formal approval by the Manitoba Health Services Commission on a policy that has been determined by the Cabinet. I know that they've been aware of it, I know that senior staff have sat on the committee and I know that certainly as Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I had initiated the study.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Another question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister inform the House whether or not the contractual arrangement made between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the doctors (I think he's aware of that arrangement) stated that the changes such as those proposed in the study are to be subject of discussion between MMA and the Commission?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend is talking about the Consultative Committee of the Commission and the doctors. Many items are brought in at this committee both by the members of the MMA and members representing the Manitoba Health Services Commission, but at no time was it stated, or is it the intention that this committee will have power of veto or decide what policy this government will bring in in the field of health, and I think that this should be made quite clear.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Why was there no consultation between MMA and the Commission with respect to announced policy changes in connection with the geriatric services in Winnipeg?

MR. DESJARDINS: Because we felt that the best place to get expertise on this would be to go to the geriatricians, and we did exactly that. I think that it was clear that we talked to the three best, and maybe the only three geriatricians in Winnipeg. There was a meeting by the Commission who made certain recommendations to the Cabinet and to myself. The Commission as well as the members of this committee met with the, what I like to refer to as the Winnipeg Bed Utilization Committee, and that Bed Utilization Committee was set up by the Commission and the MMA were invited to have a member of their organization and he certainly participated, and was part of this committee, and then of course he learned of the recommendations of the Commission when the administrators of the different hospitals and the medical directors of the different hospitals were informed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour and ask him whether in view of the serious industrial unrest afflicting the province at the present time, would the Minister of Labour call the Industrial Relations Committee of this Legislature into meetings to examine the situation and explore methods of dealing with it, and would he invite representatives of organized labour to appear before the committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to share with the apprehensions of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry insofar as the climate at the present time in industrial relations is concerned. I did announce publicly that I was prepared to hear consultations, or hear representations by the various components in industrial relations and as a result I sent around to all members of the Assembly requests for changes in our labour relations field of endeavour for their consideration. It would be my intention as soon as possible to have a consideration made of the proposals for changes in the Labour Relations Act and also the very important point raised by my honourable friend considered by the Committee on Industrial Relations. I am not satisfied and I think that I have indicated this with the climate prevailing at the present time and being of that opinion, I will give due consideration to the point raised by my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in recent date, I believe yesterday or the day before, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked whether the matter of Schmidt Cartage Limited had been brought before Cabinet in April of 1973. I indicated at the time that I was reasonably certain that it had not but that I would check. Upon checking, I am advised that the sequence was as follows: At the Board Meeting of the Communities Economic Development Fund, in March of 1973, the board agreed that the business warranted participation by the Fund but that clarification was required in view of the position of one of the directors as being a prospective borrower, being part of the company, the applying company. The Chairman of the Fund, accordingly, referred the matter to my colleague the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund who quite properly immediately referred to Section 17, subsection (3) of the Fund's legislation which prohibited any director from being a borrower from the Fund. And accordingly that was done. The matter was not presented to Cabinet and certainly not by the general manager or the assistant general manager. And I believe this does therefore respond specifically to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. You refer to a meeting between yourself and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on this matter? The matter was discussed . . .

MR. SCHREYER: A meeting of the Board of Directors . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Then the First Minister is indicating there was no presentation by the Manager or the Assistant Manager to any members of the Cabinet concerning this?

MR. SCHREYER: I have here the communication or memorandum signed by the general manager of the Fund indicating very clearly and specifically that when the matter came before the board of directors of the Fund, there was an inclination to grant the loan but it was realized that there may be a problem because of the position of one of the members of the board of directors. Accordingly the matter was referred to the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund, and I'm quoting, "who immediately referred to Section 17, subsection (3) of the Fund's legislation." And accordingly the matter was taken back by the board and reconsidered. And the communication goes on to state, "to my knowledge the issue was not presented to Cabinet and certainly not by myself or the assistant general manager."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Development) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, just on a point of clarification. I advised the House this before and I will repeat the advice. That the chairman advises me that he asked me whether a board member could make a loan. I told him that that could not be done. I don't recall the specific conversation but when the question was put to me it wasn't put with regard to any loan, it was a specific question as to whether a board member could make a loan.

The matter of Schmidt Cartage, the Thompson loan, Lamirande, Thompson making a loan, was not put to me, but merely whether a board member can put a loan. And even that, Mr. Speaker, escapes my recollection, but I indicated last year that they indicated that they asked my advice on the question, not on the loan. And the specific terms of the loan were never put to me, Mr. Chairman, prior to the then Member for Thompson asking me whether a loan had been made to Ben Thompson. The answer to that which I believe was a memo to the Premier who was asked the question was my first knowledge of the loan, the amount of the loan and how the loan was made.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . I'm correct, and I want to use the words if I can of the Premier. He said that the matter was then further discussed by the board. I wonder if he could indicate the disposition that the board made as a result of that discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well no, I couldn't, Mr. Speaker, not being a member of the board, I couldn't indicate what disposition was made of it. I thought, sir, that this communication is very clear in terms of answering my honourable friend's question. I feel completely satisfied upon perusal that everything - the sequence of events clearly indicates that all procedures were properly followed, and it is also very specific that the general manager or the assistant general manager certainly did not present the matter to Cabinet, the matter was not presented to Cabinet, and I felt that that answered the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the First Minister. Is he indicating to the House that he did not

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . know at any time the disposition that was made at that second board meeting in connection with this loan ?

MR. SCHREYER: Well that is right, sir. Asking one to search one's memory back two years, but this memorandum does indicate that neither the general manager nor the assistant general manager presented the matter to Cabinet. I go further to indicate that I have no recollection whatsoever that the matter was ever presented to Cabinet. There was a referral to the Minister responsible and he quite properly referred them to Section 17 and all that it implies.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate to the House that after a request was made to determine whether under that particular section a loan could go to a director, he had any discussion with any of his officials that the loan could go to someone else possibly related but not to the individual as a director ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not at all, certainly not. I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, that even though I don't recollect the chairman coming to me, that I accept the fact that he asked me, but he asked me with regard to a bland question, without names, without reference to a loan, without reference to a company, without reference to a subsequent loan. He asked me the question, can a loan be made to a director of a company and I showed him the section. And I recall this, Mr. Chairman, only because the chairman told me he did this, and I believe him. But with regard to a loan to Ben Thompson or Lamirande or the amount, Mr. Speaker, I know, as I am standing here, that I had absolutely nothing to do with that loan, because, Mr. Speaker, if I was advised of the loan beforehand, the chairman would advise this House that my discretion was not asked, if it was given it might have been entirely different. The substantive position at that time was that the board had the authority to make any loan under \$75,000, and I'm advised by the Chairman of the Board that everything that was done with the legal advice of the Board's counsel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. When he refers to the Chairman, you're referring to Mr. Parasiuk, that's the only communication. You did not have any communication with Mr. Jones or Mr. Hanly on this matter ?

MR. GREEN: None whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, until after the matter was raised in the House, and then I don't even specifically recall talking to them about the Thompson Cartage loan. I'm aware, Mr. Chairman, that after the advice that they say they got from me, that they proceeded to deal with the matter by having a new loan application, the chairman proceeding to exercise his responsibility which he felt was with the concurrence of the board members in granting the loan and the board gratifying the loan. All of which I understand was done with the advice of the solicitor for the Fund and which information was more clearly communicated to me sometime in the Fall of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question with regard to Mr. Hanly. Mr. M. D. Hanly apparently resigned from the Fund in January of 1975 to take up a position with the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce in Ottawa. I understand that he was offered a position, that in his view it more suited his long-term objectives and that he took the position. I am unaware and have not been advised of any side issues affecting this termination.

. . . asked a question, Mr. Speaker, relative to the Chipboard Plant in Sprague. I'm advised that a settlement was made with regard to the fire claim, that the settlement was in the amount of \$950,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development. My question relates to the Interim Report on the Health Sciences Centre and the report of the Special Committee on Geriatric Services. Has the Minister tabled this report ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWN: A supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister now table this report ?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to table that report because I think it is an in-House document. If my honourable friend would like to see it, I could provide it for him.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the government's pledge in the Throne Speech to improve telephone service, I'm wondering if the Minister can tell the House if anything is being done to improve services on rural lines where there is as many as seven parties on one line, and if it's the intention of the government to extend . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe a question of that nature could more readily be answered under the Estimates.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Can the Minister advise the House whether the spring examination papers at the University of Manitoba have been prepared or whether they still remain to be prepared?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, my department does not prepare the examination papers for any of the universities and I think that that question could more properly be addressed to the universities.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may put a supplementary to that question. The objective I'm attempting to attain is an answer to the question whether or not the preparation of those papers hangs in the balance of the unresolved labour dispute on the campus at the present time.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, regardless of what the honourable member's objective may be, the responsibility for the preparation of examination papers is still that of the university.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Several days ago I asked him a question about a meeting of the Municipal Board. He told me he would attempt to get the answer. I was wondering if he had that answer now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member is referring to the subject matter of the Wanless Trailer Court, and the possibility of a Municipal Board hearing in The Pas in regard to that particular matter, I gather there will be a hearing in view of the fact that there have been objections filed apparently with the Municipal Board.

MR. GRAHAM: Yes. Could the Minister indicate the date of that hearing?

MR. PAWLEY: I would have to obtain the date information for the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if the Federal Government consulted him in any way regarding the new rate schedules that are advertised now for the historical park known as Lower Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the responsible Federal Minister has not consulted me. Officials in Ottawa could have consulted officials of the Department, of which I am not aware of. I could say, Mr. Speaker, it's very seldom that we in turn would consult the Federal Minister or his official when an increase or decrease is contemplated in fees here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

ANNOUNCEMENT - BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House will let me announce some meetings for committees. The Committee on Economic Development will meet next Thursday. Mr. Speaker, they will also meet next Thursday, to consider the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I would like the Committee on Public Accounts to re-meet on Tuesday at 10 o'clock. The Hydro, that's the Committee on Utilities, to meet on April 1st and April 8th, and if necessary on April 15th.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Manitoba Housing and Renewal, and ask him if he would inform the House if Misawa Homes has met all the contractual arrangements with Manitoba Housing and Renewal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I have to take that question as notice.

MR. BANMAN: A further question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House as to whether the Manitoba Development Corporation has pulled out of the joint prefabrication house building venture with the Japanese company, Misawa Homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the MDC is and has been in the course of discussing the nature of its relationship with Misawa Homes Limited. Those discussions are still under way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Highways, and this is not a preamble, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into a . . . I wonder if he could tell us or tell the House if he could give us a breakdown on highway infractions between Unicity Winnipeg and Rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That question would be better under the Minister's estimates. Order please. Order please. Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

. . . . . continued on next page

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call Bill No. 7 to start with and then follow with Bills Number 2 and 6.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on Bill No. 7, second reading.

BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you. I did not take the opportunity to speak during the Throne Speech debate, so I would wish you all the co-operation that the members can give during the coming session, and I know that you will handle the House in your usual efficient way.

Mr. Speaker, this is Bill No. 7, which is the Interim Supply Bill, which allows the government to carry on the proceedings of the province or the financial proceedings of the province so they can pay their bills and keep going until the estimates and final budget is finished.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say there is one thing that concerns me at the present time with my own constituency regarding the spending of money, and one of them is that the problem at the present time on Sturgeon Creek is one which can become very serious if the province does not take into consideration the report which was presented to the City, and I am sure it has been presented to the province, and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether it's gone to the Minister of Urban Affairs or whether it has gone to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It's regarding the increase or larger bridges that must be put over Sturgeon Creek at Ness Avenue and Portage Avenue, and I believe the City has said it will cost a million three in their report. Mr. Speaker, it's all very well to say that this may be a City problem as far as the spending of money is concerned, but the province does have some responsibility in this regard with these bridges. The province is presently draining many acres of land north of Sturgeon Creek in the Woodlands area in the constituency of my colleague from Woodlands, and this water is all running down through Sturgeon Creek through my constituency which is blocked off with small culverts on Portage Avenue. Now as much as I like to have anything that may come from my colleague from Lakeside constituency, I don't want all that water which is going to be dammed up on Portage Avenue because of culverts which are too small. Portage Avenue is a federal road and provincial road and the province has a responsibility to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the speeches that were made on the Throne Speech debate, I noticed a very very serious problem with the honourable members opposite regarding the financial spending and financial problems of this province. And the serious problem is that they do not take the spending of money seriously. They actually were kibitzing and laughing while one of the members on this side of the House was talking about the auditor's report and he was pointing out some areas of the auditor's report, Mr. Speaker, that showed absolute mismanagement, absolute bad administration on the side of the government, and the honourable members on the other side took the opportunity at that time to snicker about it, and they thought that this was not really a serious problem.

As we noted in the paper today, the auditor has mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that there is over \$500 million spent by this government which does not come under the auditor, which I think is a serious thing in itself. But to take lightly an auditor's report which does point up some mismanagement, bad administration on the side of the government is something that's hard to fathom; and if they want some constructive criticism, Mr. Speaker, which is what all the members seem to want on that side, the constructive criticism is take it seriously because it's the people's money you're spending and you're not there to play monopoly with it, it's no game. And when the auditor points up these things I think it is worth more than snickers in this House.

I had a little disappointment in the Premier's speech regarding the auditor's report and the spending of the money of the province, Mr. Speaker, in that he referred to the auditor's report the same as the auditor's report in Ottawa, which would excite members greatly because there were some things wrong. Quite frankly, I can see where the Minister is trying to - I won't use the word "cover up", but sort of hopefully get people to take lightly the auditor's report because it is an embarrassment on the government. But if we are going to grant money at the present time, if we are going to grant money at the present time to this government, I



## BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . think we have to pay much more serious attention to the auditor's report other than it does create a bit of a problem when it's presented in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, during the debates that I heard when the House was opened, we had Saunders Aircraft come up many times. And here again we have a situation when we are going to use public money again to go into business, and we keep weakly putting more public money into Saunders Aircraft, and when we vote for Interim Supply every time we have to meet the payroll there I'm sure some of that money will be going to that use. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, that is quite true, as the Premier has said, it's current money, but again we're talking about moneys of the province being used and spent in different arenas.

Mr. Speaker, there's one thing about Saunders that I want to put on the record and keep very straight because the Premier keeps insisting that the Federal Government should put more money into Saunders Aircraft. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that has to be remembered in this House, and it's been said before. The Minister of Labour, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member from Minnedosa, the Federal Member from Marquette, many members of this House, and I don't know how many exactly, but many members of the unions of this province who were worried about the aircraft industry in this province took a plane to Ottawa back in 1971, and in that meeting the Minister, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Richardson, the Minister for Labour at that time, Mr. Mackasey, and the Minister from Newfoundland who was the Minister of Transport at the time, Mr. Jamieson - and the Member for Charleswood also tells me he was at that meeting - and at that meeting Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, told everybody at that meeting that the Aerospace industry was in trouble. He was having problems in Ontario with the larger companies. He sincerely said he would do everything he possibly could to help that industry. He said he saw many years of trouble for that industry, and he spoke very honestly to everybody; and the Minister of Industry and Commerce was there and the Minister of Labour was there, and they came back and they obviously didn't tell the Premier that the Aerospace industry was in trouble because this Government turned around and went into the Aerospace industry and started to manufacture aircraft. After being told it was one of the industries that has been in more trouble than most industries have ever been in Canada. And for the Premier to come along now and say that I would like the Federal Government to put money into an industry after he has been told that industry is not working well and the Federal Government is having money . . . is just strange to me. In fact, if the First Minister is going to continue on that trend he had better stand up and produce in this House some promises and arrangements he had with the Federal Government which would logically say we can spend over \$30 million up to now.

Mr. Speaker, I'm informed by the Member from Charleswood that he was not at that meeting, but I assure you that the Member from Minnedosa was there as the President of the Chamber of Commerce at the time and many of the Federal MLAs attended that meeting. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Saunders is failing because the Federal Government won't come in it just won't wash. The First Minister has got to have better reasons than that for the expenditures at Saunders Aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, the spending of money and the losses in Autopac have been mentioned many times. I would like to relate a story that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has brought forth on many many occasions. Not many. He has a better memory than I, he could probably tell me exactly how many. But he always used to relate the story of the President of Portage Mutual who said, "If you had 25 percent of the business how well would you do"? "If I had 50 percent of the business would you make a profit and how well would you do"? "If I had 75 percent of the business would you make a profit"? And then when he asked him if he had 100 percent of the business how it would go, the Manager said, "I don't know that it would go too well" - you might have to get the words right here but he said, "I don't know, but we would have a tendency to become complacent and we might not make a profit."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the Minister that he has got 100 percent of the business and he should have listened, he should have listened to the Manager of Portage Mutual, because I assure you that this Government is running Autopac on the basis of having 100 percent of the business and being very complacent, and their service is getting bad and their relationship with the people is getting bad, and their advertising is such that it is not factual.

Mr. Speaker, the rates of Autopac are going up continually as we said and for the Minister of Autopac to get up in this House and suggest that, you know, that 2 percent increase or

## BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . 2 percent tax on gasoline is not really there to subsidize Autopac is just ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, when the Autopac Bill was passed all of us on this side of the House were disappointed. Many people in this province were disappointed, many people lost their businesses. It was a drastic day but never in our worst nightmares did we ever believe that Autopac would be an industry that would cause inflation. Inflation in rates is one thing, increase in rates is inflationary, Mr. Speaker, but to turn around and put 2 cents on gallons of gasoline in this province is an inflationary thing in itself.

Produce coming back and forth to this city, people going on holidays, even cutting your lawn, Mr. Speaker, is now going to go to the support of Autopac, which is inflationary. If you're going to buy a gallon of gasoline and have 2 cents go on it for Autopac, I say everybody in this province while they're out enjoying themselves cutting their lawn, look at the cars going by because you're subsidizing it right then and there.

Mr. Speaker, Autopac's relationship with people is just another ridiculous thing. I have a lady in my constituency, she's over 65; if she did not work three days a week and make herself an extra \$250 that lady would probably qualify, and I'm sure would receive help from the province and Federal Government. She has a car and she drives it to work three days a week. She drives it in the wintertime because she would have to transfer at Ferry Road and Portage. But now that she drives that car to work three days a week she pays \$30.00 more in insurance. That is what you support and like in Autopac? That lady over 65! This was the type of thing that this government said when they brought in Autopac would be wiped out, the unfairness to people.

You know, I can remember very clearly saying to a man in the insurance business, you know, some of this you brought on yourselves I said. I know a girl, a business girl, who drove one of the first Mustangs that ever came out, drove it for two years at a regular rate and three years later got charged sports car rates. And I said, "How do you justify that?" to him. I said, "How do you justify putting up that rate on that six cylinder car for a girl that drives back and forth to work?" Well they said, "Sports cars have got to be in a different classification." This was the thing that the Autopac was going to cure, and now we have sports cars in another specification, all paying more money the same as the private people.

Mr. Speaker, it's rather disappointing, it's rather disappointing that these things are happening after some of the remarks that were said during that Autopac debate. The unfairness to people which private industry was pressing upon them would be all cured by Autopac. I don't really pay much attention to the advertising of Autopac and I get very very disappointed when I see money spent like this. This little brochure, misleading as it is. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention by one of my constituents and apparently he wrote Mr. Rogers, the Combines Investigation Act, Prairie Region, sent a copy to Mr. Bertrand, Director of Investigations and Research, he brought to my attention that Autopac reduces - from this little book, Financial Post: "Autopac Reduces Costs." And I'm sure you all know what was in the Winnipeg paper. I'm sure you all know that the article in the Winnipeg paper, and I know that nobody likes the Winnipeg paper, and it's been . . . on the government side, they keep talking about it, but a gentleman pointed out that this particular article, this particular article was listed, was listed from an article in the Financial Post and was purposely put in there to mislead.

Mr. Speaker, just for the record I'd like to read something: The Combines Investigation Act of Canada, Section 37, "Publication of false advertisements. (1) everyone who publishes or causes to be published an advertisement containing a statement that purports to be a statement of fact but that is untrue, deceptive or misleading, or is intentionally so worded or arranged that it is deceptive or misleading, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years if the advertisement is published: (a) to promote directly or indirectly the sale or disposal of property or any interest therein; and (b) to promote a business or commercial interest." Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Federal Government looks into that. I want to see what the great Federal Government will do when Big Brother Government starts to do misleading advertising with the people. And, Mr. Speaker, once you get that kind of tripe presented to you by a company, you really can't have much confidence in them from then on.

The advertising and the comments and the complete confliction surrounding Autopac is

## BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . one, Mr. Speaker, that no business could get away with; nobody on that side of the House or this side would deal with a company that has so many conflicting reports about rates and everything that goes about it. They would just ignore it, they'd say, "That's a bad company". And I think, Mr. Speaker, it's time the Premier told the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs to get to work and start doing his job in this government and start looking over this kind of advertising and saying to some of the Ministers within this government that you can't do that. Or is he there just to approve the misleading advertising that comes out?

Mr. Speaker, there has been much said on urban renewal in this province, there has been much said by everybody regarding the core area of Winnipeg, and I congratulate the government for looking at it. I only say that I'm sorry the government ruined probably the only good basis of people to work with as far as urban renewal is in this province. You now are going to go in and fix up the core area. You now are going to go in and buy all the property and spend the money and make the decisions. That's what you are going to do. And who have you discussed it with? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Minister over there may say the City, but the structure they have in Winnipeg is such that the Aldermen at one end of town are not that concerned about the other end of town because it's a structure that you put in that is not working.

If you had a regional government situation that you had before that had charge of the urban renewal as far as the Winnipeg area is concerned, you would be laughing and you'd have a good group to work with. But you ruined all that. You ruined the regional government and, Mr. Speaker, I have a report here regarding costs of cities, it's 1975 Future Growth of Saskatoon and its Regional Government. They've looked at all the others in the area, Regional government in the growth of Saskatoon. --(Interjection)-- Yet we turned around. Mr. Speaker, they suggest that the size of Saskatoon proper, downtown Saskatoon stop at 192,000 people, and from that point on you deal with regional government.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg as far as the structure is concerned has to be changed or you are going to continue to have problems, you are going to continue to have high taxes and you are not going to have a body that the provincial government can work with properly within that city to get things done. But this provincial government doesn't want that. This provincial government basically wants to buy the land themselves, do it all themselves and impose their will upon the city. And it's the old story of control. Mr. Speaker, we know that everything that this government has put forward from time to time is basically to get more control over what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Development Fund which we have a lot of money going out on. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources presented some figures the other night which showed that while it was the Fund it lost money and we have interest to pay on our loans, etc. He showed that under the Corporation where they take equity in businesses that they have some problems too. He pointed out the problems we had, and there's no question about the problems they have.

Mr. Speaker, doesn't that prove that the experiment of taking public money and putting it into businesses, large businesses especially, for the benefit of creating jobs and the profit coming back to the people to help the people has been a complete failure. On our side and theirs. And for anybody to say now that we want to change the Act so that they can have all the good loans - or not have all the bad loans, let's put it that way, is just ridiculous because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they'll only get the bad loans anyway because the good loans the finance people will take. Unless you go out and cut your interest rates, and that's quite possible too.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fund, or the corporation as it's now called, if they want constructive criticism why not sit down and take a look where they have been successful. In some of your smaller good loans which have been areas where 25 people in an area are working or 50 people in an area are working, and stay out of this great big massive loaning business which has proved to be a failure. And I hit the desk, Mr. Speaker, because in my speech it said so, like the Premier's it's been there for six years. I asked my speech writer to take it out but he forgot and I thought maybe he should. I asked him to take it out for another reason. After six years I thought I was getting a little older and didn't have to do those things.

Mr. Speaker, the fund or corporation, as you want to call it, can be successful and

## BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . beneficial to Manitobans but not if this government is going to keep going out and promoting business, loans, and buying equity in companies because governments do not run companies well, and it's been proven.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons for this government going into business, the reasons for buying land, the reasons for wanting to get into the preferred loaning area with the people's money just leaves me cold. I can't understand it for one thing. I believe sincerely in the Minister of Urban Affairs when he stood up and said "I'll defend public housing, I'll defend pharmacare". He didn't say it that way. He said, "You criticise it", but he means he'll defend it.

I think if you'll look at the record in this House over the past six years, you'll find that this side of the House hasn't always in fact most times, have listened to, accepted this government's legislation, argued on many occasions on how it's been put forth, put forth our arguments as to, we do it our way, you do it your way, but going for the same thing, but never really got that excited or into battles with the government when we talked about things that this government believe help people. I believe that they have gone too far, and basically socialism always does; but nevertheless, nevertheless where have our arguments been? The worst battle we ever had in this House was on Autopac and we're close to losing \$30 million of people's money. Which could have been where? Maybe in housing, maybe somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, we had battles about the Fund, we've said you're going into businesses and losing money, you know. Those have been our battles. And what are the priorities of the Socialist NDP government? Is it to be the biggest businessmen in Canada or North America, or what? The biggest landowners as well. What are the priorities of the NDP government when it comes to spending money? You know, it's a monopoly game with other people's money because I think they're all as conceited as Cheshire cats who figure that they know best in business and the operation of people's lives. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the Premier says I'm being silly, I assure him I am not, because I can't figure out this NDP government and their policies. You know, it's just at a loss and they're mixed up at the present time like you wouldn't believe.

Mr. Speaker, I find them quite mixed up. I'm sure that there will be a counter argument against this, but I have done something with some working papers here today regarding the collection of the money that we're about to spend. And I've got all these income tax forms here and what have you, but I've got a little book here that tells us how much we pay in tax. And in this book if you take . . . well as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to start with up to \$1,000 the Federal Government took everybody off the tax roll, and this government it would probably break out about 551 that you wouldn't have to pay any provincial tax because of your Manitoba cost-of-living credit. But if you took a man who paid tax, taxable income of \$1,200 in Manitoba and he pays a federal tax according to the book, of \$36.00, he pays a provincial tax of \$78.40, he gets a rebate, Mr. Speaker, of \$22.12 of the Manitoba cost-of-living credit. This is a single man. He pays 160 percent of his actual federal tax. The Manitoba tax is 160 percent.

A man paying tax on \$1,410 a year taxable income, he pays \$76.00 to the federal tax. The provincial tax, and it's in the book, is \$96.20. A single man's deduction on that basis on the Manitoba cost-of-living credit would be \$20.02; he pays \$76.08. And that's 100 percent of the actual tax he pays to the Federal Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's make it very clear these people say, you know, you pay your tax on the basic federal tax, but the basic was changed, the basic is higher than the actual because the Federal Government gave a tax break to the people. So for this government to say that you're paying 42.5 of actual federal tax you're paying, is wrong. 42.5 of the basic but you're paying a heck of a lot more on your actual federal tax.

Let's go to \$3,412, Mr. Speaker. You'll pay \$472 in federal tax, you'll pay \$264.20 in provincial tax and when the cost-of-living credit breaks down there, there is no more, you're paying 56 percent of the actual federal tax you're paying. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, what the policy of this thing is, and this is why I don't understand NDP governments any more, because they stood up and they said, we're for the working man. \$12,000 a year of taxable income, you'll pay \$2,555 federal, you'll pay \$1,149.80 provincial, there is no cost-of-living credit there, which is 45 percent of your actual federal tax. Do you know what this is, Mr. Speaker? That is the guy making more money is paying more percentage of federal income tax than a low income earner in this province. The man making less money is paying more percentage of actual federal tax in this province than the man making more money. And that

## BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . is NDP policy. And the Premier asks me why I don't understand NDP socialist governments, who continually mislead the people with advertising; advertising that in the Public Accounts to Dunsky agency in Montreal was \$365,000. And the Premier will say, as he usually does, what did you guys do?

Well, okay, I'm not here to argue or discuss what was done ten years ago or 15 years ago. All I know is this type of nonsense coming out is close to ridiculous. And there will be an argument, Mr. Speaker, that I have left out the Real Tax Property Credit Plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very happy to put the Real Tax Property Credit Plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very happy to put the Real Tax Credit Plan in my figures, providing you take it out of the Real Tax Plan. You can't use it in both places. That's what the Premier's tried to do on many occasions. He said, look at all we're giving you back and he uses it, he used it one year with your tax. That's income tax. Then he'd turn around and he'd take the same hundred bucks and he'd say, look what I'm giving you on your Real Tax. You can't use it twice. That's why in these figures I have only put in the Manitoba cost-of-living credit. If you want to put in the real tax plan, I'd be very happy to, but don't tell the people they're getting a break on their Real Taxes.

If you want to take all the taxes people pay and add them up in one lump sum, fine I'll do it that way too. But I will tell you this, at the present time the people, the low income earner in Manitoba is paying more percentage of actual federal tax than the high income earner in this province. And that is the policy of the NDP government. --(Interjection)-- Well the figures are there. I'm only using the federal book and I admit they work it on the basic. It kind of shoots the old previous Minister of Finance's argument all to hell, and that's basically what his arguments were when he ever gave them.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude now by saying that I don't understand the priorities of this Socialist government. They want to be businessmen and they're not. They're conceited enough to think that they are. They go out and they advertise that they can do all of these things and are doing all these things, and they're not. How can you pay attention to advertising that's put forth when half of it can be proved that it's mixed up and against the laws of the land.

Mr. Speaker, we are now seeing the - what is it - hens come home to roost or something of that nature - chickens are coming home to roost. Well this is Women's Lib year or something. But I assure you, the Premier is going to have to come up with better arguments and excuses for this government than what happened 10 or 15 years ago or what happened in other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote this down, I didn't say it, it was one of my colleagues and I guess I've destroyed it and it's my colleague from Riel. He said, we will have reached the ultimate in the Progressive Conservative Party when we get blamed for Autopac, Unicity, and all of these things that this government has gone into; that they will not, they will not take the blame themselves, they want to blame somebody else for all their mistakes. And that's what the Premier's speech was. Get off the hook the best way you can by blaming somebody else. And we've heard it for six years, Mr. Speaker. The Premier wasn't here when I told him I took the space where it said, "hit the desk" out of my speech. I wish you'd do it the next time because it's getting a little boring. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 2. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is absent. No. 6, the same. Go on to the others? Bill No. 5. The Honourable Minister of Health.

BILL NO. 5 - VITAL STATISTICS

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 5, an Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this proposed bill includes mostly housekeeping amendments to the Vital Statistics Act arising from the introduction of the new Child Welfare

## BILL NO. 5 - VITAL STATISTICS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . Act last year, the Act that came into force finally in January.

The number 1 clause though is something that was recommended and it should be in this bill, it was recommended by the Law Reform Committee, and this is a legal definition of "death". This was, as I say, recommended by the Law Reform Committee.

The remaining of the bill is mostly housekeeping. I think that there is a change that now it is the County Court Clerk who will under the new Child Welfare Act provide the recorder of Vital Statistics with the order of adoption for registration purposes. And the word "legitimate" is now being removed, that is we will not make any distinction for adoption purposes now. And it will also allow the registration of adoption agreements which was permitted under the repealed Child Welfare Act. Unfortunately that wasn't done, that was omitted and it is certainly needed now.

Then the sixth section is an extension of the principle contained in Section 2 that we no longer show the names of the natural parents of an adopted child which could create an emotional problem to a child who was illegitimate. So I think that it is, you might say practically a routine bill, it is mostly housekeeping, except that maybe that first clause that has a legal definition of death.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that is fairly urgently required if we're going to proceed with the Act at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: We'd like this to stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member make a motion please?

MR. BROWN: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Morris, that the bill stand.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 8 - CHILD WELFARE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on Bill No. 8.

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Child Welfare Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this also is housekeeping to make it possible what was approved in principle in the change of this Act last year. The major provisions I might say in the bill is to provide for a transitional period during which adoption proceedings in progress at the time of proclamation of the new Child Welfare Act and related regulations at January 31, 1975, can be continued and completed under provisions and regulations of the repealed Child Welfare Act. In the absence of this provision, adoption proceedings in progress at the time of proclamation of the new Child Welfare Act will have to be halted. Applicants for adopted children would be required to submit a new application in accordance with regulations of the new Act. It is judged this would necessarily delay successful adoption and impose undue hardship upon these applicants affected.

I'm not going to go clause by clause, I think it is clear that it's housekeeping. If there is any questions, I'll try to answer them. But again I would like to appeal to the members and the member that has the adjournment of the previous motion that if we are going to proceed with adoption, I would hope that there will not be any unnecessary delay in passing this Act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I'd like to move, seconded by the Member from La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Member for Birtle-Russell is prepared to go on his two bills.

MR. GRAHAM: Let it stand, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works 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 Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: For honourable members, it's page 9 of their Estimate books. Resolution 20(a)--The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, seeing as how we have no other place in the Estimates to deal with the Liquor Control Commission, I think we have to deal with it under the Minister's Salary, and for that reason I want to at this time take a few minutes to bring to the attention of the House some of the problems that I see at least with the affairs of the Liquor Control Commission. I'm sure there are othermembers of the House that want to say a few words in that respect as well.

It was rather interesting, sir, last Friday to pick up the paper and read where, "The Minister of Tourism, Mr. Toupin, said, Thursday that he favours having wine served in all provincial restaurants. This would be part of a program to encourage sensible and moderate drinking, Mr. Toupin told about 200 people attending a dinner." And I won't go on any further. He says, "Maybe this change is something we can look forward to soon." Now I don't know whether Mr. Toupin had already discussed this with the Attorney-General, or whether it had been a Cabinet decision that he was announcing, but it seems somewhat strange to me, sir, that affairs of the Liquor Control Commission policy changes, and what not, should be announced by other than the Attorney-General.

Sir, we find that on numerous occasions that we've had the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission making announcements. We've had the Attorney-General making announcements. We have the Minister of Tourism making announcements, and I don't know how many more there are going to be that are going to be making announcements regarding the operation of the Liquor Control Commission. I'm beginning to wonder, sir, just who is making policy for the Liquor Control Commission, whether it is the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, whether it is the Attorney-General, whether it's the Minister of Tourism, or whether it is the Cabinet itself. And I would hope that the Attorney-General when he stands up in his place will tell us who is making these policy decisions. --(Interjection)-- It's all right. I see the Minister of Public Works is leaving. I thought maybe he had something to say at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we have rather clear cut policies on the operation of the Liquor Control Commission. We had been promised some time ago that there was going to be a review, and as we all recall the last review that was undertaken was quite an extensive one, in which there was public input. So far to my knowledge there has been no public hearings; the public has not been considered at all as far as I can find out. And if there is going to be changes, and we have had changes made in the last year or so. We've had fortified wines taken off the list. It was done on a trial basis in certain parts of the province and then has been brought out province-wide. But I would hope that decisions of this nature involving the public would be carried forward. I would hope that there would be hearings held where the public could make a representation on what they think should occur in the field of the Liquor Control Commission, but we have seen nothing of that respect, sir. I think it's most regrettable.

I can well recall, sir, when a couple of years or so ago, there was a great deal of concern about the operation of what they called the "Main Street Strip", and it seemed at that time the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission almost conducted a personal vendetta on the 17 hotel keepers in that particular area. There was a great deal of concern expressed that there were maybe violations of the regulations in those operations. There was certainly concern expressed about too much alcohol being available to those people in that area. And lo and behold, sir, after that vendetta had been carried out, we find the government itself then moved into that area. After cutting down on the seating capacity of the various hotels, the government then moved into that area itself and established its own store. If there was a concern about the availability of liquor in that area, we find now that there is a greater availability, the hours have been lengthened; they can now go there far earlier in the day than was possible before. So you have to wonder just why or what the policy of the government and the Commission is. I suspect, sir, that really the whole crux of the matter lies in the field of finance, and the government felt that here was a very good chance to get more revenue for the province, more than they would if the liquor was available through the regular outlets.

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . That is a suspicion that I have and I would hope that the Attorney-General can allay those suspicions when he gets up to speak.

These are just some of the fields that I think we have to explore. There are no doubt many others, and I think that other members, particularly on this side of the House anyway, will have comments to make in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20(a). The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I would just like to support the thought of the juveniles and the Juvenile Court and the aging of same. And I think of myself as a responsible parent, and I am a parent of four teenagers, and I have indeed discussed this with them, because I do think they need a stronger hand, a firmer judgment when they do go to court, and even if that reflects on the parents, maybe it would be better for all if somehow the age was lowered, so that even if the parents have to be named, or in some form . . . I think youth today is very responsible and we should take the action that firms their hand and makes them think before they do some of these things. I think in relation to my own children that when a school principal has set them down, or a coach, and I very much support when I hear of it, and hear both sides of it, I'm the first one to go to the coach, and likewise if it was in court. I'm fortunate, my children haven't been in court, but if they indeed were guilty and were there, I think they should be named as an example, so that they make sure that if they're hidden under the veil that's now there, many of them go out just really make a mockery of the courts, and I think this to be wrong.

I also think, in following my Member from Birtle-Russell, it does seem to be in my experience in past years in trying to assist local cafes to get a liquor license, and I'm repeating myself from other years, but it is a fact in my judgment that if you compare some of the places on Main Street and go out to the small towns, and anywhere in the world, Manitoba one, I'm thinking of a local one, and certainly I would look at my view of it as it being much more classy than Main Street, and yet undoubtedly they seem to throw blocks that an awful lot of money has to be spent. I just wonder if it is done equal across the province, I think - and I don't believe it to be that.

The other area is the banquet permits which I know - I've talked to Mr. Syms prior to his health setback, and I haven't talked to him since - I know his approach has been that this is for entertainment rather than making money, but so many of the ball clubs, hockey clubs, community clubs, put this on, a couple of hours of socializing and also at the thought of making a few dollars to upgrade that club. And really, at the price today, 45 cents including mix is unrealistic, because it's a matter of those clubs have to get free help. If they had to hire the barman, there's just no way in God's green earth to show a profit. And to me, all of this money that's raised, it stays right in the community, and if you made that price up to equal the hotels, or prices such as that, there would be a lot more profit and a lot more money available for that and just encourage local people to upgrade their clubs, their curling rinks, their skating rinks, rather than, as so many of them have to do, come to the government for grants. I think that the Attorney-General has some influence over the judgments of the Liquor Board and I would just hope that he would carry that message to the Chairman of the Liquor Board. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I beg your pardon, I was just trying to figure the constituency . . .

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I only want to make one or two remarks on this particular part of the estimates. My colleague from Virden has covered one of the areas that I was going to mention, and that was the permits, licensing of ball clubs and other organizations that wish to raise funds, and the price. It's been mentioned to me that it seems to be considerably out of line with the way costs have gone to date.

I also share the remarks of my colleague from Birtle-Russell in connection with juvenile offenders, and there's no question about it it's of concern to all of us, the problems in that particular area. I know that studies are being done on it and I'm afraid that I just don't really have an answer to put forward that might help solve the problem.

One of the concerns that I have, Mr. Chairman, that has been raised to me on more than one occasion, is in connection with the smaller community, the halls, the church hall type of operation that normally have a few occasional permits a year and have been required to do some extensive renovating in connection with washroom facilities, and what not. In some of



## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . the more remote rural areas it becomes quite a costly operation, and I would urge the Minister to use whatever influence he may have on the licensing of people or the inspecting people to - certainly by all means if they want to operate these facilities, but in the smaller church hall organizations, it requires a little time to arrange the necessary financing in order to bring about the required improvements and upgrading in the facilities. I just wanted to make that point, because there are two or three halls in my area that have to spend several thousand dollars in order to drill a well and get the proper waterworks in, and they're certainly willing to do it but they're looking for some lead time of maybe 12 to 18 months to arrange the necessary financing and do some fund raising in order to afford it. I think they're being given that time, but if they're not I'll certainly be bringing it to the Minister's attention. But how widespread this might be throughout the province, I'm not too sure, but it's one concern that I have in my particular constituency that I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention.

Also I on a personal note would have some reservations about the advertising program that is carried on by the Commission at Christmas time, and I know it's certainly admirable to encourage people not to take that one extra for the road, to make it coffee, but I'm just wondering if the expenditures by the Commission itself is possibly a wise one. The fact that we're going to make 45 million or maybe 50 million this year with the price increase from the sale of liquor, I'm just wondering if it's a wise expenditure to be spending that kind of money on advertising that at times creates a lot of stickers and what not. I think probably it may be more advisedly spent by the Commission on a public relations basis rather than on the particular bent that they take in their advertising, because I know at times the Commission and the officials of the Commission are accused quite strongly, and justly or unjustly, for some of the decisions that they make. I think that there are many occasions when they could possibly get along better with a little better image being created in the public eye rather than the one that sometimes exists.

But those are the one or two comments that I wanted to make in connection with the Liquor Commission ruling, Mr. Chairman,

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief. I just want to speak on a couple of matters on the Liquor Commission, and this is the only place in the estimates where we can bring it up, so I'll. . .

One thing, when they're speaking of the banquet permits, their help, I'd like to just mention to the Minister, the municipality in which I live, we're a dry municipality, one that's never had a vote, we've never voted yet. I don't suppose we ever will vote. But what happens is, that the Liquor Commission issue banquet permits as if they're going out of style, and this bothers me. I was at a wedding dance not very long ago and everything was all in order, nothing wrong, but the only thing we're a dry municipality. I phoned the Liquor Commission up to see whether, because I'm always interested in trying to uphold the law, and I asked them why they issued banquet permits when you're a dry municipality. They said they never check, they don't check. Well I would suggest to the Minister that he would legislate every municipality make them all wet, because if you don't do that, somewhere along the line some organization is going to be embarrassed some day if somebody wants . . . So he might as well make us all wet, because there's no other choice, because I think you miss. . .

A MEMBER: They're all wet over there.

MR. McKELLAR: Yeah, I know, but he's not listening. If I have to repeat it, I realize that it is a very important thing. But this is a problem which we have in the Province of Manitoba because of the fact that the Liquor Commission don't check to see whether the municipality is wet or dry; they issue banquet permits to anybody. And I know they're out to sell all the liquor they can sell, and this is their intention, and they're doing a tremendous job at this. So that's all I'm saying. I'm not saying the municipality in which I live - you know where I live, I don't have to tell anybody. --(Interjection)-- Yeah.

Now there's one other problem that I'd like to bring up at this time. Now most of us know that we're going to the Royal Winter Fair. Many of us were there last year at Brandon at the Royal Winter Fair, and we witnessed one of the finest demonstrations I think that you could ever witness. In fact it's the first time in my lifetime I've ever seen an eight-horse team hitched to a wagon. The demonstration was put on for all to see, Carlsberg eight-horse

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . team. This particular part of the show, I understand, didn't cost the Royal Winter Fair at Brandon any money at all; they put the demonstration provided, and everything was at no cost to the Fair Board at all. One of the problems now, that they were told they were breaking the law, and they can no longer demonstrate the same eight-horse team with the same wagon in the Province of Manitoba. In fact I'm told, Mr. Chairman, they can't demonstrate in Saskatchewan or B.C. The only province in Western Canada where they can go is Alberta. And why can't they demonstrate, Mr. Chairman? Simply because they had a barrel on that wagon and they had the name Carlsberg. Now they can demonstrate if they took off the word "Carlsberg" and put on "Carlings-O'Keefes" and they took that barrel and threw it aside and put it in the barn and left it there. Took the same eight horse team out and this same wagon, and away they go, they come into Manitoba. Now I don't suppose that many children in our province looked at that wagon or they looked at the name Carlsberg. What they were interested in was the demonstration of driving ability of that particular driver, demonstrating that he could handle eight horses, and that was a beautiful something to see. Now I know I'm not the Minister, I'm not the Attorney-General, and I'm not the Chairman of the Liquor Commission, but for the life of me I can't really see what was wrong with that, can't really see what was wrong with it.

And I would like the Minister to discuss this with his Chairman of his Liquor Commission because I think we're being deprived of something in Manitoba that we should have the privilege of seeing without having to go to Alberta. I don't see why we should have to drive seven or eight hundred miles to see an eight horse team when they're willing to come into the Province of Manitoba, not only demonstrate at the Royal Winter Fair but I understand that they will go to the B-Class Fairs in the Province of Manitoba during the summer months and also put this demonstration on.

But we're not going to see them this year in Brandon. We're not going to see them when we go there two weeks tomorrow or two weeks on Friday. We're not going to have that privilege this year because the Liquor Commission decided in their good judgment they didn't want the kids to see the word "Carlsberg". I don't know if they ever worried about me or not, they didn't want the children to see the word "Carlsberg", they might be influenced at a later date.

Well that's about all I have to say in that. I think that we're being deprived of something, witnessing a demonstration of driving ability, and goodness knows we might never see again in our lifetime another eight horse team because this is something most unusual. And those of us who are in the agricultural business I think it brings back many memories, brings back many memories of the days when we used to hitch the horses onto the gang-plow and go up the fields, up and down, and I tell you it's really something to behold.

Now I'd like to discuss something else here regarding - and it was mentioned by the Member for Birtle-Russell - about juvenile, and I'm told by department people in the Province of Ontario, the Province of Saskatchewan, to the east and west of us, that a juvenile's age is 16. In other words they're treated in adult court after the age of 16. I think you Mr. Minister, mentioned something about the Federal Government are going to bring in a bill to the House of Commons to make one age across Canada alike for juvenile, at the age of 16 they become adults. I think this is a wonderful thing because I know it's very difficult for the RCMP and the officers of the Crown to lay charges at the present time, and if they do lay charges the penalties are so minor that it's hardly worth the trouble. And this is the experience that we're having in my part of the province.

Now another problem we're having, Mr. Chairman, so close to the American border. In the state of North Dakota the drinking age is 21 years of age. Now I don't know whether they lowered the age or not in this present session of the North Dakota Legislature or not, but on Friday nights and Saturday nights in Boissevain, and I'm mentioning Boissevain because it's a 24-hour port at the International Peace Garden there, that the place is just full of American young people who cannot drink in the State of North Dakota and come up to Boissevain, and I suppose that same applies to all the towns along the border, but more so at Boissevain where there's a 24-hour port, and they can get back any hour of the day or night during the summer months. And this - well it hasn't created that big a problem; you can see that some of the problems that it does create for the law enforcement people on weekends anyway, and

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . the RCMP at Boissevain and the Town cop in Boissevain sometimes on some weekends have their work cut out for them.

Now two years ago in the State of North Dakota they lowered the drinking age to 19, and Governor Link in his best judgment vetoed the bill so that brought it back to 21 again, and the problem, I don't know what they did this session, and they're still in session down in Bismarck yet. Maybe they will lower the age this year and the Governor will not veto it. I don't really know what's happening. But it is quite a problem and I suppose that's nothing to do with us. In the State of Minnesota the drinking age is 18, the same as ours, so there's no problem there, but just North Dakota is where the problem is.

Now I'd just like to ask the Minister one other question before I sit down. We used to see a lot of liquor advertising on radio, hear it and see it on radio and television after 10 o'clock. This last number of months I've hardly seen any liquor advertising and I'm just wondering is there a change in the regulations regarding advertising, or the liquor industry and brewery industry have they changed their advertising to newspaper advertising, or what's happening? Has there been any changes in the regulations regarding this particular advertising, because somewhere along the way I have hardly seen any advertising for the last four or five months. I don't know, whether maybe I don't watch television enough or listen to the radio enough after 10 o'clock, but it seems before that at 10 o'clock sharp just, bang, you'd be sure you'd see liquor advertising on the tube. Now I'm just wondering - maybe this is a good thing, I'm not saying it isn't, but it's just a change that I've noticed taking place and I just want to know if there's a change in the regulations regarding advertising.

Mr. Chairman, that's about all I have to say at this time. It's not a particular - the Attorney-General's not one subject. I always like to stay out of the courts myself personally and I never found anybody where he made any money going to court so with having had that experience all my life I hope that in the next few years of my life, or the rest or remainder, I don't have to experience having to go to court on my own behalf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps before the Attorney-General replies to some of these questions I had a particular question I wanted to ask him about with regard to the Liquor Control Commission. It's in relation to some problems that exist in the offices, head offices of the Liquor Control Commission by way of a morale problem which I understand is centred pretty deeply in the fact that a number of very senior people are being put in the position of having to retire several years in advance of their normal retirement date, and a high degree of consternation naturally exists around this. I don't know the true extent of the impact it has on their pension and what this will do to their income, but I understand it is a serious problem and I wonder if the Attorney-General would be good enough to investigate and advise the House, if it's possible, the nature of this problem and those people that are affected and apparently are being forced into a position of retirement two or three, and sometimes more years in advance of their normal retirement date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to make some comments regarding the Manitoba Liquor Commission, Mr. Chairman, to the Attorney-General. It would seem that the breweries generally are a very confused group of people as to what they can do regarding sales promotion within the province. I think the Attorney-General knows very well that the breweries on many occasions have sponsored golf tournaments, they have put curling teams into local bonspiels, they have supplied usually at winter fairs or carnivals, or most anywhere, rodeos, it's usually one of the first persons anybody sponsoring something of that nature, they usually go to the breweries and ask them if they will be part of their affair. At the present time it was brought to my attention because I was asking somebody about whether a certain tournament would be held this year or not, and they were a little in doubt as to whether they can or they can't. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General also, and I'm putting words in his mouth, or I may be, but I'm saying he knows that the breweries usually participate in affairs in Manitoba that bring Manitobans together. And they go out, certainly they are promoting their product, and it's sales promotion, but they should have - if you're going to talk about sales promotion you can't just talk about, I know it's liquor, but if you're going to say that a person can give away several cartons of Coca-Cola, or if you're

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . going to say that Coca-Cola can give a trophy, or if you're going to say that a biscuit company can give a trophy, or any company can do sponsoring of this type of thing, I don't see why any business should be put in the position where they can't, especially when they are working usually, usually to have Manitobans get together and enjoy themselves. And quite frankly at the present time I think those people are very confused as to what they can do and what they can't, and I think you'll find that if it isn't cleared up you will find country fairs, rodeos, and everything of that nature, when they approach these people for help it will probably be refused, and I think that that has to be cleared up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to if it was agreeable to the Assembly to answer most of these questions after we deal with item by item debate. I believe last night it was mentioned by the, and I believe agreed to by the House that we could proceed item by item and then return to the general subject matter. Some of the questions that have been raised in respect to the Liquor Control Commission are pretty specific in nature and I would want to obtain as much material as possible to provide the House with in answer to the questions raised. There are a few items that I would like to deal with now. One, of course, that goes without saying that any reference that was made to wine being sold in restaurants, any of my colleagues, must in fact be a personal opinion on their part and certainly was not a policy announcement or decision that has been made by the Government.

I would like to just mention briefly in respect to the fortified wines being removed from the Liquor Control Commission lists, that this has been one program which, though, was looked upon with some critical analysis at the time by some members in this House and there were a number of suggestions that it would not work. The reports that we have been receiving is to the extent that there has been some improvements in a number of areas, particularly in some of our remoter communities, and also in other parts of Manitoba, that in fact there has been some less abuse, some less difficulties with alcoholism, and in some instances law enforcement personnel do attribute, do attribute this move on the part of the Commission to remove the cheap highly fortified wines from the Liquor Control lists as having been an important and valid reason for some improvement. I'm not anxious to over-exaggerate or over-emphasize the level of improvement. I think we have to continue to watch that carefully. But if there has been a trend as a result of this move, it has been one that has been favourable.

I would like to just assure the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that I would be happily pleased if the Liquor Control Commission ceased to make any money at all, speaking as one individual, and to my way of thinking and certainly to my understanding, no policy and no effort by the Liquor Control Commission should be towards maximizing return. And I say that by way of a general statement of principle and probably I can receive some further specific information in regard to the particular instance he made reference to, but as a matter of principle I certainly don't feel that the Liquor Control Commission should be in the business of maximizing returns.

MR. GRAHAM: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question at this time?

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

MR. GRAHAM: Would he be in favour, then, of cutting the Commission in half? Or the mark-up in half?

MR. PAWLEY: No, what I was indicating to the honourable member, that I don't think by way of promotion and extra sales pitch that the Commission should attempt to encourage greater consumption of alcohol. I suspect in fact that if we did cut the mark-up by one-half, that we in fact would be encouraging substantial increases in consumption. I suspect that that would be the end result of any direction such as that.

The other questions that were raised, I believe throughout, were specific with the exception of that in regard to liquor advertising. The existing regulations have been tightened. The regulations which presently exist have not been properly enforced over the last number of years, and they are now being more strictly enforced insofar as advertising is concerned on the electronics media, to the extent that lifestyle advertising, the type of advertising that associates the drinking of alcoholic beverages with sports, with young people, with minors, with the operation of motor vehicles, etc., is being curtailed.

In general, in answer to the questions that were raised by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, there has been no prohibition of advertising but certainly it is being more

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . strictly enforced as per the existing regulations which were not being enforced up until a few months ago in any effective way.

I would like to leave the other specific issues that were raised till later, because I think I could provide honourable members with better and fuller information at that time.

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

MR. GRAHAM: At the same time, I wonder if the Minister could give us specific information in the fortified wine class, on the total number of fortified wines that were on the market; those that have been removed; and the price range of each; because I understand that it was only those cheap fortified wines that were removed from the market and there are still fortified wines on the market but they're at a higher price. And if the Minister is sincere in saying that the Liquor Commission is not concerned in making money, I would wonder why it was only the higher priced ones that were kept on the market.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20(a) - pass? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Attorney-General's in a position to answer some of the questions that he essentially took as notice last night concerning the RCMP investigation. Is he in a position to answer it now, or he may want to answer it tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think that we're trying to suggest that perhaps the items that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised last night can be answered under Law Enforcement.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the Minister, I have been attempting to try and determine how he handles his responsibilities as Minister. I am really dealing with his item as Minister of the Crown, and while I think it may be appropriate to discuss, and will discuss certain matters under Law Enforcement, I think my inquiry really relates to his perception of his responsibility as the chief law officer of the Crown in relation to an investigation that came about as a result of allegations in this Legislature and subsequently followed with a request by the RCMP for an investigation, which has now subsequently followed with a report by them to him, which his law officers at this present time are now reviewing. I believe that it is appropriate to discuss it under this item simply because I am dealing with his position as Chief Law Officer and a review of his course of conduct with respect to this matter up until the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just say that the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition, we're attempting to obtain as much information as possible and we will certainly relate that information.

I do want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I think that, and very properly so, that we are bordering on an area that we have to be rather careful about. We are in the process of investigation, and we don't know the outcome of that investigation yet; we are dealing with another investigation that has been submitted that is presently being reviewed as to whether or not any charges should be forthcoming; we don't yet know whether or not there will be trial in respect to certain issues. I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition, just prior to my attending this afternoon in the House at 2:30, I was, I think, very properly reminded by some of my staff officers that last evening we were bordering, in some instances, very close to the line, dangerously close to the line of compromising the course of justice insofar as matters that we were dealing with could in fact be the subject of further investigation; some are presently the subject of investigation, and others could yet be the subject of court cases, and I recognized this last night. I was very anxious to provide as much information as possible to the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to certainly indicate to him there is proper, in my opinion, very professional concern as to the extent to which we carry the type of debate that we had started last night, and I share with the Leader of the Opposition responsibility for that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, Wednesday afternoon, Private Members' Hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

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

## IN SESSION

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the committee be received.  
MOTION presented and carried.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. Do you have a point?

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, with leave, I'd like to file the Annual Report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate and Internal Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The honourable member have leave? (Agreed) Very well.

. . . . continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private members' hour. The first item is private members' resolutions this afternoon. Resolution No. 4, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 - UPGRADING OF PROVINCIAL ROADS AND TRUNK HIGHWAYS

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BANMAN: Moved by myself, seconded by the Member from Charleswood, that WHEREAS road transportation is of vital concern to all urban and rural and northern communities; and

WHEREAS an increase in road weight restrictions is imperative to maintain lower transportation costs; and

WHEREAS rail abandonment is a constant threat in rural communities; and

WHEREAS many bridges on Manitoba provincial roads and provincial trunk highways are not capable of carrying increasing weights;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of implementing an aggressive policy of upgrading provincial roads and provincial trunk highways.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, being a rural member, possibly we have much more contact with members from our constituency in matters such as roads and transportation. Since a good road network is of vital concern to most people, either living on the farm or living in a small urban community, it becomes a very very important part and almost an everyday challenge in the riding to try and help people go ahead and receive the kinds of road and road maintenance that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the decentralization policy of this government, the stay option, is directly tied in with the type of road transportation that we will provide for the people in these different communities. Many people in my riding commute to work, to Winnipeg, they work in Winnipeg whether they live in the little town of Niverville or they live out in the arm of Ste. Anne, or even in the town of Ste. Anne; we even have some people commuting from Steinbach, and we can see what a good transportation system such as the No. 1 Highway, we're four-laned all the way into Winnipeg now, what kind of a benefit that can be to a community such as Ste. Anne.

Mr. Speaker, another part of the resolution which I have just read states that road restrictions, or weight restrictions, are also a very important part, or are playing a very important part in our rural Manitoba communities. The Minister will appreciate that, and I might say at this time we appreciate his and his department's co-operation in raising the limits on certain highways, and I refer specifically to the No. 12 Highway. It was done after the members from my constituency, composed of the mayor and several other members, made a certain representation to the Premier and the Minister of Highways, and I'm happy to say that we have upgraded it to a certain extent.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the interim, that will serve to help the larger trucking companies in our community maintain their present growth rate, but in the future we are looking for the same kind of considerations and the same kinds of agreements as the Minister has signed a little while ago, and we saw the announcement, with the Federal Government, as to the increase of weight restrictions on the Trans Canada Highway. I understand that is going to be uniform across the province, and we applaud that move.

I would also urge that in regards to the Trans Canada Highway that we again make sure that we try and get that road four-laned as fast as possible; there's a lot of traffic on it. Not only does it pose a safety hazard to the motorist travelling on that very very much travelled road, but it also would aid the transportation facility.

Mr. Speaker, over the last years, and I expressed some concern last year during the Highways Budget, I mention that we're having a certain breakdown in our transportation system, and we need only look at what is happening to rail transportation. From personal experience in the transportation of cars, automobiles on rail cars, we used to have a carload dropped off in a siding in La Broquerie and it would take a matter of ten days. You are now looking at a time limit of almost a month for the same type of delivery. This not only means an increased cost to the people who are transporting, or who own those goods, it means an increased cost to the consumer because that particular commodity has to be paid for by the consumer who then buys it.

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, the trucking industry, for the same transportation, or the freighting of the automobiles from Toronto, or Montreal to Winnipeg, will take only three or four days. And the point I'm trying to make very simply, Mr. Speaker, I cite the example of automobiles but that same problem is also affecting all the people involved in the transportation of goods and the transportation of articles to be sold and to be distributed.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that the large, or the trucking companies are also faced of course with the inflationary spiral and that a truck can with one driver haul possibly 20,000 or 30,000 pounds more without any real additional expense. This means that once again we can possibly keep some of the transportation costs down whether it be freight coming to Winnipeg or to rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, another area which seems to be causing the highways people the most concern when it comes to rate restrictions is one of bridges. We are informed that there are many bridges in the province that will not take the additional weight; the roads are of possible construction so that they would take the weight, but there are certain bridges in areas that are not capable of taking that excess weight. I would urge the Minister to make sure that any construction of bridges in the future, that these considerations are taken into consideration, and that the future expansion of any road that is of possible concern to the rural community in which it serves would be able to upgrade it in that the bridge will be able to take that excess weight.

Mr. Speaker, I realize as well, as all the members in the House do, that we are talking about spending more money and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that for a moment. I would like to cite several examples. I would like to say that in the year 1970 for construction of highways we spent 25,437,000, and in 1975, Mr. Speaker, five years later, we spent 26,500,000 - that's an increase of slightly over a million. Now with the escalating inflationary trend that we have been experiencing, as you can see, that instead of even trying to maintain a certain amount of equilibrium in our highway construction we're following very very far behind. I also checked the borrowing, the Capital Supply Bills that have been passed by this government in the last several years, and I see that where they have borrowed money for it is in the frontier and resource roads to the tune of 10 million in the year of 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this government sees fit to spend moneys elsewhere other than on highways, and I presume that highways have become a rather low priority as far as they are concerned. Take for example the proposed legislation that the members opposite are going to be introducing in the next little while. They say the two cents a gallon surtax on gasoline will raise about \$8 million for Autopac. Mr. Speaker, that \$8 million put into road construction would increase the road construction by almost 30 percent in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we also see that if they would add the amount of money put into Flyer and Saunders, Misawa, you would notice, Mr. Speaker, that we would have a substantial increase in road building.

Mr. Speaker, the government also has seen fit to spend \$15 million a year here in the Capital Supply Bill on land acquisition - Manitoba Agricultural Credit, \$14,650,000 in the year of 1974.

Mr. Speaker, these are all places where money is being spent and I suggest to the members opposite that highways have been put on a very very low priority with this government, and I think the figures point it out.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 before Autopac came in, the Manitoba Motor Vehicle Branch for the total operation of that branch was \$2,781,000, and that was the year ending March 31, 1971. This year however, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to approve \$8,243,600. Mr. Speaker, that's an increase of over 5-1/2 million in a very very short while. Now I suggest again that this money is not being--the Minister of Highways and, Mr. Speaker, I sort of feel sort of sorry for him because he seems to be getting the scraps off the table here. You have a real large increase in the Manitoba Motor Vehicle Branch Estimates, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that possibly a substantial amount of that money is going to the operation of Autopac, because those two departments are very very hard to divorce.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan, and I tried to get some figures on it - the members opposite would probably have a little easier time getting figures from the Province of Saskatchewan than I would.

A MEMBER: Why?



## RESOLUTION 4

MR. BANMAN: But I know that the province has undertaken a very very aggressive road building policy in the past while, and it is the concern of my constituency, and the concern of many people in rural Manitoba, and it should be, I think, the concern of people in Metropolitan Winnipeg that our transportation system should definitely be upgraded. I once again urge the Minister and the Government to look at this resolution very closely and put a little bit more of a priority on road construction and do away with some of the policies and programs that are presently costing the Manitoba taxpayer a lot of money. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. STEVE DEREWIANCHUK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enter this debate on this resolution by my colleague in the neighboring constituency of La Verendrye.

Mr. Speaker, the history of my constituency of Emerson indicated that for the greater part of our hundred year history, the member from that constituency sat on the side of the government in power. And I can't understand for the life of me why we were treated as poor cousins. That is until 1969. And I certainly appreciate the fact that my predecessors quit. Before the request for highway improvements were always overlooked by the previous government prior to 1969.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I sat here during the last session and I couldn't believe my ears because my colleague, the Minister of Highways, was being complimented on all sides of the House for his very fine program. And believe me, I believed them because I was one of the recipients of that program. You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud of the people of the constituency of Emerson, and in my opinion the 1973 election indicated the degree of their intelligence by electing a member of the government which would produce highways that were in accordance with our times.

Being a reasonable man, I can sympathize with my colleague in the next constituency of La Verendrye when he states, especially through this resolution, that his constituency has suffered. It is no wonder, for look at the background of the previous affiliation of his constituency. But nevertheless, because the both of us, now I can assure him that he has had more work done in his constituency through the Highways program that he has had in many many years prior to this government's appearance.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's review the progress of the Highway Department over the last few years to show that they have been very progressive in their attitude. In 1965 the gross vehicle weight was approximately 44,000 pounds. This was increased to 72,000 pounds, and then to 74,000 pounds, and now to 80,000 pounds on some PRs, and on the primary highways system we have gone up to 110,000 pounds. Now surely how progressive can we get? Surely this government has done more to help cut down the cost of transporting goods for their increase in weight limits than any government in the history of this province.

This year I feel a little sorry for my colleague, the Minister of Highways, because he has to put a road program which I am sure is going to be difficult to meet. I am told that the rising costs of the Highway Department are so rapid that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics are unable to keep track of them, and that they are operating several months behind time. As a matter of fact, I would not be surprised to hear that their annual project and road program of the previous Minister is probably a million or so in the red before it even starts.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be over-critical of my colleague from La Verendrye, but I do feel that if his colleagues choose to compliment the Minister of Highways for his fair distribution of money and program in the last budget, then I am sure he wouldn't find anything different in this budget. Perhaps the answer is that if any MLA wishes road work done beyond what the Highway Department propose, then perhaps he would care to raise the necessary funds from his constituency. As a matter of fact, I am told that the Honourable Member from La Verendrye had more money spent in his constituency than I did in mine, and if my constituents are happy with the work that was accomplished, then his constituents must be more happy with the work that was completed in their constituency. However, if not, I would strongly recommend that a method be developed whereby his constituents could help pay for the additional road program that he wishes in his constituency. Otherwise I'm at a loss to know the reason for this resolution at this time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we're not a rich constituency, but we are a hard working industrial constituency, and we are not asking for the impossible, we are only asking for our fair

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. DEREWIANCHUK cont'd) . . . . share, and believe me in the last few years I believe we are getting most of it. And like every other MLA I wish we could get more. However, we're not being unreasonable, we only want our fair share.

I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Highways, on the excellent road program he has presented so far, and I hope he will continue to be as fair in the future.

Mr. Speaker, one last comment, that is that the constituency of Emerson is probably one of the most versatile and multicultural regions in Manitoba, and as a result our problems are multiplied. For example, we grow sugar beets, grain, and we are very heavy cattle producers, and as a result our communication links are extremely important to us. Had it not been for the intelligence of my constituents, we would still be suffering under the yoke of the previous administration. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the glowing remarks of the Honourable Member for Emerson, I want you to know, sir, that I support this resolution as put forward by my colleague from La Verendrye.

I rise on this occasion to give a point of view from another part of the country which he didn't refer to. I think I have a unique situation that is crying out for improvement, and by the look of the smile on the Minister's face, I think he knows what I am going to say. Mr. Speaker, I'm compelled to say it. I have a piece of road 20 miles long from Highway No. 10 north of Mafeking that goes into Pelican Rapids, sir, and we have a situation there which I believe is unique. There's some five to 800 people living in that particular area and this 20 miles of road, Mr. Speaker, has no less than 200 curves in it. It's nothing but a man killer, and is used quite extensively. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is this. I found out to my dismay that this year those people are going to be left high and dry insofar as the maintenance of this road.

Over the years, the Department of Indian Affairs have contributed half the cost of its maintenance, and each year it's been my purpose to try and bring both together with a view to getting on with it and assuring the people, particularly in the wintertime, that at least the snow-plowing would be done. I find out this spring, Mr. Speaker, in following through as I've done over the years, that the Department of Indian Affairs did not have any money. In checking with our own Department of Highways, I find that they won't do anything on the road unless the Department of Indian Affairs comes through with it. The Minister in his wisdom has said that the Department of Indian Affairs have a responsibility and until they make their case clear and offer to help, nothing would be done. I took it upon myself to bring this to the attention of the First Minister in writing several months ago, and he agreed with everything I had to say and promised me that he would use his good offices to try and find a solution once and for all for this vexing subject.

Mr. Speaker, people have been killed on this highway. The Mounted Police on an emergency occasion turned over their car and almost caused a death in that respect, but finally wrecked the car.

On behalf of those people, again Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize to the Minister that a way be found to correct this situation. I know it's an expensive thing to straighten out these 200 curves, but Mr. Speaker, during the last seven years that I've been appealing on behalf of those people, a couple of curves a year, and particularly the worst ones, would have made it worthwhile.

I also want to bring to the attention of the Minister, the highway between Swan River and Bowsman. He knows what happened last year, it was almost impassable, and it's been patched and patched to death, and this, Mr. Speaker, is one of the main arteries of this province, No. 10 Highway. I hope when we get to the estimates that the Minister will have something favourable to say to overcome this situation.

I've spoken in this House about railway abandonment in my area, and every day that passes, Mr. Speaker, it's becoming more and more evident. The Minister of Labour had the portfolio of looking after railways, as I understood it, and I want to assure him that as the days go by it's coming closer and closer in the entire area between Dauphin and Hudson Bay Junction. That line, sir, will be a thing of the past. And I'm appealing to the Minister to use his influence in any way he can to see that this does not happen. I'm not going to recite what it is going to do to that agricultural area, but I'm going to tell the Minister, the ex CNR man, that when they're running trains in that particular area at 15 miles an hour, it gives you some idea

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . of the road bed. Many of the stations have already been closed down, whilst we have the northern train go through there three times a week as it did in 1918, a person has to stand on the station and wave a lamp to flag down the train to get on it in this day and age. I'm merely mentioning this to indicate to the Minister of Highways that the transportation on the highways today, due to the lack of interest by the railway company, is getting heavier and heavier and heavier, and he's going to have to put more funds into that highway in order to see to it that there's no interruption in the delivery of goods and services.

So, Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation whatsoever, I support the resolution put forward by my colleague and appeal to other members of the House to do likewise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to take a few minutes of the House to say a few words on this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I did listen to the Honourable Member from Emerson, and perhaps he maybe has misconstrued the intent of the resolution, because I don't believe the resolution has any argument with the government where the roads were built or where they were not built. I believe the intent is to upgrading and maintenance of the highways and some of the roads in this province. Mr. Speaker, from my own observation and from my own experience, I feel that the resolution is quite valid.

Perhaps we could also take the time to discuss under this resolution the speed limit, safety factors that are now - are they taken into consideration when we're building roads.

Looking at the estimates, Mr. Speaker, I know there's a modest increase of approximately 10 percent in the construction of Provincial Trunk Highways. There's also approximately \$31/2 million increase in the maintenance and construction, but we don't know to what extent that pertains to the highways and roads in the rural part of Manitoba, or perhaps the greater part of that expenditure is in the way of grants to the cities and urban areas. Perhaps the Minister can tell us that, but we'll find that out later on.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I do wish to raise to the Minister, and perhaps maybe this is what this resolution intends to do, is the problem that we're having with our highways, our pavements, the cracking of pavements which I believe is a serious problem. I know that the Minister will tell us it is a serious problem, not only in Manitob a but perhaps in the prairies, in the prairie provinces, and I would think that the engineers would probably have, in my opinion, have maybe lessened, or their requirements are not as great now as they used to be a few years ago. Maybe that's the problem, that we're having as many problems with our paved highways, because I know when there's a crack in the pavement, in the cement, the moisture get in there, the water gets in there and we have a road crew come and fill it with tar and you have a bump in the highway, and the Minister would only have to take a trip from here to Falcon Lake and he'll find out. At times you hit a stretch, you hit a stretch and you think you're riding on horseback. Well surely that shouldn't happen to a new highway. Surely the engineers, in my opinion, are not making the roads as lasting as they should be, or they're not putting the sufficient strength in the cement, there's something wrong, or not sufficient reinforcement, Mr. Speaker, because you don't have to go too far out of Manitoba, just across the line, and you'll find, or even into Ontario - and they have cold weather just like we have, and yet their highways seem to stand up much better than ours do. So perhaps the Minister could check with his engineering department and see what can be done to make the highways last longer and to build them and construct them much stronger.

The other point perhaps that we could concern ourselves under this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the safety. Are the highways built safe enough? And this one of the members has just mentioned. I know that there are knolls in the highway that motorists cannot see very far ahead, which causes many accidents. I know one road that the Minister can find for himself, it's not too far from the City, Sturgeon Road, from St. James to Inkster. I know the Minister will say it's not his road, it's the City of Winnipeg. But there's two turns without any upgrading, that cars at the slow speed of 35 miles have rolled or upset, and it's amazing that we would build a road like that. There's a curve, a very sharp curve where a road was put through an open field. And I know, I'm sure the Minister is familiar with that piece of highway. So what I'm saying at the present time are we giving enough consideration as far as safety is concerned in respect to curves and respect to knolls and, because it seems to me that many accidents occur on certain spots of the highway, in certain areas, not just several but many accidents. So perhaps the Minister can give some consideration when the highways

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . are designed that the accident rates on these highways should be taken into consideration.

I know that there's been a considerable amount of debate in some other provinces - I know the province of Saskatchewan does hardtop all the shoulders on their highways. I don't know what the present policy of this government is, and again the Minister perhaps can give us some indication. So I see some merit in this resolution.

The other point that we can debate under this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and maybe we can get the Minister up and tell us what his intention is and will he be giving any consideration to reducing the speed limit on highways in Manitoba, not only for safety but for reduction in consumption of fuel, preservation of highways, which will decrease the death toll on the highways, because, Mr. Speaker, we still have in Canada today the senseless slaughter on our highways of over 5,000 people every year. It has been proven quite strongly in the United States when they did reduce the speed limit, and I know that many people did not adhere to it, many drivers were not adhering to the speed limit, but at the same time in the first couple of months the death toll, the accidental fatalities in the States were reduced not only by a small margin but a large percentage. I know the papers came out after only a month of the reduction in the speed limit, they were saying anywhere from up to 50 percent reduction in fatalities. But now there's been a longer period and perhaps the Minister in his department is getting that kind of information, and if he isn't he should be, and to give us that kind of information to the Members in this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, in view of today's heavy high speed on the highways, the Minister can give consideration to reduction of the speed limit to 55 mph; he can give consideration and check with his engineers if they can build the highways much more safer, and build them to last longer, because really I do have some concern when a road has just been built, or a highway just been built, and you go on it the next winter and within a year, and you're finding that you might as well be riding on horseback, Mr. Speaker. So surely some of the points that we're raising here - well I may be exaggerating a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I may be, but I ask the Minister to take a ride out east and the point is that it's a good highway, it's probably the best highway that we have in this province and we should be proud of, except surely in one year it shouldn't you know be as bumpy as it is.

The other point that I wish to raise, Mr. Speaker, while I'm speaking on this resolution and talking about safety - I know that I mentioned it to the Minister privately at one time and perhaps I can bring it to his attention again. I've had considerable amount of discussion with the residents of my constituency, and I'm talking about the people of Headingley, the ones that live on Dodds Road, and I hope we can have the attention of the Minister - I know he's occupied right now, but I do have some concern because all the people that live on Dodds Road appeared before the Traffic Board to see if the speed limit on that road can be reduced from 60 miles. Now when we're thinking of reducing the speed limit on main highways, surely he can give consideration to a reduction of a speed limit on a highway that isn't paved, it's gravel road, where the kids have to go to school at least a mile or a mile and a half. It has been a great concern, a concern to such an extent that many of these people took time off from work to appear before the Traffic Board to see if the speed can be reduced. The speed was not reduced. I don't know why the board did not give this some serious consideration because it isn't a paved road and since there's many people living on that road having young kids going to school, surely I would have thought that they would have given consideration instead of leaving the speed at 60 miles, because it is a piece of road that connects, if the Minister is not aware, it connects Portage to Saskatchewan, which does take quite a bit of traffic. So it's most important to these residents. As I mentioned it wasn't a complaint from one person, it was a complaint from everyone that lived on the street, everybody took time off to come to the hearing, . . . people. So I'm pleading with the Minister to really give some attention to that, or take a look at it.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I do have a problem, and again maybe the Minister can help me out in this situation. This is concerning the Perimeter Highway, and between the Perimeter and Aberdeen Avenue or Bernadine Crescent, there's a little hill between the Perimeter and the Crescent, the residential area, and it's full of either motorcycles or snowmobiles, and I believe it's mostly motorcycles, winter and summer the smaller bikes, and these people have taken it up with the city. The city says it's not our responsibility, it's the

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . Government. They went to the Government and the Government says it's not their responsibility. They can't find anyone that would take the responsibility to police this matter. And it's again I'm sure - well what I'll do is just hand the Minister the petition, because there's a petition of many names on here and perhaps I'll just state: "We the undersigned residents of Bernadine Crescent having suffered the noise and destruction caused by motorcycles and minibikes using the area of ground behind Bernadine Crescent and the Perimeter Highway behind St. Charles School, hereby request the St. James-Assiniboia Community Committee to introduce to the Winnipeg City Council a City by-law prohibiting the use of motor vehicles, motorcycles and minibikes, or other than designated roadways inside the City of Winnipeg." Now they went everywhere and they can't get satisfaction, so perhaps the Minister who is responsible for the highways, and this is the perimeter, concerning a perimeter highway, if it is in his department, because that's what these people when they went to the city they could not get any satisfaction, that maybe the Minister can solve this problem as well. Because as I say again it's not a complaint from somebody that's sore at one person, it's a complaint. As I said I have a complete petition from many residents.

So these are the points and I think that the resolution is not complaining or putting any criticism on the Government, where the Minister or the Government has built a road or not built roads, I think perhaps it's valid for us to have a debate, to have a discussion. Are the roads built to last for quite some time? Are we giving consideration to the safety aspects when we're building? And perhaps it's a good time to consider maybe the speed limit. So I believe the resolution has some validity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly want to support my colleague in this resolution, and if we go back a few years when there was a take-over of some of the municipal roads and the Government of that day, known as the New Access Road System, I think it was about 1967 and the municipal people thought at that time the Government of any day would keep these roads up as well as the municipal people did. This was a big problem at the start, and certainly the government of that day was under some criticism, and fairly so, but that problem as the years go along is becoming a much bigger problem. With many of the promises, certainly from the First Minister last election campaign, regarding the PRs and the Access Roads off of the PRs there was a promise then, and I believe maybe the Minister promised to be looking very seriously at it, but to date there is none. As a rural member you can understand a community or a town that's lying off a PTH does get the same road that's going by but a town off a PR there's nothing in the legislation at this hour to accommodate this. So it is rather unfair as one community to the other to have this. And I would hope the Minister would see fit to come up with a program in the next few months to rectify this. The simple answer is there's simply not enough budget to accommodate this. The municipal people did desire this arrangement because they would rather have had this arrangement than the grant and aid type of a program prior to that year.

And another area that is showing up a greater concern in recent years when there was the swapping of roads with some municipality, and I'm now thinking of my home municipality of Woodward, who swapped some mileage to give right-of-way to a new route Highway 21, and in recent years this municipality has come up at huge cost trying to upkeep bridges in ravines that at the hour of the switchover looked reasonable, but today are extremely expensive. I'm talking now of the bridges, and there's no way at the moment of allowing those municipalities that are caught by a flash flood where a bridge is washed out. Certainly I agree when the thought of gasoline tax going to anywhere else but the upgrading into the road system. You know, it's got to be those are the things that are wearing out our roads and surely, Mr. Speaker, that any additional tax that may be forthcoming surely should stay within the highway budget. And I think in speaking of my area mainly, I think we have real good people within the department, the highway department. I go many roads up over a hill and I've always found my highway department people always working, and there's no sloughing within that area, I am sure.

To further substantiate this resolution in my constituency I have three branch lines with dead ends right within the constituency, so I think you must appreciate the real threat of rail abandonment, how much this is going to affect me if there isn't a new look on the upgrading of the entire PR and PTHs. So, Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution. I hope the Minister will give it consideration. Thank you.

## RESOLUTION 4

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take up any time at this point on this resolution. The Minister's Estimates will be coming up but I am sure that he would be unhappy if I didn't get up today and congratulate him and the government on the bloody mess they've made of the road situation in the Province of Manitoba. I think I have mentioned this before. I think the Minister understands what I mean.

But I want to talk just briefly on provincial roads. I am not asking the Minister to upgrade the provincial roads in the Province of Manitoba but to bring them back to the standard that they were left in when he took over as Minister of Highways. That's about all I have to say until his estimates come up. But I want to point out to him that the fact of the matter is that Walter Weir, the Minister of Highways at the time when the provincial roads were taken over and the responsibility was separated between the municipal and provincial, that there was a standard set up at that time and that that standard was cut in half by the province, the present government. The Minister says no, but he knows it's a fact that the maintenance of the roads, of the provincial roads throughout the Province of Manitoba, maintenance was cut in half, immediately when this government took over. And the Member for - I forget what the hell his name is, but it doesn't matter. Okay. But my honourable friend over there still stays by that formula which was cut in half, and the fact of the matter is that now instead of the heavy traffic and the main traffic going over provincial roads are dodging the provincial roads because they're not fit to drive. Well, as the President of the Union of Municipalities said, and I said this last year, in the western area that the provincial roads were not fit to put a half-ton truck over, let alone a car, and that they were dodging and going on to municipal roads. The fact is that now it's costing the municipalities more money than it ever did to keep up the municipal roads because the traffic that is supposed to be going over provincial roads are now dodging the provincial roads and going on to municipal roads. It's costing the municipalities money. If my honourable friend would just recognize this. If he would drive out into the constituency that I represent, which I doubt if he's ever been there, and driven over some of the provincial roads, one of which passes right past my farm, and which I dodge. I go through back roads rather than use the provincial roads, because they're not fit to drive over, because the maintenance is not there. There has been no upgrading. I'm not saying that they should upgrade them, because I know they haven't got the money. They've blown it in Welfare; they've blown it in every direction. They've blown it into expanded Civil Service that we don't know what they're doing. If they'd just spend a little bit of that money on provincial roads, it would satisfy the municipalities, or increase the unconditional grants.

However, I have said, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my intention to make a speech on this at this time, but I want to let my honourable friend know that I do not give up on the downgrading, on the downgrading of provincial roads in the expansion of expenditures of moneys in other directions where they might get more votes. It's true that, and my honourable friends in the government know it, that in no way in God's world could they ever win the seat of Arthur constituency. Whether I happen to be the candidate or anybody else, they'll never win that. That is why the downgrading is going on in that constituency. So I just ask to please bring it back to the level where he took over, bring it back to the level that the Conservatives had put it at, and we will be fairly satisfied.

I think that's all I need to say at this moment, but when his estimates come up, I will have further to . . .

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the issue of provincial roads and highways I'm sure is a perennial issue, has been a perennial issue in this august Assembly ever since it was a Legislative Assembly. It's of great interest, particularly to rural members, of course, because they are very dependent, they and their constituents are very dependent upon provincial roads, the state of those roads, and so on. I'm sure the Honourable the Minister of Highways will give us all the facts and figures and give us a clear picture on just what he and his department have been doing in the past few years. I haven't got those figures. I would only remark, however, in driving around southwestern Manitoba that there seems to me that there are more paved roads today than there ever have been, and this includes many Conservative constituencies. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Highways spends more money on roads and maintenance today, I

## RESOLUTION 4

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . believe that's true, than it ever has in its entire history, and even when you deflate it, even when you deflate it, even when you deflate it --(Interjection)-- Well I know a lovely road that runs right through the Killarney, the Souris-Killarney constituency. I know of a very important road development that took place there just a couple of years ago. --(Interjection)-- No, no, it was built in the last couple of years.

However, Mr. Speaker, I just got up on my feet to talk for a moment or two about rail line abandonment because the Honourable Member from Swan River raised the matter, and I wanted to assure the members of the House that your government is very concerned about this question and as Chairman of the Manitoba Transportation Economics Council we have had, I have had a series of meetings with my colleagues in Alberta and Saskatchewan on the issue of rail line abandonment along with other railway transportation matters. And I can assure the members of the House that we have made it very clear to the Federal Minister of Transport, the Honourable Jean Marchand that we stand united, that the three prairie provinces stand united and firm in their total opposition to any type of branch line abandonment whatsoever.

I can inform the members of the House that the Federal Government, I believe, will probably be establishing commissions of review, or whatever they may be called, within the not too distant future, this is what I've been informed, in the three prairie provinces. These will be federal commissions of review comprised of appointments by the Federal Government. It is our position in the Provincial Government, and in my department, that we will make the resources of our department available, the research staff, the statistics that we have, everything that we can do, we will do to assist those communities that are affected by any proposed or threatened branch line abandonment. --(Interjection)-- Well we will serve all parts of the province but particularly those that are most concerned. If there are some communities of course that express no concern, well so be it, but I expect that there will be many many and we will do everything we can in helping those communities appear before the commission, and we ourselves of course will have a provincial brief on the situation.

At the moment, I'm advised there are three categories of branch lines or rather rail lines that are being thought of by the Federal Department of Transport: Category A, which involves more or less the main lines and those lines that are used rather frequently, which of course would not be a subject of abandonment, that's Category A.

Category C on the other hand, about five hundred miles, are already abandoned, de facto abandoned, there are bushes growing through them, and so on. There hasn't been any traffic for many years over some of them.

It's the Category B which there are I think about five or six thousand miles at stake that will be the fighting ground more or less. This is the area, the grey area, and I just wanted to take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, because I know others want to talk in this debate, to assure all the honourable members of the House that we are very firm in our position in this matter; that we will continually remind the Federal Government that what they are about to do - and I'm sorry to say that I think we've got more sympathy from the Minister of Transport than we have from the Minister of the Wheat Board, the Honourable Otto Lang, who's a Minister from the prairies who yet seems to be less concerned about rail line abandonment than the Federal Minister of Transport is.

At any rate, we are making our views known that any move by the Federal Government toward branch line abandonment, if any branch line abandonment does take place, we will demand full compensation to those communities, to those farmers that are affected by it. Because make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, branch line abandonment shifts the burden of costs from the shoulders of the Federal Government, which subsidizes the railways, and from the shoulders of the railway companies onto the shoulders of the farmers, who have to transport their grain and other products a further distance, and onto the shoulders of the communities involved, because they may be detrimentally affected, and onto the shoulders of the provincial taxpayers who have to build and maintain the roads. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you wish to call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, we have 30 seconds, I think I may as well call it, and the honourable member will have an opportunity the next time.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Could I ask the Minister a question, please. It will just take a moment.

## RESOLUTION 4

MR. SPEAKER: Very briefly. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: I'd like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce if his office has a map showing all the railroads in the Province of Manitoba that would be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have maps, and we have economic and social data pertaining to the communities along those various rail lines. If any members are interested, we'd be pleased to make information available as we will be doing to the various communities of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)