

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 13, 1975

GOVERNMENT BILL 17 - THE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when we were turning over to Private Members' at 4:30, I thought perhaps it was a little appropriate that we should be dealing with, in Private Members', with a resolution dealing with the role of the Auditor. Some of the concepts that were espoused at that time dealt with accountability of the public purse and I think it can be quite related to the very subject matter that is before us now and that is the role of the MDC in the affairs of Manitoba. Because the role is being changed, this is the whole purpose of the bill.

The government was not content to be a lender of last resort, they found that the role of lender of last resort was not a very profitable one in dollars and cents or in other methods of what you might call assessing the value. So now we find that the MDC is going to be changed to another role of taking a more active role probably in smaller businesses. It is going to be more competitive and when you look at that you have to begin to ask the question why. Why would the government want to be competitive with lenders of the recognized institutions? I would think that if you really consider that question closely that you come up with several possible reasons.

I would suspect, sir, that when government gets involved in that role they're looking for several types of returns. They're not just looking for a replacement of the investment dollar with the interest that is accrued from a successful business operation. I think that they're looking for more than just that type of return. I would think, sir, that it's not too far to try and assess it and analyze it, to expect that the government wants a great deal more than just a dollar and cent return. I think that they would expect those that avail themselves of that type of assistance to turn around and scratch their back, probably at election time. I think that that's a quite reasonable assumption to make, that the whole role that we now envisage of Manitoba Development Corporation is nothing more than a giant vote-buying machine which would perpetuate this government in office.

We know, sir, that they have had reasonable success with certain elements in society and there are some that say that they have not had too much success with the business society. Now there are some in the business society, I'm sure, that do support them just as there are some in other segments of society that they might suspect would support them and don't. But I think that it's reasonable to expect that the government is not satisfied with the degree of response from the business community and here is another means that they're going to use to try and solicit more voter response from the business community.

I notice the Minister sitting there smiling and I don't hold that against him at all. I think that if he thinks that we're on the right track, I don't think that he objects to that type of thing at all, because he has told us on numerous occasions the Number One thing as far as he is concerned is to get elected. That is the paramount point in politics, is to get elected. Now what means you use is something that you and your own conscience have to then figure out and if you can use something that is halfway respectable and does attract votes in this manner then by all means, he says, we're entitled to go ahead and use it, and we probably should use it.

MR. GREEN: When have I ever said that.

MR. GRAHAM: No, I'm just surmising. Up to a point the Minister was in complete agreement with me. Now maybe I went a little bit too far. Maybe because he hasn't said that yet. But - he says maybe I don't want to say that either - maybe the implication that is left unsaid is the one that is really the important one. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not that worried but I think that the business community would probably see what the intention of the government is in this respect. And I think that if the business community does not, then maybe it is up to us in Opposition to point out to them what the intent of this government is as we see it.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't see this bill as being any great asset to the business community at all. The only thing that I see it being of any value to is the NDP Party itself. And on that basis, sir, I cannot support the proposal that is being put forward by the government. Because, sir, I believe . . .

A MEMBER: At the last minute he pulled the plug.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . that I am not really in complete agreement with the Prime Minister of this country when he said that government had no business in the bedrooms of the nation.

BILL 17

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) Likewise I don't think that this government in normal cases should have any business in a small business of this community. I think that if this community is given a proper economic climate to operate in, if there is not that heavy-handed threat that exists in the philosophy of this government, then I think that business in this province would grow and prosper without the MDC. And so, Mr. Speaker, for those views, for those reasons, I cannot support the present legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MR. GREEN: I just want to indicate that this bill has been on the Order Paper for over a month and therefore if the honourable member needed time to prepare it, he has had it. I'm just advising him that because we don't intend that debate will be adjourned on these bills indefinitely.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 34 - THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make my contribution on Bill 34 at this time, Mr. Speaker. I have noticed in one of the papers that it was indicated that some of the realtors may be disturbed by Bill 34 and I have some questions that I wish to ask the Minister. I see the Minister is not in the House at the present time but perhaps he'll be able to answer it in committee or when he does come in.

I would like to indicate at this time that the Winnipeg Real Estate Board requested some of the changes that are in this bill. I would like to say at this time that the Association is composed of some 1,200 salesmen and 500 brokers, of some 1,600 to 1,700 members in this province and in this city, and it may be of interest to members to know that the Winnipeg Board was the first board formed in Canada. It was in 1903. I think over the years, Mr. Speaker, the members of that Association or from that Association certainly made a contribution to the city and as such I think they have policed their business quite well. In fact, I would like to indicate to the House that the majority, almost 95 percent or more of the realtors in the city, are members of a service profession and sell property for a fee and are not promoters as such, real estate promoters. They sell property or people engage the members to sell property and once the property is sold and exposed to the public it's sold at the highest possible price, then they charge a fee. I know that in the last few years the bulk of the energy by the Association and the Board were to improve the standards, develop better standards, and start education programs. I know that at the present time the Institute of Realtors is the educational arm of the Canadian Association of Real Estate Boards and there are courses offered in every university across Canada and admission to the membership is based on four years of successful completion of a four-year course.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that I'm bringing this matter to the attention of the members is because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope we could get the co-operation of the honourable members so that I can hear what's being said by the Member for Assiniboia.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason I was saying I was bringing this to the attention of the members is because I think the Association has done a very good job in policing its members and having some control in the way that the business has been transacted.

Of course I should give some credit perhaps to the Public Utilities Board, too, because I am sure that they are responsible to some extent of the fine reputation of this Association and industry has. I doubt very much if anybody can indicate to me that any trust funds have been lost or misappropriated and this is because of strong regulations and a code of ethics. I know that the requirement now is \$10,000 bond for a broker which I think has been of great help, and through regulations by the Public Utilities Board the trust funds have to be kept in trust accounts. I'd say over the years, over the years, you will find that no trust funds have been misappropriated or lost and I'm sure that the Minister for Consumer Affairs would agree with that, that the association, the board and the Public Utilities Board have done a great job

BILL 34

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) as far as the real estate transactions are concerned.

I do have some questions at this present time to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. I know that he talked about the conflict of interest . . . in full disclosure. I'm sure that nobody has any argument with that added clarification in the Act because there is a lack of clarity and I know this has been a problem with complaints committee of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board where families are involved or the identity of the purchaser has not been disclosed. So I feel that this at least is further clarification and I have no argument on that point.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principles involved in the bill that's before us is that the spouse of a salesman cannot purchase property. It's specific in the Act and I looked it up the other day - Section 19(1), "Spouse of a salesman cannot purchase property." I believe this would be probably contrary to the Bill of Rights - or the Human Rights Bill, Mr. Speaker - and I would hope that the Minister would take another look at that section because surely we do not want to preclude or say that spouses of salesmen cannot purchase property. I think it would be completely wrong and I hope that the Minister would check into this section. But as far as disclosure is concerned, I have no argument.

The other principle that is involved is commission and I'm glad that there is clarification in respect to the commission because there has been difficulties. These difficulties existed through a period of quite a few years. The difficulties arose when one broker had a listing on a property and say another broker or a salesman from another broker's office purchased a property and the listing broker could not collect commission. In the meantime he probably expended a tremendous amount of money, took the listing, took the time, paid advertising bills and had people put the sign on the property and maybe advertised it for a couple of months. Then there was a purchaser and it happened to be a purchaser, and, Mr. Speaker, when you have 1, 500 people involved in the industry, there is definitely these people buy houses for their own personal use and somebody just may buy that particular listing that one broker has. But still that broker was not able to collect commission because somebody on the other side from another broker's office was making a purchase of that particular property. And this was a considerable amount of disturbance to the industry and I know, in fact, it did go to court on one or two occasions for a hearing and they felt that there should have been a commission paid to the listing broker. And what the Act does is now makes it clear that there'd be no commission paid on the side, say on the purchasing side, whoever's purchasing, be it a broker or a broker's salesman, there'd be no commission portion to that company but there would be still a commission to the listing company. So, I feel, this is again a clarification and, Mr. Speaker, I have no argument.

The other point the Branch Manager, I think it's a step in the right direction. I think there must be able and capable people in --(Interjection)-- I don't know what the Member from Minnedosa said, he says any member off the street but I'm sure --(Interjection)-- Oh I see, great. But I do believe that there must be capable people in the branch offices and, as you know in the last couple of years, Royal Trust and Canada Permanent and some of the other companies have opened as many as 15 offices with one Manager, and I'm sure that we cannot give proper service. There must be financing to be arranged, there are problems and I see this is in a right direction to have branch managers to help in assisting and management of that particular office.

I do have one other point that I wish to raise and there is a temporary at the present time, I know and the Minister spent considerable length of time that he's updating the courses as far as the brokers are concerned and as far as registration of sales people are concerned, but there still is a 90-day temporary registration that has not been taken out of the present Act. And I wish to ask again the Minister why, if he's really concerned about upgrading, why he hasn't taken that temporary 90-day registration. I think this would have been probably a step in the right direction. So the education as far as registration, I think it's a good idea but I would like him to perhaps look at the 90-day temporary registration provision.

The other point that is of some concern, Mr. Speaker, that again one of the principles in the bill is that all officers and directors of all companies and their wives, if anyone purchases a property is excluded, any broker is excluded from collecting commission and, Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister of Consumer Affairs and all members in the House would know when you consider some of the trust companies, they must have 25 or 30 directors. And take employees or their wives and take into consideration there may be many many people involved and we're

BILL 34

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) saying that not one of them . . . if anyone buys a house then there'd be no commission paid. Well, I feel that what the Minister's intentions are and is any licensed director who are involved in real estate transactions, perhaps that's the only ones. If their wives purchased property then there should be no commission, but not all the directors of any company or any corporation or any trust company or anyone and this is what he blanketed it and says all the directors. Well, in large corporations, and I have no argument for the large corporations because at the rate we're going at the present time, there'll be very few small realtors left at the rate they're expanding, but I still say it's wrong in the Act to say that everyone that's on a directorate should be excluded. I feel it should be only, reference should be made only to the licensed directors that are involved in the transactions of real estate. Because really, Mr. Speaker, there's another situation that arises. You have many small companies, you have the secretaries, the lawyers' secretaries that are acting as secretaries for all small corporations where you need three members for a corporation, and you have usually the lawyers acting as a vice-president and again you'd say, well that secretary couldn't buy a house because now she's holding office. So that is again an area that the Minister should have a look.

The other point, registration of staff spread over the whole year instead of at one time, I believe it is in March, when the registrations can be . . . well, I see no problem with that and no argument.

The other area that I do see and the Minister has not concerned himself with, Mr. Speaker, and that is the trust funds as such at the present time. I know that no broker can receive any trust or interest on trust bearing accounts, and it doesn't matter how small or large a broker is, I'd say his average running account must be \$50,000 to \$60,000 in a trust account. And you're saying to the small broker, you're not entitled to collect any interest on that trust bearing account unless you registered every transaction which would be almost impossible to do. But at the same time you're letting all the banks taking all that interest. This is what's happening at the present time and I'd say surely the Minister and the Minister of Consumer Affairs should have probably examined this further. --(Interjection)-- Well, I have discussed it with even bank managers themselves and they agree and they say, well I can't see why the broker can't collect interest because really when that running trust account is in a bank's office, they use that money, they have the use of that money and it's there. I'm saying that the running trust account of a small broker is probably \$60,000 to \$70,000 and it's there in the bank and if you go for a loan at the present time, you have to pay 10, 11 percent and still you cannot collect any interest at all, any interest on that trust bearing account which probably is ten times as much as the loan that you need. And so you don't have to go very far, Mr. Speaker. In one year this may amount to say a running trust account of \$50,000 or \$60,000 may run to \$4,000 or \$5,000 interest. You take over a ten year period, there's \$40,000, \$50,000. And legitimately, I'm sure that you can discuss this with most bank managers or anyone and they'll agree but by the proper policing of the trust accounts now, proper registration and there's been no problems, then surely the earnings on that running trust account belongs to the broker himself and shouldn't be left in the bank account. So I pose this area and perhaps that the Minister will look at those few points that I raise at the present time. I see the Minister has a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I distinctly remember the Member for Portage la Prairie referring to the lawyers' trust accounts and the interest on the running accounts as being set by the lawyers. Would you concur in what the Member for Portage la Prairie said at that time?

MR. PATRICK: I didn't hear the Minister's question. What did he say?

MR. GREEN: In a similar situation vis-a-vis lawyers' trust accounts which are now used, I believe, for legal education or some such activity, that the Member for Portage la Prairie said that the lawyers who took the interest on their trust accounts were engaging in theft. I hope I'm not being unfair to the Member for Portage la Prairie but I remember he said it and I took it very personally.

MR. PATRICK: Well, I hope I'm not wrong but I believe that the Member for Portage said that money belongs to the lawyers and the lawyers should not subsidize the legal aid. I believe that was his position he took in the House and if it isn't, I'll ask him later on and find out but that's my position. Well, if it would be possible to get the interest on those trust

BILL 34

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) accounts to the purchasers or to whom the money belongs, I think it would be great but I don't think it's possible under any system. So what I'm saying, I don't think that the whole interest on all those trust bearing accounts should strictly accrue to the banks, that's all that I'm saying, that's my remarks. Maybe there's no other way around but I'm sure that the Minister can take a look and with a few reservations, I agree that the bill should go to committee and I'm sure there'll be representation.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if someone on that side of the House would want to take the adjournment of the debate with the intention of allowing the Minister to close it because there were a number of questions raised that he may want to answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was counting on the fact that the Minister might be able to answer those questions in Committee but I'm prepared to try to accommodate the Minister should he want to answer in the House so I will move, seconded by the Minister for Urban Affairs that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear that the Minister of Mines and Resources is adjourning debate for the Minister and the purpose is to close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I'm sorry but as the Chairman I can't accept that assumption. We've had that problem before. It's been adjourned and it'll carry on from there.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry 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 - CORRECTIVE AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer members to Page 26 of their Estimates book. Resolution 59(c)(2)--passed; 59(c)--passed; Resolution 59(d)(1)-- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Last evening, we were in the debate dealing with the juvenile offenders and at that time the Minister, no doubt, was somewhat apprehensive and on two or three occasions he made reference to the Young Offenders Act which is coming forward, hopefully, in the near future. But tonight we're dealing with adult offenders and we are not in the position of having to wait for federal legislation. We are dealing here with provincial legislation and the care and treatment, if you want to use those words, of adult offenders in the Province of Manitoba.

And, sir, while we have passed item (b), dealing with probation and parole, may I suggest to you, sir, that probation and parole are just as important in the treatment of adult offenders as they are in the treatment of juvenile offenders. We're finding today that some of the programs that are carried out can almost be called a merry-go-round or a revolving door when many offenders are coming out just as fast as they're going in, and they're probably back in court again on the Monday morning after being sentenced on a Friday.

I would ask the Minister of Corrections if he is fully cognizant of these procedures and more specifically, I would like to ask the Minister, what programs, if any, he has to correct that situation and to ensure to the people of Manitoba that those people who have been sentenced by the courts to serve a certain time period will in effect be paying the proper penalty that has been assessed by the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, on this item which of course is the biggest item in the entire project that's before us, to the extent of some \$3,142,000, I imagine a great deal of that is wages. But in listening to the Minister in his opening remarks,

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BILTON cont'd) he made some mention of straw mattresses. Society today doesn't expect that the people in Headingley Jail are on straw mattresses, so he doesn't need to mention that sort of thing in my humble opinion.

This morning we had a former Minister of the Crown choose to accept the authority of the court and he said that he was going to the provincial "Hilton Hotel" of Manitoba. And he went on to point out, in his remarks, that he felt that the inmates of that institution are treated a good deal better than many of our people in low income brackets. And I agree with him.

And I think I know the nature of our Minister, our new Minister in this particular project. I believe that the Minister of Corrections has got his heart in the right place, but I want to suggest to him not to get too soft on this. These people, with the odd exception, and I'm sorry for those that run afoul of the law by the odd exception and often by the fact of ignorance of the law, but it seems to me that there's a good many inmates there that that is their second home. And I suggest to the Minister that they have given up their rights when the court condemns them to whatever their sentence may be. They've flouted the laws, Mr. Minister, in my humble opinion they should expect nothing but punishment. That's what they are there for.

It was my privilege a year or so ago to go out there with a contingent from our party and I was astounded to see and to learn that there's very little, if anything, to keep those men occupied. All they simply do is play baseball or basketball or what have you, and that to me is not punishment. I don't want them to be in the Black Hole, far be it from me, but, Mr. Minister, I want to suggest to you that they go in there to learn a lesson and if society through you, Mr. Minister, makes their passage through that institution that much lighter with all the facilities of life, that make it a privilege to be in there rather than a punishment, I think we've got to be looking at it again.

As the Minister indicated, that a person that is convicted must be punished and it's his purpose to see that the taxpayer gets value for his dollar. And I don't want to be misunderstood in any way, but it seems to me that society is on the side of those that do wrong rather than on those that try to enforce the rights. Our judges are condemned many times for many of the sentences that are made. The resolution that is on the Order Paper that was referred to the other evening, which I spoke to for some length, suggests to me that we've been too soft on this criminal element.

A few years ago, I don't know what's in the Minister's mind, but a few years ago I supported the men to be taken out of that institution and put into our provincial parks, places set up where they could enjoy a good meal, have a clean bed to sleep in and to work in the woods and contribute in their own way, under direction, to the welfare of the state, or to the well-being of the state, I should say. And I would hope that if that is not in the offing that the Minister would give serious consideration to seeing to it that it is reinstated, particularly for the young men, and that the people that oversee them have a human approach to life with a view to seeing to it that during their sojourn of their confinement, while it is in the open air, and well worth their while, that when they come out of there, they will see to it that they'll change their ways.

Mr. Minister, my purpose in rising at this particular time is not to suggest harshness in any way, I'm not for that, but rather to emphasize the fact that if these people go afoul of the law, they must be taught a lesson. And you know as well as I do, sir, that the many habitual criminals - and there are thousands of them across this nation - will always be a charge to the state, that they too must learn that the state doesn't owe them anything. They must be taught a way, some way or other, to change their ways, not only for their own good but for society's good. And I appeal to you, Mr. Minister, that don't get too soft in your open-mindedness and your big heartedness, see to it that some way or other, they're not going in there for a holiday but rather for punishment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to as well comment in some ways on the question of the correctional institutions in the province. And I guess start out in part with a similar kind of concern expressed by the last speaker, although I think I'd probably end up going in a slightly different direction than he ended up, by saying that I think it is time that we took a good hard second look at the Headingley Jail, which is the major provincial jail in our system, and to ask ourselves many of the questions about what is happening there and about the kind of programs and developments that are occurring there.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

And by that I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should realize that since about 1971, there has been a number of efforts to change the administrative practices and the programming in the Headingley Jail. I think that those changes that were brought in about 1971 were certainly all to the good and certainly indicated a change in philosophy from the idea of jail as sheer punishment or vengeance or whatever on the basis that if you're going to spend \$20,000 a year to keep someone locked up, which is about what the costs are I believe, then you might as well try to make some effort to see that the people don't necessarily repeat and come back. Because I think that we can get into the mistake of somehow assuming that once you lock someone away, that it becomes no longer a societal concern, that if we can really sort of make sure that they're really behind those bars, then there is no longer any issue at stake. And yet there is many issues.

And I think one of the things that I understand is most important in trying to reorganize effective prison reform is to first take recognition that there are many different kinds of people in prisons, that they're not all hardened criminals or whatever. That there is certainly that element amongst them and not very much is going to change them, but there are many others who arrive in jail for a variety of reasons. Some for reasons simply of accident, others for mistakes, others for reasons beyond their control in terms of their own psychiatric or physical conditions. Some - and I think the Member from Swan River is quite right - some because it happens to be probably warmer in the winter than it is where they're living perhaps in some of our slum areas on Main Street; that there are a variety of reasons and there are certainly a variety of people who eventually find themselves being locked up.

And therefore the question comes to my mind at this stage after four or five years of this new regime or different direction, to pose some questions to the Minister concerning what is happening there and to simply try to get some answers and perhaps leave with some recommendations. Because I think any time that you try to institute a reform, which I believe was the case in 1971, that it also bears a responsibility to go back and find out how well you've done, to find out how effective those reforms have been, what the results have been and where after the shakedown accrues of those reforms, how do you sort of put things a little bit in order and see where they are.

And I'd like to first begin, Mr. Chairman, with something that does concern me about the situation at Headingley, and that is the whole question of staff. It seems to me that one of the requirements, if you're going to have a form of rehabilitation in prisons, is to make sure that the staff that you have is both able to provide that kind of rehabilitative work and has had the time to do it and the training to do it. And one thing that does concern me at the present moment is that to begin with, when people are taken on as correctional officers, at the beginning there is no prior training. They're simply kind of brought into the job with some, I suppose, tutelage by senior officers, but that in fact there is really no prior training when they get into the jail and therefore any of the kind of background that's required to bring up to a certain standard is something that you acquire on the job. There may be some validity to that, but it does strike me that if there is a certain philosophy of rehabilitation at work in the jail, then it would require some at least initial introduction to that and some introduction as to some of the purposes of it.

I think it also goes on to the fact that there is a very heavy turnover in the number of correctional officers which is basically related to the rate of pay. That as I understand it many of the young correctional officers who have gone on staff have now left the staff and gone on to the Winnipeg City Police Force, for example, where they can make substantially higher salaries. In fact it's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the chief guard at Headingley Jail makes about the same salary as a patrolman on the City of Winnipeg Police Force, and that obviously you're not going to be able to keep any kind of trained and experienced staff if you're not able to maintain some kind of equitable pay salaries or pay scales. It only simply means that it's being foolish, that you're really running at a loss, because if you are going to take the time to hire someone, bring him into the jail and give him some training and experience, and all of a sudden once they acquire that they leave and you have to start all over again, then you in fact are running a poor operation; that you're not really kind of giving the kind of service that is required.

And so I would think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the necessary first requirements in the

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) operation of the Headingley Jail at this point, in relation to the program they want to run, is to look at the question of what kind of conditions they provide the staff to bring those programs about. And in those cases, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise in part some of the other kinds of problems that are posed with staff in a jail. One, dealing with the whole idea of intermittent sentence, which is a situation where prisoners to the courts are allowed to serve their sentences on weekends. And, again, it's my understanding the system doesn't really work at all, that in many cases there's a high degree of default or delinquency on the intermittent sentence, that someone who is supposed to show up on Saturday morning, to spend his 36 hours or 48 hours in jail, doesn't show up. There's medical certificates, staff time is taken tracking them down, there's an awful lot of slippage and an awful lot of time wasted in the system just trying to keep track of these people on intermittent sentences. And I think recommendations should go forward to the courts in terms of what do you really want to have happen. Is this really a proper way to conduct business? Because, in effect, they're taking an awful lot of time away for much more useful pursuits. If someone's on the phone trying to track down where some guy's supposed to show up on Saturday morning might be and finding out if he's with his girl friend or where he is, then it's an awful lot of time he is not spending on other kinds of things. But it seems to me that in that somewhat direction of the court, in that area of sentencing, really again detracts from the work of the jail itself and the work that should go into many of the other kinds of activities.

I think, in company with that, is the whole question of the remand system which has been brought to the Minister's attention before. But I would like to bring it to him in reverse. Someone was worried about the people on remand and what happens to them being sent out to Headingley. I suggest that the problem also works in reverse, that in many cases those prisoners who are brought in on a remand require, by far, the heaviest detailing of time, because they require very close supervision. Many of the cases that are brought in, for murder cases and rape cases and so on, which may end up going to the penitentiary are going to the Headingley Jail for remand purposes, which requires a much heavier detailing of guard time, because they are on 24-hour constant duty. Again it takes away from the man hours and the manpower that's available, and again detracts from the ability of the personnel of that jail to fulfill their kinds of purposes.

And so it seems again that from the other side of the coin, from the kind of interference and confusion caused in the jail, by these kinds of sentencing arrangements, both in terms of remand and intermittent, that again it doesn't allow the jail to perform its objective which is to provide for the kind of program and ability within the jail to bring about its proper function. So that would be one major concern I would have, Mr. Chairman, in the operation of the Headingley Jail, and that is the kind of staff and use of personnel time and the way in which it's affected by the application of other kinds of sentencing which simply take away from it.

A second question I'd like to raise, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister, deals with the whole question of the physical facilities. And I realize that there has been a major capital program of renovation and rebuilding. I gather there are now gymnasiums and the renovation going on in dining halls and all the rest of it. Well, a gimmick question though is whether in fact the facilities are what they're supposed to be and whether really they are still suitable for the needs, and also what the cost has been. I looked back in the Capital Estimates Book and I gather that the cost of these facilities were supposed to run at about an average of about \$1.3 million. And I think we'd like to know from the Minister whether, in fact, they will come in on target or whether like every other capital expenditure that we're hearing about this year, that there's going to be a 20 or 30 percent surcharge on it.

And the reason I raise that question, Mr. Chairman, is that I'm not so sure really that in this day and age, the adding of additional facilities to major institutions is the best way of providing for treatment of prisoners. I think that there are many alternatives that should be available if there is going to be new capital in terms of work camps and farms and community treatment centres and so on, which I think would have a much higher result in terms of rehabilitation than simply incarcerating someone behind walls. And therefore if we were sort of loading a lot of money into Headingley Jail to provide for extensive facilities, I would really like to have it examined whether in fact that's the proper way to spend that capital, and whether the capital might not be much better spent in much smaller decentralized facilities which would provide the kind of work opportunity for prisoners so that they don't become sort of just part

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) of a very large kind of block arrangement in the Headingley Jail.

And that again comes back, Mr. Chairman, to the objectives behind the reform itself and whether there really is that kind of ability to use the money and use the time spent effectively. Because if the philosophy is rehabilitation, then presumably the devotion and commitment of the Minister should be to see that the full resources are used for that purpose and not to be used really for a kind of a halfway half gesture way. So if you really are interested in rehabilitation and I think the Minister is, I've heard him state that on many occasions, then are we really getting sort of proper value for the time spent by personnel and the capital that we're spending.

And it comes back really to a third point, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to raise, and that is the actual kind of program that does go on in a jail. It seems to me that one of the useful kinds of activities in a rehabilitative program is providing for work training so that those who are in prisons or who are under sentencing who have some opportunity, those portions of the prison population which are able or deemed able to be able to hopefully secure some kind of employment when they leave prison walls, are given that kind of support while they are under sentence. Yet the fact of the matter is that over the last two or three years, that kind of opportunity has been declining in the Headingley Jail. Now a prime example, of course, is the closing of the farm, which has to be - it's one of those curious bureaucratic moves which I find very little rationale for - but there was a time in the Headingley Jail when the Headingley Jail was in part self-supporting in food stuffs and in bakery goods and everything else. They grew their own vegetables, they baked their own bread, and many of the prisoners in fact worked on these kinds of activities at the farm. --(Interjection)-- That's right. Then all of a sudden we close the farm down, sell off the cows and the pigs - I suppose at a very low price, I gather, somebody got a real good deal - and all of a sudden you got guys sitting around doing nothing now, when in fact they could, they could be presumably acquiring some limited skills, some trades, certainly some work attitude, which would be a far more beneficial and far more sensible way of filling in their time than - I didn't see them playing that much basketball, but I'll take the word from the Member from Swan River that there is an awful lot of just lost dead time in Headingley Jail, where there's just simply nothing happening.

And while there is some counselling going on and some supervision and so on, it seems to me that that really is not a very effective way of approaching the question of retraining or rehabilitation, people with dead time don't get those kinds of opportunities. I'd really like an explanation for that. I'm sure the Minister has some. It may even be related to some kind of dollars and cents cost. But I think if you add it up, the dollars and cents that would be in this day of inflation when food and milk and bread and so on, everything else costs so much, that that would in fact provide a basic form of sustenance in a jail as well as the additional contribution of being able to support and develop, become a basis for a work-training program. It just doesn't make any sense at all to me, and I would really like to know what kind of things were on people's minds when they did that sort of thing.

Because it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, as I have read in this field, and I don't pretend in any way to have read extensively, but in trying to - and I should say that my Mother is involved in one of the sort of programs related to prisons and some of our jails, and in talking to her, discovered that in some of the other jurisdictions, particularly in Ontario now, I believe in Saskatchewan, they're now making a much more concerted effort to really take people on their sentence out of the walled jails that we have and put them into farm camp kind of arrangements, work arrangements. I believe there are some interesting experiments going on now in Ontario, where prisoners are working in steel mills getting the full - whatever they make \$9.00 or \$10.00 an hour. That goes back partially to pay their room and board as well as to build up a little capital for them when they get out. And in fact - and I'm simply in this case repeating from secondhand reports - but that it is having again a very remarkable kind of influence on the men under sentence and is having, the fact of the matter, is also saving some money along the way.

It would seem to me that that goes back to the point I was trying to raise with the Minister, about the use of staff time and the use of capital resources. That if the thrust of his ministry in dealing with correctional institutions is to support that kind of philosophy then I would simply suggest that at this present time Headingley Jail is really kind of stuck halfway.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) It's made some initial progressive movements forward but has now slipped gears and it hasn't really continued forward to the kind of more logical conclusion of that philosophy in terms of carrying it forward so that those people in the prison population who are capable of remedial work and of getting out from under are going to get their experience while under sentence rather than waiting until they get out after. I think it's just as important what happens when they're under sentence as it is what happens after. We're spending an awful lot of time and money now, Mr. Chairman, in terms of trying to provide for ways of easing prisoners back into the population and providing halfway houses and the rest of that kind of work. But it seems to me to be an awful lot more helpful if that started much earlier down the track and developed some of those habits to move forward.

So I would really hope, Mr. Chairman, that while the Minister again is new on the job, I'm sure he would have had an opportunity to get some explanations for some of these critiques and I want to make it quite clear that I offer these comments mainly in the fact that I agree with the philosophy of the Minister in that respect. I'm not so sure the philosophy is being carried out as effectively as it should or the resources being applied as well as they might. I would hope that in this case of the correctional institutions we might be able to both see some changes in the Headingley Jail itself, I think for the sake of the staff and the resources that are used, and perhaps looking at the question of prison reform beyond it and seeing what other kinds of non-institutional forms of treatment and care and responsibility we would apply to people under sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in quite an awkward position tonight speaking to the present Minister of Corrections and I think that I believe that the present Minister of Corrections that we have has basically an understanding of many of the problems that have been brought up yesterday and today. I personally came from a school which was called Old St. Johns College School for Boys where if you did something wrong the Prefect - which I happened to be one when I ended up as Head boy there - decided if you did something wrong that it was maybe his decision whether you got six across the rear-end or whether you got your leave cancelled or not.

I would like to start out by saying again to the Minister that the problems that we have today with corrections of adult men - and adult men today are boys and girls over 18 years old and even in the juvenile section which we have passed - is that the way that some things seem to be going today we could have a situation where your cure will have to be drastic. I would like to say this to the Minister to clarify that statement, that if you have a cut on your arm or a cut on your leg and you don't take care of it in order to cure it, if you leave it long enough the cure becomes very drastic. So the situation we have today in the cases of juveniles and senior people being involved in crime is one where if we are going to keep continually putting them into institutions and not really letting them know why they are there, that your cure will be drastic.

It really doesn't make much sense if there is a person who is convicted of any sort of a crime, no matter what age, has to be counselled on it and the counselling is such that when he comes back he doesn't know whether he did anything right or he did anything wrong. You know what we are saying to him, if we are not going to have some sort of discipline for his actions against society then he obviously has to think he didn't do anything wrong. And that's why I find myself in a very awkward position. I don't believe in complete lash and all of this sort of thing that could be done. --(Interjection)-- Well my colleague from Swan River says "strap". I think maybe sometimes if a man were put into an institution and he were going to be there for three months and while he's being treated very nicely - and I think my colleague from Swan River mentioned the Hilton and as Mr. Borowski today also mentioned the Hilton - if he's going to be there and treated as somebody in the Hilton, our guest, that he comes out wondering you know maybe this is the best place to be if I do something against society. And when I mentioned the six across the rear-end at St. Johns maybe, maybe once a month during that three month period if he got a paddle across the rear-end once a month, he might not come back.

MR. BILTON: Good idea.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So really what I'm trying to say to the Minister is that the price we are paying for a little lack of discipline - that's the word I'd like to use - just a little lack of discipline from the point of view that somebody has done something against society, maybe we

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) have to look at it now because if we don't, if we don't I would say your cure is going to have to be drastic. And I personally don't want to see that drastic cure. I personally don't want us to get to the point where we will have to use discipline to the point that none of us would like here. So maybe we should start now into looking at a little more discipline.

In other words, the example I will give, if you go to Headingley Jail why can you go to hockey games? If you want to talk about rehabilitation in that way, shape or form, why? But you know there is this; you have committed a crime against society. In order to arrive in that institution of correction there has been a judge and jury probably decide that you had to be there for what you did. So while you're there, there has to be some discipline, and the discipline really has to break down the boys and girls or the men. You have to be made known that you've done something wrong. I know that the Minister that we have at the present time is not a person who wants to take drastic measures, I don't think anybody in this House wants to see drastic measures. But unless we start to take a look at it from that point of view, as I said before, your cure will have to be drastic and you will end up being a mean man when your cure gets that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Minister that it's not happening at the present time. The correctional institutes are being done on the basis of we will have people while the person is in the correctional institute, talk to him, try to rehabilitate him, do all of these things. In fact we are saying that society has put him there, not himself. And that may be true, that may be true. But he comes back, he comes back very often because there is no discipline. Now I don't really believe on many occasions that the other side of the House, people on the other side of the House, really believe in that little bit of authority that I'm asking for or suggesting the Minister have at this present time in society with those people who have committed a crime. You don't come back, you don't come back if you don't want to be there. Quite frankly - and I heard the Member from Fort Rouge talk about the Rockefeller. The Member from Fort Rouge's suggestions haven't cured anything. They have never cured anything. They haven't hurt but we're still knocking the hell out of ice cream boys in this province. Even last night. --(Interjection)-- No I didn't, I didn't, and if I had I'd have got leaned across a chair and got six across the rear-end. And I might not have done it again. I am just saying that you know really, really, you know, I was almost ready to sit down when I heard some of the comments from the members on the other side and from the Member for Fort Rouge. Are you really kidding yourself that you can change human nature? And we will do a good job if we can change human nature by being a little bit lenient and that's all I'm asking for, just a little bit of leniency rather than the hard core. But I am saying on the other side of the fence let's be a little bit tougher and maybe we won't have this situation. If any one of you think, if any one of you think that you can sit down and talk a lot of common sense in this respect you're wrong. You're wrong. Because when you get to Headingley you have got there because you are a person that has committed a crime and discipline has to be brought into it. And I say to the Minister: I'm not saying, I'm not saying be overly harsh but it's time to get a little bit harder than we have been at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister for Corrections is not going to be too pleased with me entering the debate at this time but I think that I have endured a full two nights of discussion --(Interjection)-- That's right, Mr. Speaker. Endured. Endured two nights of the suggestion that the reason for the difficulties that we are experiencing in our society is that there is some sort of permissiveness in the corrections institutions and that the Headingley can be compared to the Hilton. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been at the Hilton and I have been in the Headingley Institution and I can assure the honourable member that it is no bed of roses and that it is not a place that he would want to go. It is not a place that anybody in this room would want to go. It is harsh, sufficient and enduring punishment to deprive a citizen of our society of his liberty and put him into the confinement of a penal institution. And I for one, Mr. Speaker, do not do that because I am seeking to punish that individual. The basic reason for depriving that person of his liberty as far as I'm concerned is to protect society from the commission of further offences by that person. But if the honourable member thinks that it is the punishment that is going to undo the kinds of troubles that we are experiencing in society and which have been experienced as long as society has been in existence, no matter what the punishments were, then I have to say that there at

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) least should be somebody saying the other thing. Because everything that I have heard today sounds like disciples of Spiro Agnew.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying now, what is being said, what is being said by the Member for Swan River, by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, by other members who have been talking about permissiveness, by the Member for Lakeside - I'm not referring to the Member for Fort Rouge who has been apparently referred to as one of the softies and who made what I considered to be some of the more valid remarks . . .

MR. BILTON: What if your daughter was raped?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks the favourite question, "What if your daughter was raped?" You know that is like the question that they used to ask, "Would you have your daughter marry a negro?" When somebody got into a discussion on race relations the final answer was "Would you have your daughter marry a negro?" Mr. Chairman, if my daughter was raped I would feel terrible about it. I would probably feel emotionally some type of deep vindictiveness against the person who did that thing. But I would expect society to behave more intelligently than the victim of a particular criminal offence. Because if you let the victim deal with that person the victim would probably chop his head off. Would that be the way that the honourable member would deal with it if his daughter was raped or if he'd say . . .

MR. BILTON: I'd shoot him dead.

MR. GREEN: Exactly, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly, exactly the point that I was trying to make. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point that I was trying to make. That it is not when one is considering how to deal with an offender in society one does not ask the question, "How would the victim deal with it?" Because the victim would deal with it in a state of emotion, in a state which he cannot be objective about what has occurred and with an overwhelming desire to be vindictive against that person and I would expect the victim to feel that way. But I don't expect an intelligent group of lawmakers who are considering what is the best way of dealing with maladjustments in our society to adopt the view that the victim would adopt. I expect that we would put a little more thought into it than the victim would. And when I say to the honourable members that they are the disciples of Spiro Agnew I don't think that I'm making a remarkable statement. What they are saying now is what Spiro Agnew went across the United States talking about: law and order, do not be so permissive to the criminal, teach him a good lesson and do those things. That's exactly the type of language that we are getting from the honourable members.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that criminals should be coddled, I don't think that they should be congratulated for their acts but I reject the notion that if they are dealt with by corporal punishment or if they are dealt with by six swats across the rear-end, that that will, in some way, cure the evils that you see in society. It never has. The honourable member knows that years ago there were hundred of offences that were punishable by capital punishment. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that the bravest and I believe the man who will be most supported, by the way, because I do take the position that the right position is the best electoral position in the long run, that Warren Allmand as far as I'm concerned is a hero in my eyes in this society today because he says, "I will not hang anybody." I say that I want somebody else to stand up and say, "I won't hang anybody." And there are people here who say if a person does away with somebody, he should be hanged.--(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, the honourable member has now become another biblical scholar. You say, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and I say that if you say that with reference to capital punishment then you are misinterpreting the Old Testament. That when the Old Testament refers to an eye for an eye, it is saying that when somebody's eye has been taken, the person who takes his eye has to replace that eye so that he can see or do something which compensates the taking of the eye. But do we not also accept the fact, Mr. Chairman - you know, the honourable member who says an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, that we should love thy neighbour as thyself, that hostility breeds hostility --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Mr. Chairman, now we have a new testament being quoted, we have a new testament being quoted here in the House by the Member for Swan River. That when Jesus said that you should love thy neighbour as you love thyself which is a repeat of the Old Testament, he was not referring to criminals. That is a new testament which is now being declared to the world from the "mount" of the Member for Swan River who says that he wasn't referring to criminals. And I say he was referring to every human being. And I think that that is the way it has been

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) interpreted by all the churches up until the new sermon from the mount was delivered by the Member for Swan River when he said it wasn't referring to criminals. --(Interjection)-- Well that's fine.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that society should coddle criminals. I believe that there has to be a way out of some of the difficulties that we are experiencing. But I challenge the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Swan River or any other of the honourable members who have spoken on this subject to show that harsh punishment has resulted in a minimization of the crime rate. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't know. You know, taking a grown person or even a young person, removing him from his liberty, putting him into a cell, requiring him to be under surveillance 24 hours a day, then pulling him out, laying him across a board, taking out a paddle and striking him six times across the seat of the pants by some guard, in addition to the slight pain that may be caused - but I say that because I say the pain can be gotten over - is a humility from which the person never escapes. I'd say that that is harsh punishment. I'm saying that it may be necessary but it is harsh punishment. And the results of that punishment has been what we have known from the beginning of time, that hostility and hate breeds hate and the person who is dealt with in that way hates society and reacts against it and that there are times when love and mercy breeds love and mercy on behalf of the person who is affected. And I think that everything has to be looked at. But there seems to be some suggestion here today that if we involve ourselves in merely being tougher that we will do away with these things.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge said that we have to look at the circumstances and indeed we do. We will find that most people who find their way to penal institutions are from the lower rung economic level of society, and that there must be circumstances which result in them winding up as social maladjusters who could not find their way in the midstream. And I don't suppose that merely going through a penal institution is going to change that nor will six strokes across the rear-end with a paddle change that. But it isn't always that way. There are people who have been very well treated who still end up as social maladjustments, who are unable to make their way in the midstream of society. One of those people was Spiro Agnew. --(Interjection)-- Well, he's a good example of a man who called for law and order and tougher punishment as being the way to remedy the evils of society. As a matter of fact, he and Nixon in the most recent election ran generally on the social policy of law and order, harsher punishment for criminals. That was their general position in the United States, so I bring them up. But it turns out that Mr. Agnew was a social maladjustment in accordance with what the rules are for what is fair conduct within society. Well, you see Mr. Nixon has never been convicted but he stands convicted in the United States whether he is convicted of a criminal offence or not. Mr. Chairman, I, for one, do not feel that Spiro Agnew or Dick Nixon deserve any worse punishment than they have already gotten, although there are people who are saying put them in prison. They deserve prison like the guy who steals a loaf of bread deserves prison. I suppose the logic holds, the logic holds.

But one has to see what the penal institutions are for. One has to see whether they are being effective, one has to see whether the remedies that are being advocated by members on the other side have ever changed anything, and the fact is that they have never changed anything. I am not here able to say as did the Member for Lakeside that he has an answer and I have no answer. His answer was publish the names of the juveniles in the newspaper. That will cure anybody from ever striking an ice cream vendor again. Well if I thought that that was correct or had an inkling of a chance of being correct, I would certainly publish the names because that would do the trick. But, Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- the honourable member says it does. You know, when I went to school there were those amongst us who did criminal acts. They were not published in the newspaper but we all knew who they were. It was common knowledge who was in trouble with the police, who had been to reform school, who had done this thing and who had done that thing.

MR. BOYCE: Was it St. John's College?

MR. GREEN: It was not St. John's College. But everybody knew, and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it did not affect, the fact that his peers knew, did not have the kind of effect that the honourable member is talking about. It did not have that effect. And when we talk about harsh punishment - and to get to the issue that was raised before, Mr. Allmand's position - there has never been any evidence whatsoever that the imposition of capital

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) punishment has deterred other people from committing the act.

So that when we are talking about what the punishment shall be, I think we should realize that in this room we are not the immediate victims. We have to try to deal with the protection of society as a whole and we have to have some knowledge that what we are doing will minimize the possibilities of the further commission of an offence. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the best way of realizing just what the punishment is - you know, some people say capital punishment is not so bad because they are not involved in the receiving end nor are they involved on the giving end - but I think that when society calls for a harsh punishment just like capital punishment, which has almost effectively been done away by the Liberal administration in Ottawa which is one of the things that I would congratulate them for - they haven't put it into legislation yet but effectively they have done away with it - I suppose they are now arguing about whether somebody should hang. Well, Mr. Chairman, let's remember that when we hang somebody, we all hang that somebody, that we all then become the machinery by which a human being is removed from this world. If a dog, you know, bit a little girl or even caused greater harm than that, society would want that dog taken away but they would call it inhumane to eliminate that dog, to kill it. But when a human being does it, we seem to have a great number of the population who expect that the elimination of that human being is an acceptable thing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I could stand with Warren Allmand and say I will not hang anybody. And if that makes me an accomplice, if the honourable member would want to make it in wishing policemen to be killed, I tell him that I am not. I believe that if society is bigger than the murderer in society that there will be a chance that we will have less murders. But if society says that if you murder, we will murder, that the chances are that we will have the same amount of murders. And I think that each individual in society - and perhaps some people can stand this - perhaps some people can stand being there when a person's hands are put behind his back, his wrists tied together, a black cap put over his head, stand on a trapdoor, wrap a rope around his neck, attach the rope, release the trapdoor and break his neck, that that is something that they can live with. That is not something that I could live with. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member says that he would want to know what channel it is going to be shown on. Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess that's why there is a difference between what people's views are on this question. And I say to you that I don't know what the answer is. I don't know what the answer is. But the honourable member has not shown that if you did the type of thing that you are talking about, that no little boys will be attacked, that no girls will be raped and that there will be no crime. If that could be demonstrated even to a reasonable probability, there wouldn't be any argument here because nobody would be able to withstand the overwhelming rush there would be to involve people in doing this type of thing.

The reason that there was an attempt at prison reform, the reason that there was another try at doing something different is because none of these harsh things works because they were all in existence and they did not reduce crime. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I suppose there has to be some voice, Mr. Chairman, some voice to at least balance the tide of suggestion that if only we were tougher on the people who have become involved in criminal activity that this would eliminate criminal activities, I have not seen it. I have seen that exactly the reverse has happened in different periods of history and therefore I would ask the Minister of Corrections not to be overwhelmed by the number of voices that seem to be expressed in this direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas. Order please. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. BOYCE: Well on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I'm at your pleasure of course but there's umpteen dozen questions and I just wonder, you know, I'm quite prepared to answer them. But nevertheless we are getting further down the road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Honourable Minister of Corrections. I recognized the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, if he's not going to speak then I will recognize the Minister.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister wants to respond to certain questions down there, so okay. I may wait but I would like to speak on this matter though. --(Interjection)-- Okay, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to say that it would be very hard for me to agree with the Honourable Minister for Mines and Natural Resources.

But I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation of my colleague, the Minister

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) for Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, for the job he is doing. At the same time, I almost feel I should express my sympathy to him because it is a very difficult job.

Society right now seems to expect that the corrective function of a government should achieve conflicting results. Some persons see the job as that of punishing wrongdoing, wrongdoers rather. Others see it as helping criminals to become rehabilitated. Others still see it only as being a custodial jailkeeper. Some would hang most offenders and put the rest on bread and water. Others wish to feed them steak and treat them so well that one wonders if they will ever want to leave prison.

But perhaps we must take a deeper look than simply our surface feelings if we are to really get a grip on the growing problems of crime and corrections. Children are, after all, born innocent of law and crime. It is the way in which people experience the world which makes them what they are. If crime looks attractive, or even if it looks to be the only alternative, it will be tried. A society which is full of glorifying crime through media should not be surprised when many turn to crime.

Talking about the Holy Gospel or Holy Scripture, I would like to mention about the one verse of St. Paul who said, "Whatsoever you will sow, that will you also reap."

When the road to employment is long and hard, when it is easy to be unemployed and hard to find work, when at the same time, crime appears glamorous and the price if caught is not that bad, is it surprising that crime is on the increase?

Ultimately, no gimmicks will work. What is needed is a concerned society, parents who instill genuine values in their children, schools and churches which can inspire youth to seek a lifestyle which is more than simply "me first", and the acquisition of as much as possible as fast as possible, with the means being irrelevant.

We need to teach a quality to life that is more than just a quantity of material goods collected. For too long, we have blindly accepted the distorted values of those who believe the purpose of life is to sell a gullible public anything and everything, who measure the standard of living by counting the number of TVs, houses, cars, boats and even bathroom fixtures. To become victimized by the shepherds of the consumer sheep is to constantly want more and more and more. If it cannot be easily gotten through work, why not simply take it?

To instill a lifestyle which measures the standard of living in terms of love, honesty, concern for others, respect for fellow human beings, careful and moderate use of the gifts of God's creation, these and only these values can really solve the problem of crime, and of course, these cannot be instilled in a generation of youth if the parents themselves do not live by it. If we reap in materialism, we shall harvest the results in a demoralized and disillusioned youth; if we sow in genuine spiritual values, then we shall reap in a different kind of riches.

Let us then analyze our own values and those of the society we live in if we would look for more than simply superficial explanations to the problem of a rising crime rate. What is it in the climate of today's society that makes a life of crime attractive? What incentives are "built in" our code, in our society and man as part of our society, that makes him choose to steal, for example, rather than work?

The problem is not one dimensional, there are many factors at work. Unemployment figures may give us part of the answer. Not only does unemployment perhaps provide the need to seek the means to support life in less than honest endeavour, a chronic state of unemployment affords the time to contemplate and initiate criminal acts. As well as need and time, we need only stop to consider the emotional frustration of the unemployed which is a contributing factor. Think about the humiliation and frustration of job hunting day after day to be turned down from even the most menial and low paying jobs. Imagine the growing resentment with society and its structure.

Along with the unemployment factor, there is today's moral climate to consider. Television, movies and radio, in short the media, not only capitalize on crime but positively glorify it. Crime is not portrayed as a destructive force, undermining the framework of our society. Crime is rather presented as an exciting and often rewarding way of life. Violence is so commonplace that we fail to stop and think about what is really happening on our screens. Think about some of the most popular films in the last few years - Bonnie and Clyde, The Godfather, and Chinatown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is straying from the section here that

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) We are under. We're under the care and treatment of adult offenders, and I have been listening fairly close and I think the honourable member is starting to stray away from what we are under discussion. I know I have allowed a certain amount of laxity in this debate, but I think we should get back to the debate under what we're under. We are now under care and treatment of adult offenders, we are not . . .

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your remarks, but I would like to find in section of crime?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with, I think that the honourable member is dealing with a grievance on crime.

MR. MALINOWSKI: I don't want . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! You should be making that under the Minister's Salary. I would caution the member to come back to the item under discussion. --(Interjection)-- No, you cannot continue if you're going to continue speaking what you are continuing on. I would ask the honourable member to come back to the resolution. The resolution is the Care and Treatment of Adult Offenders, Salaries.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, judging by the large numbers who have been in and out of jail, perhaps life in jail isn't so hard to take. (I will be talking about jail now.) The food for example is not only edible, but good - steak is served. Mr. Chairman, many of my constituents cannot afford to eat steak. The menu in jail is, I daresay, better than thousands of people outside jail can afford on their low incomes, and for the person who has not been able to afford to eat regularly because of lack of money, the fare is regular, substantial and nourishing.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just put on the record a menu from one jail which we have in Manitoba, Stony Mountain. Breakfast, for instance . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not under provincial jurisdiction. The average menu from Headingley, that would be in order, but not Stony Mountain.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Well, in making the research I didn't get a menu yet from Headingley. Okay, I didn't get it. So, I'm sorry. I don't want to, you know, put certain figures. But anyhow, it's not surprising for me that a former Minister of Crown and former member of this Chamber went to jail so willingly because it's really comfort in my opinion. --(Interjection)-- No, if you like it, you may.

Mr. Chairman, from this perspective, is freedom such a desirable commodity? This much is sure, those that engage in crime are willing to take the chance of losing their freedom, repeat offenders have no great fear of being sent to jail, it becomes a way of life.

Let us consider the attitudes of the prisoners themselves. A few years ago the CBC had an hour-long documentary dealing with life in Canadian prisons, and the attitudes of the prisoners, those interviewed - and many of them had been in prison before - stated they did not think their prison term would reform them. Furthermore, most thought that they would not have much chance to go straight, even if they wanted to, when their terms were up. Finding a steady job with a prison record is not an easy matter. One prisoner went so far as to say that he would not consider a life working from 8-5 at low pay. He bluntly stated that he would risk his freedom again, on the chance that his next big hold-up would set him up for life. On the other hand, if he failed, he stated that he wouldn't mind serving another term in jail. He was willing to take the chance.

Where does this leave us? We send people to jail and deprive them of their freedom until they have paid their debt to society. This is one of the greatest ironies about our prison set-up. People sent to jail are given free room and board without any obligations to the society they have offended. In fact, it costs taxpayers \$24.31 per day, or roughly \$9,000 per year to support one man in Headingley. And what for? So he can come out and begin again? He is virtually the same when he comes out as when he goes in, and he has cost a substantial amount of money. If this is unsatisfactory and obviously it is, what are the alternatives?

Working from the premise that jail is not a rest home or a recreation centre like the Honourable Member for Swan River says, we can begin by employing those prisoners in useful work for regular wages. Part of their earnings could be used to make restitution to the victims of their crimes or to support their wives and children. This should not be busy work. Regular work should be part of the efforts to rehabilitate them. This work should be trade orientated, thereby training the prisoners for productive employment when they leave. It could also

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) provide a challenge and eventually a sense of accomplishment. Their earnings, apart from their maintenance, should be set aside for them so that when they get out they will have a small nest egg to tide them over until they become established.

Tied up with this idea of productive employment is the proposition of making prisons self-supporting. This was tried in the U. S. A. from 1829-1929. They actually turned the state prisons in the industrial north into factories. This possibly could be investigated.

Major reforms in this field must, of course, be effected on a national scale. Hopefully, however, some effective reforms can be introduced on a provincial level. I hope other honourable members will have some worthwhile suggestions.

In the meantime, I commend the Minister and his staff for the way they handle their very difficult and frustrating job. In the past, prisoners were subjected to rather harsh and inhuman treatment. Certainly we don't want to go back to that. At the same time, I don't think our prisons should become hotels where the wrongdoers in our society can get free room and board at taxpayers' expense as a reward for having committed a crime.

According to the annual report of the Solicitor-General for 1973-74 there were 526 inmates in Stony Mountain in March 31, 1974. For 1973, the average daily population in Headingley was 230. We have a lot of able-bodied men locked up. It costs the taxpayer far more to support one person in prison than to support one person on welfare. But quite apart from the public expense is the fact that prison life can prove demoralizing rather than rehabilitative.

I believe our treatment of prisoners should be enlightened and humane. Humane treatment to my mind should mean time served in prison should be spent in a constructive way, improving their education, learning a trade, doing useful and constructive work. It should also mean learning to bear the responsibility for their own maintenance and that of their dependents through their work in jail. Instead of spending so much of their time idle, prisoners should be fully occupied preparing and planning for a new start.

I am fully aware of the fact that reform does not happen overnight. I further realize the difficulties of implementing reform of the nature I am suggesting. Nevertheless every individual is equally responsible for the health of our society, and it is our moral duty to work towards the real rehabilitation of those confined in our prisons today. This at least is a positive step towards the ultimate goal, a society in which each member is a productive and contributing citizen. Thank you for your kindness, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm going to be very brief. And I'd like to compliment the member who just spoke. I think his statements, whether they may have been wandering a fair amount from the clauses that we're on, were something we should all listen to. And towards the end when he got down to punishment, as to what we should do regarding punishment, people who are in our jails and what they should be doing in our jails is very right. I don't think we have any argument with him.

I would just like to say that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources took the opportunity to try and make a statement or statements that would have people think that the members on this side are extreme in their punishment or extreme in their attitudes towards jails. He brought in capital punishment which we have never talked about here tonight. He talked about putting somebody's hands behind their back with a black hood on their head, etc. It's not what we were talking about here tonight. It certainly isn't what I was talking about earlier. And he used the occasion because I happened to go to a school where they - and he remembers the school I went to, he came up in the same district in the school I went to, he even went to Toph's, the place where I used to go and sneak cigarettes, etc., and he knew the punishments that were upon a person in the school that I went to, which might have been six across the rear end. And he chose to take that little statement that I made as what we may believe in on this side, and which was practically wrong.

I go back again and very briefly say to the Minister that nobody on this side has been talking about capital punishment in this debate. I'm the only one that said I got six across the rear-end and that doesn't really say what this side's opinion is. --(Interjection)-- No, it might not have cured me. --(Interjection)-- Yes. It really boils down to that I may have just a little tougher rear-end than some of the others.

A MEMBER: That's callouses, sitting down too much.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And I might say, Mr. Chairman, just to wind up what I said to the Minister. Nobody on this side is saying go out with a gun or go out with a paddle or go out with a guillotine or anything of that nature, and the Minister of Mines should not be allowed to interpret it that way. He's a lawyer. I don't know of any lawyer that likes to see a client they defend be punished, it's basically against their grain. So they really think that way basically.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I said to you earlier or, Mr. Chairman, what I said to the Minister earlier was this. Maybe there is a time when the Minister has to look at a little more discipline - and I keep using that word because I don't know of a better one - to people who have had or been convicted against a crime against society to be put in the position of maybe not wanting to come back. I would sincerely hope the Minister does not interpret my remarks the same as the Minister of Mines and Resources. The interpretation of my remarks are basically this. That I hope the Minister believes that we know that all the rehabilitation the other member just speaking was speaking of, we believe in. And I sincerely know that he believes in them. But I am saying to him that he has to take the position, he has to take the position not basically on criminal offence or something, or murder, that's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about offences against society where there maybe should be some more authority or discipline used so the criminal will not come back. The member who just spoke really said that, that we make it very nice for them but we don't do anything in rehabilitation. We make it very nice for them, we do many things in rehabilitation and maybe there has to be some discipline.

For the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to use the analogy between Headingley and the Hilton Hotel which we have jokingly made tonight, is really wrong; nobody even thinks that the Headingley Jail is anywhere near what the Hilton may be, but the Minister chose to exaggerate that point.

A MEMBER: We'll ask Joe Borowski about that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He chose to exaggerate that point and quite frankly I know that - no, I don't know - that the Headingley Jail is the same as the Hilton but I am well aware that it isn't. So what the Minister of Mines said, just forget, just forget it, what we're saying on this side. And, you know, he brought in Spiro Agnew and all of this sort of nonsense. Nobody on this side even mentioned that. All we are mentioning and requesting of the Minister is, yes, we believe in rehabilitation. Yes, we believe in the work that he is doing, but maybe there is an area of a little more discipline and responsibility to society, when you have been convicted of a crime.

. . . . continued on next page

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, the subject that is being discussed here tonight is perhaps one that has not been discussed enough in this Chamber, one that has been a continuing debate for a number of years. And I recall becoming involved in the debate on capital punishment in the House of Commons in 1966. One thing that struck me about that particular debate was that the pro abolitionists and those who were opposed, all had their reference material from the same set of statistics and it was a curious thing that they could prove opposite sides of that particular argument with the same set of statistics.

I know one other thing on this question. That you're not going to change anybody's mind. It's a highly emotionally-charged issue that one has a feeling about one way or the other and depending on your point of view, I think one can successfully defend either side of the argument.

The question of prison reform has been one that has lived with us for a good many years and there have been attempts made over the years to introduce changes in our penal system, to adopt what are generally termed as progressive ideas in dealing with the commission of crime. And I would like to think that one of the earlier changes that were made, and I think a real step forward in dealing with this whole question, was done by the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Fulton, when he introduced amendments to the Criminal Code that provided for different classifications of murder. Prior to that time honourable gentlemen will know that the conviction of murder carried with it the mandatory death penalty and the change that was made at that time provided that there would be first and second degree classifications, second degree classification would not call for the mandatory sentence. Since that time governments seem to have become more and more reluctant to take the ultimate position and for reasons that were, I think, quite properly outlined by the Minister of Mines and Resources earlier this evening.

But what has not been debated sufficiently, in my view, in this whole subject, is not just the difference in the kind of society that we live in and the new problems that has brought along with it, but some of the more underlying and fundamental reasons behind the changes that have taken place over the years, they were touched upon by the Member for Point Douglas. And without attempting to violate the rules, Mr. Chairman, I think it's proper to say that perhaps the debate that's taking place in the other Chamber right now is in some way related to this whole subject. I don't think there's any question that the amount of violence that is being portrayed on the television these days must have a bearing on the impressionable minds of a good many young people.

It was interesting also to note just last evening, if one watched the late news, a news story emanating from, I believe it was Maryland, where the State legislators are now making an effort to reverse a decision that was taken a few years ago about lowering the drinking age. And there were some very startling statistics that were outlined in that short newscast which have prompted the legislators in the State of Maryland - Massachusetts or Maryland, I'm not sure which one it was - to now think about taking the serious step of reversing - and I don't know how they will succeed in doing that because sometimes it's very difficult to reverse your field on an issue like that - and bringing the drinking age back up again to 19, 20 or wherever it was prior to the most recent change.

The statistics that were quoted indicated a very startling entry into crime by juveniles as early - and not only entering into crime but alcoholism, severe cases - as early at 12 years of age. If that makes any contribution to the commission of crime, then I think all legislators must look very seriously at the step that was taken by this Legislature, and I think pretty well endorsed by every member here thinking it was a progressive step, I think what we should be doing is examining those so-called progressive steps that we took a few years ago and determine whether or not those steps have not led to the greater problem that we're being faced with today in dealing with a rise in the crime rate and a somewhat casual attitude towards commission of crime as manifested just recently in Montreal. When normally law-abiding labour people will start to use the technique of taking hostages in a labour dispute, it seems to me that the kind of respect for law and order that we would hope our citizens would have has been somewhat diminished. What is the cause of this disrespect for law and order?

Well mention was made tonight by one of the members to the effect that criminals should not be allowed to see hockey games and with that comment I would wholeheartedly agree, because the kind of violence that takes place on the rink that even a hardened criminal shouldn't be subjected to. Particularly junior hockey. But with that aside, I do think that the dependency

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) is on the part of a good many of us to look at crime today in terms of what might have existed a number of years ago and many of us, I think, make the very serious mistake of assuming that those who commit crimes have, and perhaps we cannot think otherwise, have normal minds. We do not look beyond that screen to determine just what kind of a mentality exists that encourages or even compels a person to break the law or commit crimes or even think that he can live a life of crime forever and get away with it.

Well do you treat that kind of a person simply by punishing him? Because in my view, punishment to that kind of a criminal will have no effect at all. I think perhaps there is an argument that can be made that punishment to the person who thought he could get away with something and really isn't a criminal at heart, might have some effect. He can be taught to respect law and order. But can you really do that to a person who is a habitual criminal, who by some quirk in his makeup, in his mentality, decides on a life of crime. I think not. I don't think that any kind of punishment, any kind of treatment is going to do that much good; at the same time, society must be protected against those. So you arrive at the question of how do you best protect society from those who, by their nature, look upon the commission of crime as a vocation rather than as an episode that they are going to try and get away with if they can possibly do it.

Well how do we deal with that type of criminal and are we looking at the whole question in the perspective of the criminal himself? Are we capable of looking into that mind and determining how he can be adjusted? I doubt very much if we have devised means of doing that or if we have the people in our institutions who are capable. I honestly believe that it is in that area that perhaps we have been most lax in determining whether or not there is any kind of a treatment that is possible in order to protect society without just simply filling up more and more and more jails.

I would ask the Minister if his department has looked into that particular aspect of crime prevention or treatment of prisoners and if there are any solutions that he has that may deal with that situation effectively.

I'd like to draw to the attention of the House, and perhaps some honourable members have read Arthur Hailey's book "Wheels" in which he described a person who had been involved in crime for a good many years and how the automobile manufacturing company had attempted to find a job for him in that particular factory and the difficulties that they had. And even after having found work for him in the car manufacturing plant, how eventually he was encouraged and finally persuaded by the criminal element to revert to a life of crime right within the factory. It makes one wonder if rehabilitation of the criminal mind is a science that we have not been able to master at this point. And I ask the Minister if, in his limited experience in his portfolio, if any discussions or any decisions have been made to determine whether or not such rehabilitation of that kind of criminal is possible. I mentioned I think in the debate last night that a separation, first of all an identification of that kind of a criminal is, I think, absolutely essential. And then an isolation of that criminal or a segregation of that criminal from the other types, the type that may be rehabilitated by incarceration for a period of time, and then a program of rehabilitation.

I asked the Minister last night if that had been achieved in our present institutions and I ask him again if that kind of desegregation, the program that is currently being carried on to ensure that the hardened criminal, the seasoned one and the habitual one and perhaps the chronic one, is not able to direct his influence and indeed his expertise and influence on those who can be rehabilitated. And I think it's very critical that if we are to rehabilitate those that it is possible to rehabilitate, that this be done and I would appreciate the Minister's response to that particular question at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: I've been listening for about an hour and a half and perhaps you will allow me to answer some of the questions generally and then come back and answer some of them more specifically.

The Minister of Mines when we first came into the House gave a speech which I thought was up to his usual excellence and he talked about us as legislators. And my mind went back to it and I couldn't help but sit here and think in listening to the debate that really every member in the room is here because they're primarily interested in people. Now we may differ in our philosophies but nevertheless I couldn't help but listening to the various arguments and thinking

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) really we're all talking about the same thing. We're using different emotions, we're using different language but nevertheless we're talking about the same thing. And I think it's basically what I said when I introduced my estimates last night that what we have to do is develop a system in my judgment that protects society, that is responsible and functional as far as being assistance to the courts, and in trying to do something about helping these people correct their behaviour so that they can get along with themselves and others.

Now the argument about the utility of penance, or "penalty" or penitentiaries, you know these things will probably go on but nevertheless the reason that some groups are rather steeped in this tradition . . . when the Member for Swan River was talking, I understood what he was talking about. When the Member for Sturgeon Creek was talking, I understood what he was talking about because I myself was raised in that milieu. I can't help but I think that the Member for Swan River was a former RCMP officer and I, as a child living in Elm Creek, practically idolized a chap by the name of Rankin who was the Mountie from Carman, the detachment was at Carman. I was raised on Horatio Alger books and thought that the way to get society to change was within that tradition, that milieu, and I believed, and I still believe I suppose to a certain sense, in people that are prone to quoting Bibles and that one of the sayings is that unless you do penance you shall all likewise perish. Well that to me may not mean what it means to someone else but really I'm not dealing with my problems in life, I'm dealing with other people's problems and I'm trying to help each individual to solve their problems.

And when the Member for Morris asked me what are we doing to identify a criminal propensity or a criminal attitude or, you know, there are some people who suggest in the scientific field that there is a chromosomal aberration that results in criminal behaviour and this sort of thing, and you get various and sundry opinions written, you know, just exactly what leads to criminality. I said quite some time ago (I have a fortunate relationship with the press and they ignore me) but I had said before the negotiations with some of our people in forensic services came to the attention of the public that in my judgment we weren't paying these people enough money. I'm glad I didn't get involved in the debate that took place rather ad hoc here recently because when you ask me what are we doing, I really can't do anything. And the staff that I have, and I think that we are very fortunate in Manitoba in the staff that we have in the correctional services, because it is difficult, as the Member for Fort Rouge pointed out to attract people to the correctional service. I don't want to comment more on that at the present time to make things more difficult for my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, who is at the present time negotiating with the employees.

I said earlier, that in conversation with John Berry on CKY this evening, that I can't do anything without the support of the community. I can't do anything without the support of this House unless the House is willing, my colleagues on the government side, my colleagues on the Opposition, are willing to support the type of commitment and it's not just a commitment in dollars, it's a commitment in the programs. I appreciated very much some of the constructive criticism of the Member from Fort Rouge that unless we get together on this, we're really not going to solve some of the problems.

Now there is evidence around - one paper comes to mind, a study that was done in British Columbia - that suggested there is a relationship, I'll get to the member's specific question in a moment, there is a relationship between the increase of social illness, if you will, and the density or the concentration of people. The closer you pack people together the more sick in the head they get, and more divorce rates occur, the more alcoholism and all the rest of it. Society has, of course, a lot to learn in this field and in other fields. It takes, I would suggest, and I'm glad that we have the type of people that we have . . . I said last night that the former Superintendent of Headingley Jail left the province and went somewhere else and was given more money, and in a few months was named Man of the Year for doing something for which our staff in the Province of Manitoba gets criticism for, that we're not doing enough.

I would like to take this House and a couple of ST-27Bs or whatever you have available and take you up to The Pas to see the "Hilton" at The Pas. Or I'd like to take you out to Brandon and show you the "Hilton" in Brandon.

Now hopefully the Member for Fort Rouge asked me a bit about capital and I'll answer that perhaps briefly in this regard. If you press the First Minister in his Capital Supply Bill, you know, for the general purposes he would ask his Ministers, one of whom I happen to have the honour to be, I would tell you that there is in the Capital Supply Bill in general purposes

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) some \$4.4 million relative to correctional institutions. And some of this is allocated for what we hopefully, hopefully I repeat, want to put in place in Brandon.

Now it has been my wont in the past, and I firmly believe it, that if you're in a community you deal with the elected people in that community. And in the City of Brandon, the Member for Brandon East and I discuss where we are, what we're thinking about in these institutions and I ask him to be patient because I'm not still in the position to say that we're ready to commit, the latest figure seven millions of dollars to build a facility in Brandon of this magnitude. But yet people ask questions. They say, "What are you doing with remands?" Well remands have to be separate from the main prison or main correctional facilities. They say, "What are you doing for juveniles?" These have to be separate. "What are you doing for women?" These have to be separate. "What are you doing for men?" These have to be separate.

The concept in Brandon, as it has evolved to this point in time, you have seven different populations in one institution. Now this word "institution" has been badly bandied about in Canada, especially in the correction field, and literature comes out that we have more people in prisons, more people in correctional institutions than any other nation in the world. And senior voices sometimes are not heard because when you take statistics or figures, you have to ask what are you considering a prison or correctional system population? Oftimes there is the tendency to take figures from one jurisdiction and just extrapolate them relative to another and they're totally erroneous. For example, in the American system, the figures that they use don't include people that are in county jails, drunk tanks and all the rest of these sort of . . . whereas ours do. If somebody is in the correctional system, they're in the correctional system. If they're in Headingley Jail, they may be at Bannock Point when it was in existence and, hopefully, my colleagues will allow me to reconstruct that. Because at that particular camp that we had, we had an excellent individual operating it. He ran an excellent program in that the people who were transferred there, and really what this man did, I couldn't tell you, but yet with the staff that he had and these people that were sent there, they were better because of having been there.

There is really no debate that society has the right to protect itself. Even anarchy. If we took away all the laws we would develop a system that if somebody threatened to try if we'd exclude him, or stone him to death or something. This is what people do and have done it throughout history. But the only thing that separates us from the apes, I would suggest, is our hope that we can evolve a system of law and order in a social sense. If you look around this room, we record such endeavours. We've got up here Codex Gregorianus, Codex Napoleon, Codex Julius Caesar, Codex Leviticus - what's the other one? --(Interjection)--Right. And that wouldn't be too bad either, I suppose.

But back to the specific questions. The Member for Birtle-Russell, perhaps he can read it in Hansard, but he asked me what did we do to ensure that the people that were being sentenced were serving their sentences. The people who are committed to the institutions are done so by virtue of a piece of paper which is called a warrant, I understand, and it says on this warrant what has to be done with this individual, and I'm sorry to refer to human beings in this regard, but they're accounted for. And the books have to balance and this is one of the things that the staff is responsible for is to see that the charge of the court is discharged. This is one thing - I'm at the mercy of the courts really - we have no control over our custom. You see, we deal with the people who are sent to us by the courts. I just use the word "us". I would like to just interject in that regard that if I fumble the ball somewhere along the line, I want to apologize to my staff for having done so.

One of the problems that was referred to by the Member for Swan River, you know the idea of a more stringent control or a punitive process. I've been in this House, what five, six years now and I know the Member for Swan River and I know what he means by that. And really, what we're talking about is in some way getting through to an individual. In his own self-interest, perhaps, he should smarten up.

You know, I can't help thinking when I was a youngster in the City of Winnipeg, there used to be a fellow, a policeman that road a bicycle around and he was about 9 feet tall and he had great big boots. And if he caught you doing something, I mentioned it to you before, he'd give you a butt in the rear-end with his boot. But he did it in a kind of a way that it really

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) wasn't, what some people would think as punishment, cruel, vindictive punishment. And I don't know how you could put that in a system.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek says he got six on the backside. Well, perhaps the reason that he's sitting on that side is he only got six because my grandmother couldn't count, she just kept . . . I got clobbered quite often with a stick out of the woodbox. I think every one I got hit with was split, there was never a round one in there. And I don't, at 51 years of age, think I have some kind of bent in the back of my mind that these people were cruel to me or anything. Because it was never done in vindictiveness. But I don't know how you can instil that kind of thing in a system. Where as the Member for Inkster said, the Minister of Mines said, where a man is taken out, he's laid on a bench and he's paddled with a paddle by some guard who is supposed to be, you know, impartial. I think that kind of thing is degrading, I don't think it accomplishes the purpose for which it was intended.

I know when I was a teacher, the kids used to laugh at me because I had what I called "Boyce's Board of Education", it was a 1 x 4, and one of my things was that if - these are teen-aged kids - and one of the things was if the fellows misbehaved the punishment was swift and sure, was come up to the front of the room and touch your toes and they got one whack on the backside. It didn't hurt. It was degrading in a sense, but - humiliation, it was a little bit humiliating, but the kids I bump into now that are men in our society, they laugh about it. I quit giving kids the strap on the hand because the only time I ever did it I strapped a kid for something he didn't do. But that's an aside.

The questions that the members have raised are serious questions, and especially in the area of capital punishment. I'm sorry, the discharge and the sentence is a provincial responsibility. The people in the correctional system at Headingley Jail would be called upon to discharge the sentence should the appeal mechanisms and the ultimate prerogative of a Cabinet of the Federal Government not be exercised.

I wish to say, and I was a little bit chagrined at my colleague for up-staging me a bit because I have a wire to send to Warren Allmand tomorrow supporting his position on capital punishment. But at the same time I am asking him to insist that the Criminal Code be changed so that the policemen know that this is a condition of employment when they start and that the society accept this as a condition of employment. This has been my position for quite some time; in fact I even wrote a letter to the Law Reform Commission on it quite some time ago, that the policemen who are in the field, if you will, they are called upon just as much as any soldier in the front line, in my judgment, especially with some of the conditions that prevail in our society, and their employment conditions should reflect this. I think that the local police law enforcement officers should be entitled to the same considerations as soldiers are, as RCMP officers are; that they should be eligible for earlier retirement, because society is demanding much of these people.

While law enforcement is under the purview of the Attorney-General, nevertheless it is part of a continuum in a justice system. We as legislators change the roles of people, and sometimes in my judgment we do not attend to the problems that we create for these people. The Member for Morris refers to the problem of alcohol abuse. Here in our wisdom a few years ago we passed an Intoxicated Persons Detention Act which made it no longer a criminal offence to be publicly inebriated, and then we still expect the policemen who traditionally we have asked to apprehend people who are caught in the commission of an offence, to become social workers, in that they are required and asked to take people who are not involved in a criminal activity and attend to them. In my judgment we erred in not taking this into consideration at the time.

If we are to say that the concept or the idea of capital punishment or death for certain offences should no longer be on the statute books, we owe it to the people who are involved in rather hazardous, rather hazardous - right at the present time there is under review an appeal - I don't know whether it should be considered sub judice as far as reference in the House is concerned, but a guard here recently in one of the federal institutions was killed. And really, in checking into it we are informed that it was a fit of anger that this person picked up something and the guard died. If we say to the people who are in the correctional institutions that this is one of the hazards of employment, then they should know that, they should know that these are the conditions under which they are working, we should kid them not.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

Just back briefly to the staffing of the . . . one of my apprehensions is advancing more rapidly than we can train staff - and when I say train staff, I mean helping the new people that are coming into the system. You know the people that are in the system, the people that have done the job that we have asked of them, this Legislature, society, have done an excellent job. We changed the roles a couple of times and asked them to change and they've only been too willing to change. But nevertheless it's not just enough for us to say in this Legislature, here your job is different. We have to give them the support that is necessary.

My experience, as the Member for Morris says, as a Minister of the Crown in this regard is not that extensive, but nevertheless I was involved in an educational system that was asked to change, and I know the difficulty that the people face within that system. There was a very conscientious teacher at St. John's with whom I taught, who spent 40 years at that one school, and he taught chemistry. And all of a sudden they came along with a new textbook and they said you no longer can teach chemistry in the old way, you have to teach it this new way. And the fellow tried to change. He went out to university and took a course in chem. studies. Instead of teaching some aspects of this thing by rote, he let the people learn by themselves - and in the staff room in discussions, the guy just said candidly, he said, "I can't change!"

I would hazard a guess that the people that were exposed to this teacher had as good, if not better, understanding of chemistry when they left him than they did some of the others who were . . . --(Interjection)-- I'm glad the Member for Swan River, you know, sees my parallel before I mention it. Because the people within the institutions that have been there for awhile, that have been there for awhile, some of them years, and a goodly number of them are coming up for retirement - excellent men - the problem is not with these people; the problem is, as mentioned earlier, is attracting people to the system; that we are fortunate in that we are getting a few people that are interested and are willing to become involved in this. But I have a problem and I would ask you this question: If I can make \$1.75 an hour more pulling nails than I can for being a correctional officer on the floor in one of our provincial institutions - what job would you take?

One of the things that we did here in the past year - just while I'm shuffling all these notes that were written to me in answer to some of the specific questions that were asked - not to do some fast reorganizational work that doesn't accomplish anything - but within the department we now have a director of corrections, then we have an assistant director of corrections for adults and an assistant director of corrections for juveniles, and they're two excellent people in these two fields. The one in adults has been - shortly after I came in as Minister, one of my first pleasant duties was to appoint Mr. Doug Lawrence as Assistant Director for adults. And Mr. Hunter for juveniles has been with us - how many months now? - since January. I knew it wasn't that long but I couldn't remember whether it was January or February. And just in that regard, perhaps we could undertake to have an unofficial non-partisan advisory group to the ministry of corrections. I'd be only too glad to sit down with the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Morris or anyone else to discuss some of these things.

But with reference to work training, most of the sentenced people are . . . the fellows in the system and the women in the system try and assess, you know, what we can do to help these people. Now there was reference made to the bureaucratic decision to close Headingley farm. I'm sorry, it wasn't bureaucrats, it was me; I made that decision. And I said earlier when we were talking about the . . . that the times have changed, that the staff people have tried to develop work activities, which there's no disagreement in that, that the work activities that they're trying to develop are related to jobs which they can go into when they get out. I think I said earlier that the farm when they first established it back in the late 1920s, '29, was it? - 1929 - was a show piece. The herd was a thoroughbred herd, they really operated as a show piece and a very efficient one. But the sentences were longer there and the types of activity or employment that a person could become involved in in the 20s, 30s, 40s, it served as a training function. But nevertheless the whole farm was built labour-intensive and it didn't fit in as either a productive capacity within the system or as a training facility within the system. Because what you end up with in Headingley Jail as a population, you must remember, are those that are left within a pretty strict custodial system. I guess the term in the field is almost maximum security type of thing. If you think of all the prerogatives which are exercised before a person comes into the correctional system, the Crown has certain

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) prerogatives, can stay prosecutions in certain instances, the courts can discharge unconditionally, they can discharge conditionally, they can suspend sentences, they can put on probation. There are so many things that can, you know, be done in trying to help these people, to keep them out of the institution, which may - I think it was referred to by some member opposite, I can't recall, I think it was the Member for Morris, that they actually become institutionalized and the institutions contribute to their institutionalization sort of thing, a vicious circle type of thing. So many judgments are made trying to deal with this individual with the two goals once again in mind, to protect society and to help the person, modify their behaviour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister's time has elapsed. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: I would like to ask the Minister a very specific question arising from some of his comments. When the Minister stated that he was going to send a telegram to Mr. Allmand tomorrow, I want to ask the Minister if that is the official position of the Government of Manitoba on the question of capital punishment, and I would like the Minister to explain more fully what he intends to include in that telegram.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, if I may move from the philosophical to the more practical area of works and bricks. I noticed that the Minister in his remarks a moment ago, mentioned that he had hope that there were going to be some progress made in the replacement of the second largest correctional institution in Manitoba in the WesMan area. I know that the Minister has only been in his portfolio and had these responsibilities for less than a year, so this is the first time that he's expressed that hope. We've had that hope expressed by his predecessors I think for three or four years, and it's for at least three years that the appropriation has been included in Capital Supply for the replacement of the Brandon Correctional Institution.

I wonder if the Minister now can give us something more than just a general expression of his hope for the future in this respect. We mentioned before that about some time prior to the last election a sign was erected on a certain site in the area announcing that this was the site of the imminent erection of a new Brandon Correctional Institution. The sign now is weathered and losing some of its gloss, but the message is still there. I know the people of Brandon would like to know whether or not the Minister is prepared now to go ahead and whether he proposes to proceed with the commencement of construction during the current construction year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Well, to the Member for Brandon West. Firstly, I don't want to go to Brandon and put a new coat of paint on that sign. I hope to be in a position by the end of the month to give a decision one way or the other on the evidence that I have, and I will express my hope again that my colleagues will support my position that we should go ahead with this particular institution. There is one final argument to be resolved, I'll be quite candid about it. It was alluded to somewhat by the Member for Fort Rouge.

The argument is, and it is a sincere argument, that large institutions is perhaps not the best way to have some therapeutic process take place. But having said that, a large institution is not what is envisaged. See, when somebody thinks of a large institution they think of some of the jurisdictions in other countries or other parts of Canada perhaps where they're huge, they're dealing with thousands of people. If we are to have a range of services available within the correctional system - once again let me repeat, for only a million people - then we have to think very carefully of where these are located and what type of facility and staff and people we put in each one of them. And the staff has been most responsible in this regard; that their thinking has been concise and the recommendations have been, you know, that in my judgment the Brandon institution fits into this type of thinking. That we have a facility at Headingley, we have one at Brandon and we have what is evolving in the North, hopefully.

The First Minister in another regard talked about the necessity of making long-range commitments with reference to atomic energy and I would suggest perhaps we should consider the long-range commitment of capital to upgrade the correctional system in Manitoba and we plan it well. Because, once again, I have to repeat it, we only have a million people, but yet we want to try and keep as close to the community as possible the people who we have to deal

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) with, because there is no quarrel among the authorities that the closer you can keep the people to their communities, the more chance you have in having them change their behaviour.

With reference to the question from the Member for Birtle-Russell, I said I would be sending a wire to Warren Allmand and I still have a right as an individual. I don't speak for the Province of Manitoba unless . . . I'm the Minister of Corrections, I'm a member of the Legislature for Winnipeg Centre, and I'm also Bud Boyce. I don't, you know, divorce myself from any one of those. --(Interjection)-- Well sometimes when I'm a Christian, I speak for my Jewish friends. But it is a serious question and when the Member for Morris was speaking I was thinking of the idea perhaps we should introduce a resolution into the Legislature to discuss this matter. I perhaps would be willing to move such a motion if the Member for Morris would be willing to second it and we can have a non-partisan debate on this issue and the Solicitor General can have an understanding of where the representatives of the people, the Province of Manitoba, feel relative to the dilemma which faces them at the moment. --(Interjection)-- Well as Judge Sirica said, he may be in error but he's never in doubt. In this particular case I would have to say that also. I may err but I have no doubt what my position is. I may not have support in the government or in the community.

I'm sorry, the debate has gone on and we've gone around, and I have a couple of notes here that I didn't answer earlier. And I didn't identify it, I'm sorry, but someone asked the question about intermittent sentences. (The Member for Fort Rouge). There seems to be considerable doubt about the efficacy of intermittent sentences firmly expressed by all people in the system. And I understand that there is a session going on between the correctional people and the benches and hopefully, you know, there will be a reassessment. You see, this is, as I mentioned earlier, we are faced with a dilemma that, you know, well the courts ask us what our capacity is, I understand, and what we can do in certain instances, nevertheless the prerogative of the courts is such that - and I support this contention that the sentencing function should be left with the courts. You know, somewhere along the line people have to make judgments and we select people from our society to act on our behalf. There are people from the legal profession and people who are charged with the responsibility of understanding what the society wants in this regard. It is their responsibility to determine sentence. But I also said earlier that it is our responsibility to the courts to try and develop a system to give them some range of alternatives in their sentencing practices.

With reference to people in work camps, I referred to that a little earlier with reference to Bannock Point, which regrettably burned down, but in 1974 I am informed that about 25 per cent of all the people who were in sentence were in some type of work activities.

I would just remind all members that the Correction Act stipulates that any member of the Legislature is entitled to visit any correctional institution at any time, and I would only be too glad . . . if somebody wants to go, I'd be glad to go or you can go by yourself or anything else. Hopefully some of the members will choose to come to the opening of one of the phases of the development that is taking place in Headingley, I think it's in June - June 19th - and I think the intention is to lay on a bus that members of the Legislature can go to attend this function.

With reference to the Solicitor-General in another dimension, the nature of government is such that, you know, sometimes there develops a little bit of by-play between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, but I think we are fortunate in the Liberal Government's selections of Solicitors-General because this incumbent is one of the most co-operative people that I have ever worked with; the programs that they have worked out with the staff here, and hopefully next week when we're in Victoria, we will make some more progress in this regard because he and his staff, his deputy, Roger T . . . is only too willing to co-operate. I'm sorry that some of the other Ministers I can't say the same, but nevertheless he is very co-operative.

Someone mentioned earlier about a former member of the Legislature being one of the recipients of our services. I can assure you that he will receive the same treatment that any other recipient receives and be entitled to the same counselling. --(Interjection)-- Well this is one of the difficulties, it's of short duration I understand.

One member on my senior staff said in 1967 this Legislature and the Correction Act repealed the Gaols Act. I still can't get used to this English spelling, and I think we should

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) change that. I think a jail is j-a-i-l.

We've covered all the points, but I just may say briefly, that with the correctional system, it's one thing . . . of course I'm always accused by people such as the Member for Brandon East when he says get away from philosophy and down to facts. This is kind of a cute put off I think sometimes that we allow ourselves, you know, that really we are not talking about the problem. But I suggest we are. It's complex, but when you ask me about a correctional system and I refer to such things as people saying how close together we pack people makes them sick in the head, and somebody says, you know, you're philosophizing again. That I suggest is not true. It's a fact. It's just as much of a fact if I drop that box of matches and it falls down as a demonstration of a fact and these other things are demonstrations of fact. Yet because societies and people don't understand facts and aren't ready yet to cope with them, you know, this is one of the problems that we're faced with.

And one of the things that we're faced with, I would suggest in this whole area of having the necessity of a correctional system, is that a lot of people misunderstood Spock, you know, the idea that you've got to be nice to your kids and you pamper them and everything else, which was a total distortion of what Spock said. But nevertheless the kind of people not developing a sense of discipline as mentioned by the Member for Sturgeon Creek when he said that, you know, people have to have a sense of discipline, I don't disagree with him at all in that regard. People somewhere along the line have to learn that they have to suffer the consequences of their acts and if they don't learn it, then they just keep getting themselves into trouble.

I think that in the next few years you will hear more about a third alternative in an educational system. You know, we've heard about the three "r's" and the kind of permissive type of thing, I think you'll hear other alternatives as far as an educational system is concerned, because I think that one of the things that we're faced with is the necessity of taking a good look at our whole manner in which we bring up children. We're talking about the increase of juvenile "misbehaviour", if you will, I'm not thinking so much of criminal activity, but nevertheless vandalism is a manifestation of misbehaviour, a rather serious one I will agree. Nevertheless if we don't take a good look at the way we're bringing up our children - that's not true the way we're hiring people to bring up our children - I don't really think that we're going to be able to afford the type of services that we're going to require.

So unless there's some other questions, I think I've answered everything that was asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just go back to the bricks for a moment. I noted that the Minister hoped to make an announcement in about a month about the new correctional facility at Brandon but he said that there are some problems still to be resolved and then he spoke about the size of such institutions and the problems relating to that decision. I assume that if he's in a position to make an announcement within a month, or hopes to make one, that he has already made some decisions about those problems and that some actual designs have been completed and that he will be able to say at this stage what size he is proposing.

I would like to ask the Minister if it's the intention of the department to include facilities for both male and female prisoners as presently exist. If the institute will include holding units for juvenile offenders. I believe that function is being performed now in the old institution at Brandon. If there are any facilities contemplated in the new building that will provide some short-term detoxification treatment for prisoners. Those are three areas in which perhaps the Minister can tell us what the present plans include.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: I might just say to the present time I think it's some \$400, 000 that I have expended relative to the Brandon Correctional Institution for architectural drawings and specifications. I'm rather vulnerable in having recommended to my colleagues that we expend these moneys if I wasn't pretty well committed to, you know, proceeding with this institution. I'm quite candid about it. The member could file an Order for Return and I would give him that information anyway, so I let it sit at that.

What the member asked relative to the juveniles in Brandon, what he says is correct. When I said relative to the remand system yesterday applies to some of our facilities with reference to juveniles. They're the same range of development I would suggest. And with the seven different populations that I alluded to earlier, the Director of Corrections corrected me, it's 96 people; I had used the figure 92 people but it's 96 people. And one of the populations

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) in this that I referred to is for juveniles.

We will be dealing with the detoxification part of it under another item but nevertheless I just had to at this time, without being out of order, Mr. Chairman, inform the Member for Brandon East, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Alcoholism Foundation was in my office discussing some of the things which are being done in Brandon and under the Steering Committee which has been developed in the community and the local AFM function, hopefully an announcement will be made in that regard relatively soon also. But nevertheless I appreciate the member's concern, and really just while I'm on my feet in that regard, when I said earlier that I intend to consult with all local elected people, whether they're on that side of the House or this side of the House, it's the town councils and the chiefs of police and the reeves and all the rest of it, and in the member's own area in West Brandon we had an excellent example of what can happen as a result of when you sit down and talk to people. In this basis we had several meetings in his area with people from the board on the hospital on which the Member for Brandon West sits and other people and hopefully we can work together to solve some of these problems.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest when the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation made his statements with regards to capital punishment. I also had the opportunity of listening to the last part of the Minister of Mines and his comment with regard to capital punishment and I was somewhat dismayed, because if I understood the two Ministers correctly, what they were implying was not what the Minister stated was that we were above the ape society, and this has always been my understanding - and I'm speaking as a layman with regards to the legal profession, not as a lawyer - it has always been my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that we were about the animal kingdom. That it was not the survival of the fittest. That we had the right to defend our life and our family's life. And so that we wouldn't live in a society where we had to guard every minute, every hour, every day against fellow humans possibly taking our life, we came up with laws in our society, we came up with laws that would be enforced by certain people in our society which became recognized as policemen, as RCMPs. Now, if I understand the two Ministers correctly, that these laws that we have, we have laws in the books right now, federal laws which are enforced provincially, that state that if a policeman or a guard in a prison is shot or killed during his duty, that that individual who commits a crime will be hung. That's the law on the books today.

And if I understood the two Ministers correctly, what they are saying is exactly what the former Attorney-General, who was the Member for St. James, said with regards to rustling. That the first one's on the house. If I understood the two Ministers correctly, that's exactly what they've said. They said it's a condition of employment; if you become a policeman that you might get killed, but we won't punish that individual that kills you because the first one's on the house. Your life is on the house. That's exactly what he said. --(Interjection)-- And the Honourable Member from Point Douglas has recognized this. How do we expect to get people to enforce our laws that we as a society have established because we're above the animal kingdom, how will we get people to enforce these laws if the two Ministers stand up, the Government of Manitoba, and says "The first one's on the house, fellows out there. If you shoot somebody you're okay." Because that's exactly what you said, and if I'm wrong then please correct me. Because as far as I am concerned there has to be laws. And we're dealing with risks, we've dealt with risks throughout our whole history. And we're going to make mistakes; there are going to be innocent people hung. But how many innocent people are going to be killed because people in our society know that the first one's on the house, and if they escape the second one's on the house. If they escape again the third one's on the house. Because that's exactly what the two Ministers are saying. And I might not be a lawyer, I may be a layman, but I'm a citizen, and I know that it's wrong, and it has to be changed, because I know that a former constituent of ours, not while I was a Member of the Legislature, was a policeman, who was doing his duty, he was a person who took on the challenge to enforce the laws of our society and was shot in St. Boniface by five people, shot - maybe it was four people, I could be corrected - but shot four or five times in cold blooded murder right in a parking lot after a robbery had occurred. Were the individuals hung on that particular case? No.

Can the Minister honestly say, Mr. Chairman, that that is correct? Because what we are really saying is that we have gone back to the survival of the fittest, because under that

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . particular situation and that particular time four individuals were able to kill that person who was trying to uphold the law. That's exactly what happened. We are back to the level of the apes, back to the level of the animal kingdom, the survival of the fittest. That's exactly what we're sinking to. Mr. Chairman, exactly, if the government endorses what the two Ministers have said, that we do not endorse capital punishment. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if this is the policy of the government, that we are going to have a very difficult time in finding policemen to enforce our laws. Because what we're saying is, "You're not one of us, you're not one of our society. We've lived by laws but if you're going to enforce them you go back to the animal kingdom, you're going to be the survival of the fittest. Because if somebody is able to outgun you under a certain circumstance then that's too bad, brother. We're not going to hang anything over their head, we're not going to threaten them if they should take that chance, a criminal, to try and kill the enforcer of the law that they will be hung or they will have their death taken away."

That's exactly what you're saying, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what the Minister is saying if I understood him correctly, and exactly what the Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management was saying tonight. That the enforcers of our law in Manitoba have gone back to the way of the animal kingdom, that it will be the survival of the fittest when it comes to enforcing the law. And that will be a condition of employment.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest there's something awfully wrong with that attitude and I would hope that the two Ministers and the government would reconsider what they are suggesting, because I'm not a lawyer but I know if this continues that people in our society will say - and it's happening, it's happening right with this government. What do the people in Headingley do right now that break the law? We used to have cows out there, which was my understanding they milked and they maintained, they had fields; and I even understand now that these fields, parts of them, are leased out to people who want to grow gardens. What are the inmates of Headingley doing now? Are they just standing in line every day and waiting for their food? Sitting around? What are we doing to these people that break the laws of our society? What are we providing for them? I don't know, but all I know is I heard on the radio the other day that one of the inmates got their wishes that they wanted to go to Stony Mountain, so they escaped. So instead of getting a two year sentence they could get a three year sentence.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when we get to a point in our society where people who commit crimes want to commit another crime so they can go to a better spot, there's obviously something wrong. There has to be something wrong. And it's unfortunate that the Honourable Minister of Mines was not in his chair when I spoke earlier with regards to our feelings on capital punishment but I'm sure that he will read it in Hansard, and as my fellow colleague the Honourable Member from Morris has said, don't repeat it again. I'm sure the evening is getting late so that he wishes to terminate at some point in time. That I think it's important, it's a very important subject. That we hope that the government will reconsider the points of view that the Minister has at the present time with regards to capital punishment, because I would suggest that if this point of view is followed throughout Canada, and in Manitoba, that it's going to create a very difficult job for the law enforcers of our society. They won't have anybody on their side, and how will we expect to get good people to take on this responsibility? It may well be that we'll get people who are sadistic, people who are there for kicks, or will become the enforcers, and these aren't the people that we want. We want stable individuals, people who will know that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada are behind them. But at the present time, if I understood the two Ministers correctly, they're not. We're slipping back to the old days of the law of the apes and the law of the animal kingdom, that it's the survival of the fittest for those who enforce the law. That the first one's on the house for the gangster or the criminal. That if he shoots the policeman, the policeman knows that the guy's not going to be hung or his life taken. So the first one's on the house, the same as the rustling was suggested, as the former Attorney-General suggested many years ago, that let the first cow be on the house, then the second one's a different matter. That's exactly what the two Ministers have said with regards to the life of law enforcers in our province. That the first life is on the house. The gangster will know that this government will not enforce the death penalty if a guard or a policeman is shot during duty, and I would suggest that the Minister is going to find it a problem of getting good guards for his jails, because the government itself is not supporting them in their duty in the enforcement of the law.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

I would like to make a brief comment with regards to why in my opinion we are having the difficulties with certain individuals in our society whether adult or juvenile. Why there are more crimes being committed. And I think the reason being, and the Member for Fort Rouge indicated in other debates in the House that he has stated, you know, what can we do for the people in the centre core, or what can we do for the young people? They have nowhere to go, nothing to do, nowhere to play, streets to play in. It's not uncommon. We had the same situation in St. James and I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Mines had the same situation in his area when he was young. And it's surprising, I'm sure the Minister of Mines doesn't realize it, we have many things in common the two of us. That when we were growing up - I'm sure he doesn't realize that both our fathers shovelled coal for a living, if I understand him correctly that his father did. My father did. But there was one thing that I'm sure the Minister of Mines had in common with me when we were growing up that the youth of today and the young adults of today do not recognize, and that was that we didn't necessarily recognize it a right to have a bicycle or a right to have a suit of clothes. We knew it was a right if we worked for it.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is the basic difference in our society today and that what we grew up in as young people, was that we just didn't accept that because we were born on this earth that we had a right to a bicycle or we had a right to a suit of clothes. We worked for it. And I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Mines would say, "Yes, that's what he had to do." We were kept busy working toward this goal, we didn't have time to get into trouble, at least not as much time as the present generation seems to have. This is one of the basic problems that we have, Mr. Chairman, in my belief, with our society, is that there's too much time on the hands of individuals right now. That we have to somehow educate the people in our society that just because they're born on this earth that they don't have rights to everything and to the best. Because that is what I believe is happening, that individuals look around and say, "Hey, I should have that. It's my right." And if they can't get it through normal means then they try and get it through illegal means, many of the people do.

And then we even sort of support this particular thinking with our institutions, that when they do arrive at the institution because they've committed a crime, they are to have everything carte blanche. That's exactly what would appear has happened at Headingley. They've taken away the cattle that they had to look after. And I would like to know from the Minister just what exactly that the inmates do at Headingley now in keeping themselves busy, and why individuals would want to get out of Headingley and go to Stony Mountain and would escape for that very particular reason? And when we see people being interviewed on TV that are inmates in Headingley they say "It's a lovely place; we enjoy it." That's exactly what we saw on Channel 7 one night. I watched it and I think the majority of inmates said yes, it's a good place, that they enjoy it.

Something's awfully wrong, Mr. Chairman, when we get to a society that's in this way. We don't support the law enforcers and we give everything to the law breakers, and I hope that the Minister who is new in his particular responsibilities would review this and would hopefully correct the situation, and hopefully review his present thoughts on supporting that there be non-capital punishment in terms of when death occurs, whether it be for individuals or for police enforcers when they're on duty.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Osland): The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. James says that I'm new in this job. When he first started he said that he was speaking as a layman, as a human being. I'm not new at that. Perhaps I'm a little older at this being a human being than the Member for St. James. And I don't particularly like death no matter how it occurs - and when called upon to defend my family or defend myself, I will use that which is at my disposal to do so. --(Interjection)-- Perhaps we're still there. I don't see any difference in transgressions of the law. We write laws against this, that and the other thing, and I don't see any difference between people cheating on their income tax or stealing. I just don't see the difference. --(Interjection)-- Of course. That's it. You've done it yourselves. You've just shown exactly where it's at. If you're talking about respect for law, then I suggest that this is where people learn it. They learn it at home. And it's a big farce. It's okay to cheat this guy but not that guy. It's okay to steal from this one but not from that one. It's okay to kill this one but not that one. Here

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . recently some schnook took off from Saigon with 3-1/2 tons of gold after being responsible for the slaughter of millions, but that's all right. I spent a goodly part of my life running out of Murmansk and people shooting back and forth and killing each other. That's all right.

What I said earlier with reference to the Member for St. James' remarks what's going on at Headingley, and I'm not going to repeat myself, I suggest that he read Hansard relative to why I took the decision to phase out Headingley Jail. But I will comment on what he said relative to my position on capital punishment. I agree with what he says. It is difficult to get policemen, law enforcement people, and one of the reasons it is, is because they don't have the support of the community. I would suggest. And for people to stand up on their hind legs in self-righteous anger and talk about capital punishment relative to slayers of policemen, I think is not good enough.

I regret just as much as the Member for St. James the incident in St. Boniface and the families that were involved. But nevertheless the argument goes on. It is a matter of statute, as the member says, that persons who are guilty of certain offences, killing a prison guard and killing a policemen, are subject to be hanged, but in the same Act it says that there is a prerogative reserved to the Federal Cabinet which they, by the same law, are charged with the responsibility of exercising a discretion. So by the same law that you condemn, you waive the application of the law. And what I said . . . and I have to admit that if we got such a motion as I suggested earlier this week, we debate in this House, perhaps, to see just exactly. . . have a free vote and see how members stand on this particular issue, and with reference to what you're talking about, I would be hard-pressed to decide. And I don't want to be ambivalent about anything when it says that you have to decide.

In a conversation with some students at St. John's at the time there were some policemen in an incident in Chicago - they had a convention and somebody spit in a policeman's face - I said if I was a policeman and somebody spit in my face once. . . I wouldn't make a very good policeman. I wouldn't. I have, you know, a temper that I have learned in 51 years to control somewhat. I wouldn't make a good policeman. I'm afraid if somebody shot at me and I had a gun in my hand, I'd shoot back. But yet, when we get around to the point and say let's get rid of all the guns, let's stop manufacturing these guns, we get the hunters up on their back legs, and "Oh, I got the right to hunt. You can't take this right away from me." --(Interjection)-- No, you can't. You can't. We have too many hunters in our constituencies that want to go out and shoot and all the rest of it. I think that's too big a price to pay in our society in this day and age, that people are allowed to manufacture in the first instance. That's where you stop it. You don't stop it by selling, you stop it in manufacturing it. --(Interjection)--

But what I said earlier, as the member tries to pooh-pooh the suggestion, I say it is unfair to the policemen, it is unfair to my correctional staff, for the law as it stands at the moment where there is nobody hanged. It either is or isn't, and perhaps we should have this type of debate. At the present time I said - and I've read and read and read in trying to understand this - the evidence is such that it does not inhibit murder. You get one state here and one state there, prepare your statistics, do anything, and you come up in the same position that you have to decide pretty well on how you understand things. So don't bring in the emotional argument, as mentioned earlier by the Minister of Mines when he was talking about it, if somebody raped his daughter, what his reaction would be.

I know, any one of us, I mentioned earlier, why I should grin at somebody that just kicked in my back door that they gave some change to. How did I feel? If I could have caught the guy, what do you think I would have done? I confessed to having a violent temper. I'm glad they didn't even ask me to come down to the appearance of this individual. But surely to heavens you wouldn't expect justice to rest with people who are emotionally involved in a particular case. We talk about conflict of interest. We try and have people decide dispassionately in these instances. And all I asked for in my presentation a little earlier, that they were at least candid with the people who do become law enforcement officers, that do become correctional officers. We say that this is what the law is and we stand by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, We have had many eloquent speeches tonight on this particular item and I would like to reserve my comment on this when we're on the Minister's Salary. But nonetheless we are on an expenditure here of

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BROWN cont'd) . . . \$3,142,000 and I am wondering just exactly how does the Minister propose to utilize this expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I imagine I could break this down for the member but I'll perhaps follow the Member for Lakeside's suggestion from his seat. You were given, earlier in the session, a report from the department which gave various statistical breakdowns as to population, you know, people in the different institutions. But as set forth in the Estimate book, the amount of money that is relative to salaries and other expenditures, other expenditures can be further broken down. I don't know just exactly the degree of detail that the member would like, but it is such things as heat, electricity, food, clothing, and this sort of stuff. And each one of these, you know, has an item beside it, and I could undertake to provide as much detail as possible on that. But the facilities which are operated under this particular appropriation are the Correctional Institutions at Headingley, Brandon and Dauphin; the Portage Correctional Institution for Women; and The Pas; and the Adult Detention facility at Vaughan Street; and Bannock Point Camp, which was operational for part of last fiscal year and hopefully will be operational for part of this fiscal year; the Bird's Hill Camp which we phased out, and the Egg Lake Camp. These are the operational costs of these facilities - the salaries and expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking for the Minister to go into any great detail, but when we do have an expenditure of over \$3 million, I think maybe we could have a cursory explanation of where this money will be going to.

MR. BOYCE: Well, of the \$3 million, this allows for a staff of 330 people, and if you divide the \$3 million by 338 you'd probably come up with an average salary. This is, of course, the largest expenditure. It is for salaries of the staff in the various correctional institutions and administrative services relative to those institutions.

The \$1.3 million or \$1,372,000, as I mentioned earlier, is expenses relative to the prisoners . . . Excuse me. You know, I'm an old timer myself. . . the people in the institutions, relative to food and clothing and other services for these people while they're in the institutions. There is an expenditure of \$70,000 for support of organizations which provide services which are outside of the government, such as the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society and the Native Clan organization, and a small grant to the Canadian Congress of Criminologists. As mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge earlier, there continues to be a role for, you know, agencies outside of government for the - you know, services within the Department of Health and Social Development and including correctional services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we're getting down to the little incidents. I want to ask the Minister how much money he has set aside for the establishment of a small jail in Rossburn.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I really wish the Member for Birtle-Russell hadn't asked that question at this time of night. You know, they can't get money in their constituency on highways any more, so they think they can prevail on me. I wish he'd ask me this question next session. But seriously, Mr. Chairman, there are in Manitoba some 76 lock-ups. Now lock-ups are not under my jurisdiction and I could use that as the standard ploy for getting away from answering the question. But nevertheless, once again, if people don't get sick of it . . . We only have a million people in the province and to try and rationalize the functions of custody - you know, people are in custody for something. So we say in our wisdom that we're going to have detoxification centres, and I don't know about other members, but I have great difficulty, being dragged up the way I was that a rose was a rose, and if you're going to build a system perhaps the . . . --(Interjection)-- I haven't done it yet this session, Mr. Chairman, but I think it's a propitious moment for me to give my Greek speech. It is a serious question and I have been in consultation with the Attorney-General's Department with reference to the problems at Rossburn specifically. And while I cannot speak and don't intend to speak for the Attorney-General, nevertheless the conversations are that we are asking for some co-operation once again from the federal system to try and rationalize this, because there has been a commitment of the government that they would be willing to come up with some money to reconstruct some type of a facility in Rossburn but, as I understand it, there was some difficulty in the community raising their portion of the funds.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

Here again, there's so many things that are interrelated, and if we keep procrastinating on them we're never going to come to grips with them. Take, for example, a place where you have one of these lock-ups which is, under present circumstances, really under the Municipal Affairs Department, because law and order in the community is done through the co-operation of the Attorney-General's Department, and the municipal people through the Department of Municipal Affairs, and it is usually done by virtue of a contract with the RCMP. Negotiations are going on with the Federal Government; in fact, at this conference next week that both the Attorney-General and myself are attending, we hopefully will come to grips with this problem. I don't mean to use fast footwork on my friend from Birtle-Russell, but nevertheless I'm not in a position, and I don't believe the Attorney-General is, to say with any definitiveness just exactly when the facility will be replaced. I know it is of dire necessity and it's an important problem, and we have to come to grips with it as quickly as we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, even though it's a late hour, I don't intend to let the answer of the Minister rest with just what he has said. What has happened is that the Government of Manitoba made a commitment to the people of that area. The report of the Ombudsman brought forward a case which made it very clear that there was something needed there. But what does surprise me is the stand that is being taken by the Minister, where he is saying "Yes, we will do this, but what is the commitment of the local community?" Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister right now, what was the commitment from the people of Headingley to build the Headingley Jail?

Sir, we find government making decisions, arbitrary decisions, and then going back to the local people and saying, "Look. You put your hat in here too." If the government wants to build it, let the government build it. Go ahead. The people aren't going to stop you. But when you go ahead and make decisions and then put all your plans in and say, "Now we want so much money from you." sir, that is not consultation or co-operation or anything. That's arbitrary decision. There's been no consultation with the local people of any consequence whatsoever. And the Minister to stand up here now and say that the local community hasn't put up their share of the money - why should they? Why should they? If you want to dictate to them what they've got to do, you put it up. You put it up.

Sir, I think that the Minister owes us more than these evasive shuffling and shifting that he has given us. Tonight he hasn't given us anything of any consequence, any rational explanation of what's going on. We've asked him what kind of program he's got for the rehabilitation of the prisoners at Headingley. He hasn't given us one bit of evidence of what he's doing. He stood up and made pontifical speeches that have meant absolutely nothing. And, sir, quite frankly, I'm ashamed of the attitude of this Minister. We were certainly hoping that a new Minister would make a conscientious effort and do what he could. We had high hopes for him. But, sir, we haven't seen any evidence of it tonight, and I hope that when these estimates are continued with, that he will finally give us some explanation of what he is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought, you know, we've had an excellent debate up to this point in time, and I'm sorry that I cannot accept the responsibility for the degree of . . . Well, I'll use different terms than I'm tempted to use. I could have said, you know, in response to the Member for Birtle-Russell when he first posed the question, to raise his questions relative to the appropriate ministry. The 76 lock-ups at the present time are under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General's Department; I have no responsibility whatsoever for them. I don't intend to operate that way. And with all members opposite, except for some reason or another the Member for Birtle-Russell envisaged himself as a great antagonist in this session, that he wants to antagonize and debate with himself as he did last night and continue on in this vein, I'll be glad to accommodate him. But because he doesn't understand the law, I cannot accept responsibility. It is under the Municipal Act that lock-ups are built by the municipalities for the municipalities. If he is suggesting we change the law, let us do so, but let us do it under the ministry that is responsible for it and I will make my contribution to the debate at that time.

MR. GRAHAM: . . .

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS

MR. BOYCE: It isn't. It isn't. Show me a piece of correspondence from the Ministry of Corrections relative to the jail at Rosburn. It's the Attorney-General's Department. I'm only too glad to co-operate with any member in this House at any time, but I will not sit idly by and listen to a tirade of that nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (3)--
The Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Under (d)(3), I wonder if the Minister could identify the external agencies that are involved in this particular appropriation.

MR. BOYCE: The agencies are John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society for \$46,300; for the Native Clan Organization, \$24,200; and the Canadian Congress on Corrections is \$100,00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (3)-- The Member from Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, under (e)(3) - I believe that's what we're under at the present time - there are a number of questions that I would like to ask the Minister at the present time. I would like to ask him what his attitude is towards volunteer organizations that are involved in this item, and I would like to ask him if he could tell me what the grants are that are provided in the above estimates of - what is it? - \$2,382,100, to the various organizations. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be to the X-Kalay. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards their Main Street project - first of all to their facility on Main Street, secondly to the Detox Centre on Lydia Street. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards the Alcoholic Family Services Centre. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards the Salvation Army Harbour Lights Centre, first of all on Rupert Street, and secondly on Arlington Street. I would like to ask the Minister what the grant is going to be towards the Native Alcoholism Council of Manitoba. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards the Alcohol and Drug Education Service; the grant towards the Kiazan Society. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba - first of all, the service programs in Winnipeg, the service programs in Brandon, the service programs in Thompson. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards the Detox Centres in Winnipeg, The Pas, Churchill, and Thompson. I would like to ask him what the grant is going to be towards Clinic. I would like to ask him, when hospital beds are involved in hospitals, whether these are being funded through the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission or whether these are being funded from this particular item of \$2,382,100. I would like to ask him whether this funding is provided for in the estimates of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, or whether these amounts are granted in agencies that have been mentioned. I would like the Minister to please indicate what amount of moneys is contained in the Estimates to cover the cost of the Board of Governors in the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

I would appreciate it if the Minister could give me some indication of what the grants are going to be towards these various organizations. They are very concerned that the Minister is attempting to somehow or other curtail the activities of these organizations, and if he could give me some indication of what he is planning to do with these, we would greatly appreciate this.

. . . . continued next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - TOURISM,
RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Walding): Order please. I would direct the attention of members to Page 14 in their program Budget Estimates, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, Manitoba Film Classification Board. Line 1 - Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits - Page 14--The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Well, Mr. Chairman, since we met last night I have been privileged to have had a copy of the Annual Report of the Film Classification Board presented to me through the Minister, and I thank him very kindly for the courtesy. I wasn't sure last night, and I spent half the night looking for it in our caucus trying to find this which was suggested in the Committee last night that we had, and we find now that we didn't have it. I don't know whether the members of the Committee have it or not. It's a pretty devastating report and I can well understand why the Minister withheld it likely from the . . .

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: The point of order is that the report itself has not--there is no compulsory regulation or any act that compels the Minister to table the report. I tabled the report out of courtesy and I would not want the honourable member to say that I tried to evade the report by not tabling it.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Minister for his sentiments and I'm most grateful for his--but I don't see how the Committee, or the people of this province, can deal with this matter unless we have all the documentation and the facts that are supposed to be before us. We're dealing with a matter that's very important to the committee, it's very important to the people of this province, and it's raised great concerns. And I am surprised that the Minister hasn't at least given the opposition the courtesy of presenting us with this report. I thought in the House today, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would have - having presented me with a copy, that the rest of the members of the House would have been favoured with this document because it's - I likely will deal with it in some depth tonight, but I don't see how the other members and the Committee can deal with this because I'm the only one and the Minister who have a copy. But I will do my best to pursue that level of debate and, Mr. Chairman, hope that I can deal with it within the rules.

Let us take a look at this thing that I raised, and other members of the Committee raised last night, and this is the report of the Chairman of the Board and the board members. In the second paragraph the statement is made, "But by and large relative to the large number of films coming before our board, the world of films remains rather bleak with few signs of better days or better films ahead." Now what is the future for this province on the smut, pornography, dirty movies, if the chairman of the board and the board members are that uptight about it that they said there, "with few signs of better days or better films ahead." Then I think it's time that the members of this Committee and the Legislature, and the Premier, deal seriously with this very important matter which is before us tonight.

The report goes on, Mr. Chairman, and says, "Profanity and what had generally been regarded as a gutter language has become the norm in movies." --(Interjection)--It's in Manitoba, yes. "In depicting scenes of sexual perversion and debauchery the utmost limits have already been reached." Now that's a terrible statement. "But conceivably new records have been established this year depicting scenes of killing and violence." New records in Manitoba have been set today in killing and violence in our movie theatres, and, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Committee, you don't think that this should be dealt with in an in depth study tonight.

The report goes on, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, "Visually the worst aspect of man is predominant in current films. Murder, sadism, brutality, viciousness, criminology, all that's vile, crude, vulgar, grotesque and degrading is featured." What a devastating statement in this Province of Manitoba today, that we have that kind of society and that's the arts and the culture that we're practicing in this province today, Mr. Chairman?

The report goes on and says further, "A film depicting happy, pleasant, amusing, normal, or more wholesome human relationships, is very rare." Very rare, Mr. Chairman. "In fact love as a theme has almost become taboo in modern films."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how the members of the Committee and the Minister

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) can deal with this matter, and we can go on - the report, it's as bad all the way through the report, that it's that bad in this province today. Whether we should ask for a judicial inquiry, whether we should ask for a committee of the Members of the Legislature to be established, or whether we should ask the Premier to take the initiative, or the Minister to take the initiative, I'm satisfied in reading this report that there's no way that our caucus can support this \$45,700 in this Committee tonight until we get some answers on this very important matter, Mr. Chairman. I've had some chances today and some time to think about it, and I can certainly speak I think, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister and the members of the Committee, and I think politics has, or should play a very important part in a more rigid censorship of the films that are in this province. I don't see how else we can do it. The city council downtown can't do it; the federal people could if they'd enforce the Criminal Code, which we have our friend Joe Borowski sitting in Headingley Jail tonight for another matter of legislation that they're not prepared to enforce.

But I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister in a more general way, that I think politics and censorship have become sort of linked together in this debate that we're discussing here tonight in this problem that we have in this province today. And I well recall the days and the debates that we had in the House when the Minister was sitting here and the former Minister of Tourism and Recreation - we debated and the votes were held. There were amendments to the bill in 1972, I think it was, or 1971. The vote was 26 to 27, I think the opposition voted, they were 26 and the government were 27. So it was a very close vote on this very important subject.

But, Mr. Chairman, and committee members, there's many people today in our society that think this is a good thing, this smut and this dirt and things that just turn me off, Mr. Chairman; that it's okay. I don't support that concept, Mr. Chairman, nor does our caucus support that concept. I think that we as legislators and the taxpayers of this province, and the people of this province, deserve a better show. Maybe we failed on the debates of the Classification Board, and maybe the Minister will speak - I'm sure he will - and maybe we should have gone another way. But I think that the immoral, the obscene things that are happening in this province - this report which I've got here from the Chairman of the Film Classification Board, other documentations that I raised last night and other - I see some members from City Council . . . I think that if we're going to survive in this struggle and hopefully keep the heads of Manitoba high, that at least we've got the guts to fight this dastardly thing that's going on in this province, smut, pornography, dirty morals, low principles, then I think, Mr. Chairman, that we've got to be seriously debating this thing for some time to come, and as we stand tonight the members of our caucus can't support this resolution.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all the . . . I indicated a while ago on a point - it should have been a point of privilege - according to the legislation the report from the Film Classification Board does not have to be tabled. I intended to have the report circulated, and I found out last night that I hadn't, so I made a copy available to members of the Conservative Party . . .

MR. McKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . and a copy available to the Liberal members. The Honourable Member for Roblin knows me well enough to recognize that if he or any members of his caucus wanted additional copies that I would have made copies available to him. As a matter of fact, I have additional copies here tonight if any member of the committee would like to have a copy of the report.

I go back, Mr. Chairman, to the sections of the Criminal Code that actually attempt to deal with what is classified by some people as being ill-advised to be shown in movie houses in Manitoba, whether it be because of sex scenes that are not acceptable, violence that is not acceptable. In regard to dealing with morals of people, I contend that we don't legislate morals. Whether we had a Censor Board in Manitoba or whether we live with the ongoing Classification Board, there's no way that that Board, in my humble opinion, will deal with the morals of the people of Manitoba, because if you look at the provisions of the Censor Board as compared to the legislation that the Film Classification Board is operating under, films that are not being charged for - and that can be presented and shown by a club as an example - they can show anything, anything under the Criminal Code if there's no fees charged, and there are a lot of those films being shown that enter Canada, enter Manitoba, what they call stag movies like you

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) may see in Montreal, you may see in Minneapolis, you may see in other countries of the world, and that is smut. Definitely the Honourable Member for Roblin is right; there's a heck of a lot of people in Manitoba that seem to favour this type of film. Because if you look at the report that I gave you today, you have the number of films that were classified in 1974 considered adult, with parental guidance, and restricted adult, mature - 173 films restricted adult, 94 adult parental guidance. And I indicated equally last evening, Mr. Chairman, that until there are people in this province, or coming from elsewhere, that want to see these types of movies and if the Criminal Code is not amended, and if there is no, say, provincial legislation to actually foreclose the showing of these films, that private enterprise will show them, because they're making money. Private enterprise is making more money showing these smut films and the films with violence today than they are with . . .

MR. McKENZIE: CBC is not private enterprise.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . than they are with general - Mr. Chairman, I'm talking, I'm not talking . . .

MR. McKENZIE: CBC is not private enterprise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about the CBC or the CTV, and the honourable member is not talking about CBC or the CTV. The honourable member is talking about films that we see in our theatres in Winnipeg and Manitoba. And that's the type of films people seem to want to see, and they pay for it. Now if you look at the number of films that were classified as being general, and if the honourable member is wanting to take one of his kids, or one of his grandchildren, to see one of these films in Winnipeg or elsewhere, there's very few of them. Why? Obviously because the demand is not there. There are more people that want to see these types of films. That doesn't mean that I agree with that. That doesn't mean that I equally agree and believe that we can legislate morals. I don't happen to believe that. I happen to believe that we as Canadians, if we're able to actually make good Canadian films, educational films, and promote them well, and make them well, that people will go and see them. It's a question of education, it's not a question of compelling people to do things. The honourable member, who is a farmer, knows quite well that you can take a horse to water but you can't make him drink. I've tried it a lot of times where I felt that a horse should drink, and he just wouldn't drink. So really what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that if I had a choice as the Minister responsible for this Act, to go back to censorship with the same type of provisions as we had in the Censorship Board, I would remain with the classification aspect.

Maybe with a better classification, informing the public better of what can be expected in a given movie - Yes, I indicated that last evening too - that possibly we could do a better job in regard to promoting good films in our public school system; that we could be promoting better Canadian films in Manitoba, and even maybe one day compelling a certain percentage of Canadian films be shown. Yes, we could look at that. But I don't believe that we can judge between the Censor Board as they have it in Ontario, as we had it here, as compared with the classification, and go back to the Censor Board, with the same type of responsibility as we had it then. I think it's more a question of educating the public, and if you want to educate the public I believe that we have to start with the younger generation as we have it.

Mr. Chairman, I know it's an aside but it's quite related. Why do we see so many kids fighting while they play hockey today? All you have to do is to go into one of our caucus rooms and look at the hockey game that's being played right now, and that will tell you why the kids today are fighting while they're playing hockey. That will tell you why equally when you get close to the penalty box and hear the violent words that are being said, why the kids are talking that way. That will tell you why equally when the coach can't control his players on the professional hockey league, that a local coach here in Winnipeg, or anywhere in Manitoba, cannot control his kids on the ice. Now that's where it really comes from, Mr. Chairman. It's not a question of saying you can't do this because it's not right. I think what we can do, and what we're attempting to do, is to indicate that films are classified adult and adults should see these films alone. If they're adult with parental guidance, a parent or a guardian must be there, and that should be enforced, I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. No, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I take strong issue with the sentiments of the

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) Honourable Minister who is blaming the free enterprise system for the pornography that we have in this province today, and I will not accept it in any shape or form. We had reasonable censorship in this province, we didn't have this smut and dirt before we changed this legislation. And this government has to assume some of the responsibility because the films in this province - I used to be able to take my grandchildren to a film to a theatre and I would never be scared about the smut and crap that's going on in these theatres today. I wouldn't take my grandchildren to a theatre today under any circumstances because you don't know what you're going to find. And let me tell you, Mr. Minister, that the phone calls that I've had since that CBC, which is a Crown corporation, an arm of government, film came on Sunday Night Program that they call it, where a certain school teacher that - the film as being depicted to me, I didn't see it myself - but he seduced one of his students, and that's on the Crown corporation video tube today; it was on Sunday night. You think that isn't something that's serious in this province. My phone has been ringing right off its wall of people--(Interjection)--Well, you can blame who you want but he can't blame the free enterprise system because that wasn't, CBC is not a free enterprise system. It's a Crown corporation of the arm of government.

But, Mr. Chairman, let's go back to ask the Honourable Minister, under this legislation that we have before us and this subject matter that we're dealing with, which is the Manitoba Film Classification Board, what type of censorship have we got with this Board today? Now let me talk. Some of the reasons have been mentioned to me, they've been mentioned to others, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, why censorship is a very serious issue today, and it is a serious issue today. Before we go any further I think it would be very helpful to the committee if we'd take a look at the federal legislation that we're dealing with under this subject matter. A section of the Criminal Code makes it an offence to punish, to distribute, or to perform anything which is disgusting, indecent, obscene, I think are the words if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Chairman. And acting on that section of the Criminal Code the Attorney-General in any province, which includes Manitoba, on this province, he can lay a charge that can be judged in any ordinary court in this province, that's the Criminal Code. Presumably, I think that section of the Criminal Code is general enough, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, and members of the committee, that we can also apply it, as Members of the Legislature we can apply it to newspapers, we can apply it to books, we can apply it to magazines, subversive, obscene or otherwise, and why - we had the former Attorney-General did act and all of a sudden now they're not going to act any more. We're just going to let it run rampant. The answers of the Honourable Minister are just not good enough, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that we're going to convince one another this evening, the Honourable Member for Roblin and/or I, but I do believe that we have legislation that we're living under, and it was not considered that the Classification Board would be a censorship board when the Act was passed, and the honourable member knows that, and he voted accordingly.

MR. McKENZIE: I voted against it.

MR. TOUPIN: Sure, he voted against the bill that we had before us. Now, the honourable member says that I blame the free enterprises. It's not a question of blaming anyone, but I did indicate, and I . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Well, you must assume some of the responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt the Honourable Member for Roblin. I wished that he'd give me the same courtesy. If there's anyone to be blamed, and I'm not the person, I'm not God Almighty to blame people, but if anyone is to blame it's the people that want to see these types of movies. And I say it again, and if there's enough of these people that want to see these so-called dirty movies, then the free enterprise system, which is in place, it's not the government at any level that's making this available in movie houses in Manitoba, will take advantage of that. Isn't that true?

Now, in regard to the CBC, the honourable member well knows that we, as a government, have no control over the CBC. That is a Federal Crown Corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has made the point that

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) the Classification Board is not intended as a censor board, and I think we recognize that and we are prepared to live with that situation and condition, but I think that there is a legitimate question that can be asked, Mr. Chairman, as to the criteria that the Classification Board is using with respect to its assessment of films and the desirability of making them available to the whole cross section of viewers.

You know, when my colleague the Member for Roblin speaks in the manner that he does, he's really only reflecting a fairly substantial degree of concern and outrage that is expressed from time to time to all of us as MLAs, and I'm certain is expressed to the Minister from various persons in his constituency, having to do with the kind of entertainment there that is available in the community today, and I think that although the Minister might not like what the Member for Roblin is saying, I think he would do well to listen carefully to the reasons behind the outrage expressed.

There's a great deal of adult entertainment available in the community today, and any adult can be entertained in any form or degree that he or she may desire. But I think there's a very legitimate question that can be asked as to whether there's sufficient family entertainment, and whether there's sufficient juvenile entertainment, and I can say as a parent of children who are not small children, by any means, but who are still children, that there are many weeks and many weekends when the movie bills of fare in the two dozen or more movie houses that exist in the City of Winnipeg do not provide one bill, do not provide one program that I as a parent would feel comfortable in going to with my children, and certainly if they were younger children, smaller children, that situation would prevail for me much oftener than it does right now. I think that many parents feel that there are oftentimes on weekends, and ordinary weekdays as far as that goes, but particularly on weekends and in holiday periods when they would like to do things, go to movies and that sort of thing, with their children, that there is not the alternative, there is not the range of options of programs available to them.

For the Minister to say that he hopes we'll develop some Canadian educational films that people will go to, is in my view a cop-out. There's nobody here urging that we develop a mill that will produce educational films.--(Interjection)--Nobody's going to go to them if they are developed. We're not looking for educational films. We all went to the movies all through the 1930s. There was nothing much to do but go to the movies in the 1930s--(Interjection)--Well, go to movies or stand in bread lines whatever, I don't know where the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was, but for the most part I was at the movies.

Now, admittedly there were different social manners and mores pertaining at that time. But we weren't going to educational movies; we were going to entertainment movies. We were going to action and adventure movies. I agree that tastes and manners and standards have changed. But that is no reason for eliminating the entertainment, the action, the adventure type program entirely. I know that we are at the mercy of the movie producers, but I wonder if the Minister, together with his colleagues in other jurisdictions across the country, and indeed across North America, are looking at this problem of the responsibility of the motion picture industry and the entertainment industry generally, for at least evening up the balance a little bit. I don't expect that there'll be as many family entertainment films as there will be restricted adult films, not in this day and age, but if the scales could be even tilted slightly to accommodate the family and the young people who want family and juvenile entertainment, it would be a step in the right direction. And I don't see why we have to go to big brotherism or authoritarianism to have the movie industry and the entertainment industry persuaded, cajoled, to respond to some degree to that kind of need if the proper leadership comes from the Minister and his colleagues throughout North America.

I agree with what the Minister has to say about violence insofar as it exists at the level of some of our minor and major sports activities, but I don't think that's any justification for the kinds of violence that are continually exposed and exhibited and promoted to the public at large in the general movie bill of fare today. I think, you know, the Minister says you can't legislate morals, but I say at the same time, you can't abdicate moral responsibility. I think there is a responsibility for leadership here, and no one is asking, at least I'm not asking the Minister to try to turn the clock back; this is 1975 not 1935, but I'm asking the Minister for some leadership. Don't just say to us, "Look, the reason the movies are like this is because people want this kind of movie." What people want that kind of movie? You can show me thousands of people that want that kind of movie, I agree. But at the same time I can

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) show you hundreds of people who want a different kind of movie. You're the Minister for all the people, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, you're the Minister for the people who want the light entertainment kind of movie as well as for those who legitimately want and deserve their adult kind of entertainment. I think you have a responsibility to give some leadership in this area. If it means brow-beating and cajoling your colleagues across the country to meet on this issue, then in the same way as you've taken some initiative and some action in attacking violence on the minor hockey rinks, for which I give the Minister credit, Mr. Chairman, I ask him to do the same thing in this other area, and not just dismiss the comments of the Member for Roblin as the outpourings of some 19th Century reactionary, because they are not. There are many many parents in this community tonight who would like to think that some leadership was going to be given in tilting the scales somewhat a little bit back in favour of providing entertainment for those sectors of the community now who seem to be exiled because of the trend towards adult forms of entertainment.

So I would just ask the Minister to consider his responsibilities as a leader in this field, and to sit down with his colleagues and attempt to work out some program for trying to correct and modify the prevailing mood and the prevailing opinion somewhat.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask him a direct question about the Classification Board. I'm at a loss to satisfy myself what the criteria are for determining when a film should be classified "Restricted Adult" and when it should be classified "Adult Parental Guidance". I think there are many films in this city playing this evening classified "Adult Parental Guidance" that my wife and I would be very comfortable in watching, but would be highly uncomfortable in watching with our children. I don't think that a film in which you are, you know, in which you're uncomfortable necessarily in watching with your children is really classified correctly if it's classified as "Adult Parental Guidance" which seems to indicate that it's all right for young people as long as adults or parents are there. Many of these films should be classified "Restricted Adult." I think that there is a difficulty in this area of classification that is causing a lot of people a great deal of discomfort and unhappiness and displeasure, and I would like to know what the criteria are for those two classifications in particular. I would suggest that there are several movies playing in Winnipeg tonight under that "Adult Parental Guidance" classification that should be "Restricted Adult" and nobody under 18 should be allowed in them. You know, I think it's interesting, it's worthwhile noting that many young people, if the Minister sits down and talks with them - and I'm sure he does - are not as rebellious, and are not as insensitive to this kind of thing as some of us may think. Many many young people want some rules, want some discipline, want some leadership, want some guidance, and are somewhat adrift by the fact that they're not getting any in a society that seems to have become too permissive for their own good, and many of them are intelligent enough to recognize that. So I guess what I'm really asking for, Mr. Chairman, is for the Minister to give us some leadership in this field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all if my personal opinion is sought here this evening, or even my opinion as a Minister responsible, I happen to believe that there are not enough family and juvenile films available in Manitoba, and I've so said to the major operators of movie theatres in Winnipeg. I have not met too many outside of Winnipeg apart from two. But I have indicated my concern and my feelings pertaining to what could be made available pertaining especially to children in Greater Winnipeg.

The answer that I was given by two of those major operators is that, "Yes, fine, we were willing to make films available at least in a few of our theatres" - a lot of them won't change and own quite a few theatres in Winnipeg - "as long as it pays; we're not willing to offer a general movie if we can't meet at least our costs." And in a lot of cases they don't, and that's the indication that they leave with me. So there's no way that we can force them to play general films unless we subsidize. Now, is that the intent of the honourable members that we go as far as saying, "Yes, give us better movies, less filth in movies, and we'll subsidize the deficit that you may have with a reasonable profit"? Because that is the indication that I get from a lot of the owners that I've talked to. It's just not paying. If they want to attract a crowd, the crowd, they have to have violence. They seem to have to have violence. They seem to have to have different scenes in the movies that are attracting the attention of the public. But I happen to agree with the honourable member that there's not enough of these

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) better movies. And yet I wouldn't want to go back to the 30s, the 40s, the 50s and the 60s, because I'm practically the same age as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and I can remember my grandfather taking me to movies in the 30s, the 40s and the 50s and there was a lot of cowboys killing Indians, and to me that's not acceptable. You don't see as much of that today as you did in those days. That's all my grandfather wanted to see was the movies of the cowboys and Indians, and it was always the cowboys that were winning. The Indians were being slaughtered by the thousands. Once in awhile, Mr. Chairman, there was an Indian that got hold of a white man and scalped him. Now, that was violence, wasn't it? It was worse than a fist fight on the ice. But you saw that in the 30s, the 40s, the 50s and the 60s. Maybe you see less of that. You'll see Clockwork Orange where you see violence. It's a different type of violence. But I mean the movies of those days in my humble opinion weren't, you know, weren't any better than the ones that we have today. The general movies that we had then.

Now, in regard to--(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: In regard, Mr. Chairman, to the criteria followed pertaining to the classification of movies, I've got the Executive Director of the Film Classification Board, who is equally the Vice-Chairman of the Classification Board. I'll ask him to give you the criteria for, say, classifying a film Adult, Parental Guidance, or General. If there's any further questions I'll take them after. Can I be allowed, Mr. Chairman, to ask Mr. Charlie Biesick to give the criteria of what actually they use to classify the film. Mr. Biesick.

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

MR. McKENZIE: I am led to believe that in this committee we deal with the Minister only, and any subject matter that the Minister wants to bring forth to the members if he wants to get it, he has his civil servants here and he can get the information. But it's my understanding that we deal strictly with the Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order. It's understood, and if the honourable member wants to get his House Leader here I can get mine, it was well understood in the House that when we came to this level of committee that it was left up to the discretion of the Minister to call upon a civil servant to make comments on the call of the Minister. Is that agreed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the understanding of the Chair, that it is at the Minister's discretion to call on any member of his staff to reply. Mr. Biesick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman, then this is no longer a political debate.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order, the answering of a question posed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is not political. The question that he asked is in regard to the criteria that is being followed, that has been set down by this government, pertaining to the criteria to classify a film. Now that's technical.

Now, if the honourable members want me to read it, I can always obtain it and read it to the committee later. But if the honourable members want a question, I have the executive director here who's fully qualified, and he can give it from the top of his head.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member did not have a point of order before. Does he have one now?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I'll try it again. I am a politician. I come here as a politician representing the people of Roblin constituency. How can I debate with the gentleman that's now going to give us the information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, how can I . . . I'm asking you, Mr. Chairman, how can I debate with the estimates the figures that he's going to give me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question of the Chair is not a point of order.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, how can I debate on the subject matter that's going to come before us right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair had recognized Mr. Biesick. If the honourable member has a point of order then let him raise it. Otherwise Mr. Biesick please.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. BIESICK: Well I can give you the criteria now of classification very briefly. A film in the general category, our criterion would be whether the film is understandable to children, whether it has sufficient interest to younger children, and also whether to some extent it is of interest to adults, to the parents, and would therefore qualify it for general family entertainment.

Films in the mature category would be a film with a theme that is more suitable for a mature audience. It might be a film that would still be suitable to be seen by children; that is, there would be nothing particularly objectionable for a child to see except that it would be beyond a child's comprehension. But in the mature categories there is generally some violence, sometimes the language is somewhat rough, but generally the theme is for a more mature audience.

In the film in the adult parental guidance category, that would be films that have a fair amount of violence, there would be a fair amount of rough language, and sometimes explicit, fairly explicit sex scenes, or dialogue, explicit dialogue on sex, but still it would be film that has a good story content.

Now in the films in the restricted adult category, these would be films that would be generally regarded as pornographic, or they might also be put in that category because of extreme violence, or a combination of both. But generally in that category we've had most of the films which are regarded as of the pornographic type. Now that briefly is our criterion in classifying the films.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, before I speak I'd like to raise a point of order, and have it clarified first. As I understand, one of the members of the Conservative Party, the Member for Roblin, said that it was the intention of his party to vote against this appropriation. Now can we . . . will a vote against an appropriation in committee stand up? In other words, it seems to me that it's . . . well it's maybe within the try-out, the trial period of the rules to do this; I don't think it's within the competence of committee to hold a vote when other members of the House cannot participate in that vote. Now as I look around the room, it's possible that this vote could be carried, and the expropriation could be expunged from the estimates. I would like that clarified before we go any further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside, to the same point of order.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, speaking to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. It would seem to me that we have recognized the autonomous rights of the two committees. We pass the estimates put before us and we react in the same way; just as we can vote for or against estimates in the considerations that are taking place at this concurrent time in the other committee room, namely the House, and where they can have votes, that I assume, without question, without question, that we can have votes in this committee room too. It's the responsibility of all of us, namely the government, the opposition parties, to have sufficient members here to record properly their feelings on any given matter that a vote may be called upon. But I would certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, that to suggest that we are not empowered, or do not have the capacity in one way or another to vote on the matter of the Minister's estimates, or any segment of his estimates, would be to make the sittings of this committee rather meaningless.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To just set the minds of members at rest, I would remind them that there is only one Committee of Supply and that members will not be denied the opportunity to vote on any particular item. If it should come to a recorded vote, then the buzzer will sound, members of the committee will come into this room, the proceedings presently in the Chamber will be recessed to allow that to happen. Does that answer the honourable member's . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie would now . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: In speaking to the question, although there's no question yet, but in speaking to the Classification Board's expropriation. Last evening the . . . by the way I thank the Minister for giving us a copy of the Classification Board report, and he's quite right in saying it's not required by statute that it be tabled in the House. I think for the future though there should be a change made so that it is a statutory requirement that this Board be required to table a report through the Minister for tabling in the House.

Now, last evening the Minister said on questions from myself that since the inception of

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) the Classification Board there have been no prosecutions. I take it that there had been some admonitions by the Classification Board to certain distributors that it's possible that they would be open to prosecution if anyone laid a charge. But in any case, our history dictates that there has been no prosecutions since the Classification Board has been in effect, so in effect it's a wide open game. If your explicit movie - I'm talking about if a person is a distributor, if you have an explicit movie that is X rated for sex or extreme violence, it can be shown without cutting. Now it seems to me that when the chairman and the executive-director, and I presume with the concurrence of the other members of the Classification Board, gave the Minister this report, I think there's a message in the report. It's a very depressing statement to read really. Just to quote a little bit out of the report. In the third, or the fourth paragraph it says, "despite appalling trends in films there has been a decline in the number of complaints received at the office of the Board. A few people, mostly women, have phoned or written complaining in particular about so much profanity and coarse language in films." Then he says, "Of late we also get more complaints about the violence aspects of films rather than explicit sex scenes." He goes on to talk about the situation as it exists in the United States, and then he mentions Ontario. He said, "Ontario has recently launched a Royal Commission to investigate the effect of violence in television and the movies, in it's relation to the ever-increasing crime rate in Canada."

And I just quote the final paragraph of the report, where they say, "That we on this Board who are constantly confronted with a steady run of films of this type" - and he refers to the type - "do feel they have a harmful effect, particularly on younger minds." Now, Mr. Chairman, to me that's a cry of despair and a call for help. The Classification Board are saying that there's something wrong and they're powerless to do anything about it. And for the Minister to defend and say well, if enough people wish to see an X-rated movie uncut, well then so be it. We all agree that people should have freedom of choice providing whatever they are choosing to do doesn't affect others. But there's enough evidence in Canada and the United States to show that there is an effect, there is a cause for stirring up people towards more aggressiveness and more crime. It's the place of government not to please everybody but when they recognize a problem to try and do something about it.

If we follow the Minister's statement and his philosophy through, then if enough people want to speed, and enough people want to drop hash, or use liquor illegally, then if enough of them want to do it, will you allow it to be done? But we don't allow it because it is harmful to others, other than the person doing it. And there's enough evidence surely, to indicate as if . . . the report of the Classification Board alone isn't enough to say that the government should take a look at this. The government should say, well we should . . . I don't say go back to the thirties or forties, but something has to be done whether it's a study of it with the idea of finding out the effects that are being caused in Manitoba, in particular, or with the idea that the Classification Board be given some weapons to fight with. Because the Minister has just said that if free enterprise wants to show this, there's enough people want to see it, that we allow it to happen because that's the way it is. Well that doesn't have to be the way it is. That's why we're elected to be legislators. We don't have to say that's the way it is because a certain number of people want it. We have a responsibility to our constituents, whether they voted for or against us, or whatever, but they expect us to make reasonable laws. And if year after year a report comes from a Classification Board such as this report, well then I feel that we as legislators are letting them down, we're letting the people down, and we have a duty to fulfill, and the Minister has to show leadership here. He can't say well, it's only an appropriation of 45,000-odd dollars, there's not enough of a storm being kicked up about it, leave it alone for another year and another year. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that this is the year the Minister should show some leadership and should say to the Legislature, and propose a plan, that this be examined and a solution be found, whether it be give the Classification Board some weaponry to combat what they believe and see is wrong, or whether there should be a change in the law, or there should be something done. But not just say well, enough people want to see it, there's enough private enterprisers want to show it, so leave it alone. To me that's not good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I may agree or disagree with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in regard to what we now have before us in regard to rules

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) and regulations, and we do have an Act, and people are responsible, whether it be the people that own theatres and decide to show films that are not considered suitable to be shown to the public, they are responsible. The government is not responsible. The Film Classification Board is not responsible. The onus is on the proprietor that if he decides to show a film that is considered to be against the sections of the Criminal Code, he is held responsible. Mr. Chairman, we've had such cases in the Province of Manitoba, and the honourable member well knows that, the case of one film that was prosecuted, brought to the courts, and thrown out by the courts. Now the people of Manitoba . . . what I said a while ago and I repeat, I wouldn't want my words to be misinterpreted, what I said is that within the framework that we're operating within in regard to the sections of the Criminal Code, films that are allowed to be shown under the Act that governs us in Canada, if there's enough people that want to see those borderline films - they may be pretty close to the borderline - there will be people that will show them. That's what I said, and that's what's happening today, and the report that we have before us proves that.

Now, in regard to changing the Criminal Code, the honourable member well knows that this is not the body to do so. But there is nothing to prevent any member from any side of the House to bring in a resolution if he so desires and to have the opinions of the members brought forward and then sent to Ottawa, as we've done on so many other occasions, if that's the desire of honourable members. But we do have an Act governing the Classification Board, and I did indicate a while ago, Mr. Chairman, that if I had to choose between the Act that we had pertaining to the Censor Board as compared to the Classification Board, I'd stay with the Classification Board. That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I'm happy, totally happy, with what's happening pertaining to the classification of films. I believe that we could have a better explanation of films that are being shown, so people at a glance could actually decide and judge if that type of film is suitable for them or for their dependants. Now that's something that can be improved on. I feel that is part of my responsibility as the Minister responsible. And if it's in regard to getting more films for, you know, whether it be general, adult, because of desires of a lot of people to see these films, yes, I take that equally as my responsibility and discuss it with the owners.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: The Member for Roblin has just handed me an article, and I was just checking the source, but I'll quote the paragraph, and this is in response to the Minister saying that anyone, or someone under the Criminal Code of Canada, can make a charge, and saying that really that is the answer. The quotation I wish to give you states that there is another avenue, it doesn't have to be that way, and I quote, "The section of the Criminal Code makes it an offence to publish, distribute, or perform anything which is disgusting, indecent or obscene. Acting on this section of the Criminal Code the Attorney-General in any of the provinces can lay a charge which will be judged in an ordinary court. Presumably this section of the Criminal Code is generally enough to be applied to newspapers, books, magazines, plays, motion pictures, etc." Now the province has an opportunity to exercise a position which looks after citizens' rights, and there are enough citizens who feel that they do expect from elected representatives people who will act on their behalf, and this is a method by which this can happen under provincial jurisdiction. So I'm pointing out to the Minister it isn't just the Criminal Code and anyone going before court, it can be the Attorney-General of the province. As a matter of fact, I think that has happened in the past, it's been the Attorney-General that has laid a charge on occasion. We don't have to go back to the dark ages to have recourse to the law, nor do we have to have a public spirited citizen, or one who feels strongly enough, to go to great expense to take on a theatre chain, or someone who knows the law very well and is able to look after themselves. This is why nothing's been done up to date, I'm sure, it's because the average citizen hasn't got the means to push a case like this in court and take it all the way, which they would have to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Honourable Minister answers, I should point out to honourable members again that the Criminal Code and prosecutions under it really does not come under this department. It would be better dealt with under the Attorney-General's Department, and it's really not fair to ask the Minister to comment on such matters. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was partly my point. In a sense, yes I agree with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the Attorney-General's Department

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)has a certain responsibility to take action on information laid before them. Now, that information can be laid by different people in society. It can be laid by individuals. It can be laid by a police officer. It can be laid by a member of the Attorney-General's Department himself. I've laid charges as a citizen, laid information before the courts and had prosecution. Now, that has to be done, and I agree with the honourable member that that has to be the process taken, and from there usually to the courts. Now, this has nothing to do with the Classification Board itself in the appropriation before us. Because they have not that power.

A MEMBER: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I choose to change the tenor of the debate to some extent with perhaps some passing reference to the debate that has taken place up to now. There seems to be a funny division in our concept of morality when it comes to this particular kind of question. For instance, I'm quite prepared to accept the fact that if I decide to stop somewhere after the debates of this committee and have one or two drinks, and perhaps one or two more than I should have, and should be stopped by an RCMP officer and be asked to blow into a balloon, that I'll accept that censure if it happens to be over .08, or something like that, and I accept the censure of my community and my society and my fellowman for having transgressed specific points. Without doing that if I decide on my way home to the ranch when I want to get home a little earlier to my good wife and speed and travel at the speeds of 75 or 80 miles an hour and get stopped by the same RCMP officer, you know, I again accept that limitation of freedom of choice, I say to my honourable friend the Member from Thompson, as being within the bounds of what the community says that I can and cannot do. So I have some difficulty in just this kind of statement that the Minister says that, well, a lot of people want to do that, and so we have to accept it. Well, a lot of people want to do a lot of things. A lot of people want to speed. A lot of people want to drink. A lot of people want to do a lot of things. But we have some responsibility, Mr. Minister, in setting out acceptable guidelines. But that's in passing, and somewhat in support of the remarks that have been made up to now in the committee.

I'd like to bring the question to a more current situation. My problem is, Mr. Minister, what are we doing about, you know, this kind of general frustration that the people of Manitoba feel about who is responsible for what in this respect, you know, and to bring it into a very current situation. Right now the City Fathers are in debate about passing a by-law that will prevent well-endowed girls from wriggling their ass from second-floor windows as the passing public drives down Broadway Avenue, including MLAs on their way to their luncheon, and decide that they should be fully clothed, and that this should not happen. I want to assure you, Mr. Minister, that has never prevented me from enjoying my luncheon. (Laughter) But nonetheless, you know, the jurisdictional problems that this creates - I wish you wouldn't laugh. This is a serious question. The jurisdictional problems of disgrace is serious. I mean, how can - you know, where does the leadership come in? This is a frustration that the people of Manitoba are asking; this is why the people are writing to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, to the Honourable Member for Roblin, and others, who is responsible for this, you know, just this sudden change in the whole moral of our society, and who do we look for some redress, if in fact that's what we want. I make no particular judgment about the morals of the situation, but I accept the grave responsibility that I am, in the first instance, a representative of the people. And if people want me to represent a particular point of view, then I have a responsibility for representing that point of view.

Right now we have a situation where one jurisdiction, a major jurisdiction in our province representing possibly half the people in the Province of Manitoba, are talking about taking very specific action against this specific group of people, namely the massage parlors. You know, would you believe it, long sleeves up to their wrists, and closing at 11 p.m., and all of this. Now, how can you do that when down the street we have the Venus Theatre operating, and we have other theatres operating, you know, coming under provincial jurisdiction. There has to be some bringing together, Mr. Minister, of these situations before we can at least allow through the elected representatives some measure of public feeling to be exercised.

I humbly submit to you, Mr. Minister, that you have some responsibility in showing some leadership in this sense. In other words, that you cannot just let the City Council,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) Fathers of the City Council, flounder away in trying to respond to the pressures that they're subject to, at the same time not prepared, or not being prepared, to exercise any degree of control, discretion on the part of what is being shown in the films, in the theatres in the province. I'd be interested, Mr. Minister, in your response to how you see your role in this particular area. I'm sure you must recognize that it's totally unacceptable on the one hand to pass very restrictive legislation against this certain kind of activity taking place in a city by one jurisdiction because they have the power to do it, and yet allow adjacent to that massage parlor theatres to have the kind of entertainment, show the kind of movies in fact that are totally incompatible with the kind of by-laws that are now being contemplated by the City of Winnipeg, for instance. I'm just wondering, do you not see conflict in this area? Do you not see some of the difficulties in this area? Do you not want to accept some leadership in this area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all I do accept that there are laws that we must attempt to follow or suffer the consequences. And I too, like the Honourable Member for Lakeside, have suffered because I felt that given points in life that I had to speed and I was caught by radar, and I even challenged such a case in court, and I won, because I felt that I had a good reason for speeding. And there was a point in the Highway Traffic Act that allowed me to speed at a certain time. You know, there are laws that we have to follow. It's the same in the . . .

MR. ENNS: I paid my fine and had my licence suspended, Mr. Minister, but that's all right.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes. It's the same as in regard to movies that we have in the province. There are laws, Mr. Chairman, that are in the books right now and we do have - I feel that we as a province have a responsibility to make sure that the movies that are being shown in the province are well classified.

Now, if movies are being shown to people that contravene sections of the Criminal Code, then people are responsible, yes, definitely, and they should be prosecuted. But, I said it awhile ago, and I'll say it again, this is not the responsibility of the Classification Board. This is the responsibility of those that enforce these laws but not the Classification Board. The inspector that we have in the Classification Board has certain delegations of powers pertaining to seizing of films if the films have not been classified and included a band around the film itself. He has the power to lay information before a police officer or before the Attorney-General; he has the power to ask juveniles to withdraw themselves from theatres; he has the power to indicate to a movie owner that the classification that he has in front of his movie is not correct according to the bands on the films, and he does that, and fines have been actually levied against proprietors. You know, these are responsibilities that we take.

Now, if we're wanting to change laws pertaining to what is allowed and not allowed in our province, that's another subject matter that I'm willing to discuss here in the House. But I don't believe that it falls under the responsibility of the Film Classification Board.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the thing is that change has taken place with the event of the dropping of the film censorship board, to a large extent.

MR. TOUPIN: I don't agree with that.

MR. ENNS: Well, people say it's not so, but you know people looked for some benchmark when the change took place. They were producing these movies in Denmark and in Sweden and in Hollywood, and then across the lines many years ago, and then they have now with the dropping of the censor board in 1971, or whatever that year was, you know, there has been this kind of completely opening up of the scene. Now, I don't want to enter into with you, Mr. Minister, a debate about the rightness or wrongness of that. That's not my point at all, Mr. Minister. My problem is that you're walking into a situation where you're going to have a situation where you have an institution where everything goes, and on the other side right beside them you're going to have people dressed in a nun's habit . . . certain kind of entertainment that up to now people have been led to believe was acceptable. I'm worried about the split jurisdiction that we're walking into. You cannot be unaware, Mr. Minister, of the debates, the considerations that are being undertaken by the City of Winnipeg, and it comes through the City of Winnipeg.

We can see the very stupid kind of situations developing where what is acceptable in one

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) place of business is a criminal offence in another place of business. And that in fact is to some extent, you know, entrapment, the kind of thing, sir, that you should be trying to avoid. I see that developing. I think we all see that developing, and I see little or no direction on the part of yourself as a provincial person with authority to direct either the City Fathers and the entertainment world, you know, business here in the Province of Manitoba in this direction. I see that we can become, you know, to be looking very ridiculous in this situation unless there is some correlation of effort being made here.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that there is desire to attempt to co-ordinate responsibilities at different levels of government, including different levels of responsibility in society. You know there's a need for that, and we're attempting to do that in this department.

But there's a possibility of overdoing one's responsibility, as the honourable member knows. I remember when I was a kid on a farm and I was too small to jump on a horse, and my dad said, "Well, listen, I'm going to help you", and he took my leg. Well my uncle came along too, and he says, "I'm going to help too." Well, they threw me over the horse. You know, there's always a possibility of doing too much.

A MEMBER: The best thing they ever did.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, fortunately I didn't get hurt. But in regard to massages - if we're going to deal briefly, Mr. Chairman, with massage parlors, and the honourable member did bring them up - I wrestled for ten years in my life and I can tell the honourable members that I used more masseuse and massages . . .

MR. ENNS: Ah, ah, there it is boys. We've got it on the record now.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing wrong with a massage. If the honourable member wants to accompany me to the YMHA tomorrow noon, I'll present him with the best massage that they have there.

Now, if you want to go to another type of massage, well that's different. But physiotherapy as such is good (hear, hear) when you have muscle ailment.

A MEMBER: I'm all for it.

MR. TOUPIN: And, you know, I don't . . .

MR. ENNS: We'll include it in Medicare next time around.

MR. TOUPIN: I don't apologize for that, and I don't think it's fair, Mr. Chairman, to require . . .

MR. ENNS: Massage parlors included in Medicare. Have you got that message?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's wise for anyone to impose dresses that go right up to your hands when you want to give a good massage, because my own masseur happens to massage me with his arms as well as his hands . . .

MR. ENNS: Keep on talking, it gets better all of a sudden.

MR. TOUPIN: Really, and it's good physiotherapy. I can take up probably any member in this House, you know, in regard to attempting to be fit. But there's nothing wrong in massages . . .

MR. ENNS: Pass.

MR. TOUPIN: It's just a question . . . But I had much more to say, Mr. Chairman in regard to what should be acceptable in regard to things that are good in society, but we tend to go overboard. If we attempt to restrict society too much, what happens is that in most cases things are done underground, where no control is had at all, and you know what is the situation that happens then. You know, we've had it in this province, and we've had it elsewhere in the world, so there's got to be a degree of control, yes, but there's got to be flexibility for certain types of freedom in society.

Now, there's one point, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make in regard to the porno trend in this province. It did not start after 1971 - I wish the Honourable Member for Roblin would listen to this, the upswing started in 1970 after we changed from the censorship to the Classification Board. There's been an upswing ever since, and if we compare with, say, other provinces in Canada and some of the states in the United States, we're close to being virgins.

MR. ENNS: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Well, Mr. Chairman, it's pretty hard to follow

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) without repeating things that have been said. But I believe the government cannot legislate morality but they certainly have a responsibility in the morals that they put into their legislation. Now, we as people, recognize that there's many queers and this around, but we needn't display them and give an awful lot of other people ideas they never even had, and this is what they actually get at the movies. We say we can't legislate things that control people, but we do in cases of liquor, and speeding and traffic, and other things. We legislate things even though people do break them. So we say, they won't follow the rules, or what you call morals - so they break them. I don't say the Film Classification Board isn't doing its job. I believe that under the present legislation it is doing its job. It's just that they haven't the power to pull these movies out, and this is why I was against doing away with the Classification Board which had that power--(Interjection)--Censor Board, yes. And I think there's a very strong warning here put on by the people on the Film Classification Board, and that's the last sentence they have.

It says here: "But we on this board who are constantly confronted with a steady run of films of this type do feel that they have a harmful effect, particularly on young minds." Now, anybody that reads this last paragraph and thinks that there shouldn't be something done, or something changed about it, is just really shirking their responsibility. And when you're elected from an area that's talking to you about this, and you see this sort of a line even put on by the Classification Board, you realize that you have a responsibility to try and do something about it. I think we made a mistake in the first place by changing, and maybe we should go back.

I think everything else has pretty well been said, but I certainly think that the way we're going on this is just wrong and that we have to take a step in the other direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the basic point that we have to address ourselves to is, where did the responsibility lie when we had a censor board? The responsibility lay in two fields. It lay with the censor board because it had a right to cut films and withdraw films, and it equally lay with the operator, with the film theatre or the theatre in the Province of Manitoba in regard to the films that he showed, that he wanted to show to the public. Now, the responsibility today lies with the proprietor. Now the same sections as we had then exist today, but the onus is on the proprietor today, and that's where I feel it should be. It shouldn't be on the Classification Board, it shouldn't be on a censorship board. If we take the last year that we had a censorship board in Manitoba, and Ontario had a censorship board - they rejected eight films, and we rejected 12 films.--(Interjection)--Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: But the proprietors don't always know other than by the way it's classified what type of a film they're really going to show. Then on top of that when it says not suitable for juveniles or young people, the way people dress now and the way some people grow up so much larger for their . . . you know, they're young but they're quite large, how does a film operator really know the age of the people that are attending his shows? He really doesn't know. And to be punishing him because he let somebody who is under age into this show when he shouldn't, that's just ridiculous.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, now the honourable member is dealing with two points. He's dealing with the responsibility of showing, say, dirty movies or violent movies, and that responsibility lying with the proprietor that decides to show a film. Now that's there now, and he well knows that that film is classified restricted adult or parental guidance, and he knows equally because a letter from the Classification Board goes to him and goes to the Attorney-General indicating that if he shows that movie that he's subject to prosecution. Now that's one point. So he knows that he's responsible and that he can be brought in court.

Now if the honourable member wants a system where the proprietors and the inspector can decide by the showing of a legal card, an I.D. card, that a juvenile is a juvenile and not an adult, well he equally knows that we passed - what is it? - two years ago, permissive legislation for the proprietors to get an I.D. card system going. Now that's on the books.

MR. HENDERSON: That's on the books, Mr. Chairman, but it's just not practical at all because you see people lining up to go to the movies and they're having an awful time to try to process them to get them through, and how can you tell, you know, unless you really went and checked everybody's card as to whether they might be 15 or whether they might be 25. I would

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) certainly hate to be a film operator and have to have that responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't agree that the proprietors don't know the types of films that they're showing. I'm sure they know full well the types of films that they're showing. As the Minister has pointed out, he has found the prevailing attitude to be one of opting for the adult type of film because some of them have suggested to him that they can't make money on family films. I think that's utter nonsense though. There are many family films . . .

MR. TOUPIN: That's what they say.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, there are many family films that we could cite, and I'm not suggesting that they're necessarily my type of film fare, but I think there are many family films that come to mind, like the Sound of Music and True Grit, and there's one running now, Where the Red Fern Grows, I think is the name of it, and it's been running for about nine weeks. The Sound of Music ran for weeks on weeks on end, breaking attendance records. That type of thing. Those are family films, and for any movie operator to suggest that he is even coming within a scintilla of the truth by suggesting to you that you can't make money on family films, is utter absolute nonsense . . .

MR. TOUPIN: Can I pose a question?

MR. SHERMAN: . . . and it should be repudiated. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: How many times have you seen the Sound of Music? I've seen it three times. How many times will people go to the same show?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that gets back to my original point. But don't let them tell you . . . my original point is there aren't enough family films, but don't let them tell you that they can't make money on family films, because if they make a good family film, they can make money and draw crowds for just as long, and they'll pack just as many houses as they can on The Phantom of the Opera or any other mature adult film of that type that is playing.

But I just want to touch on a point that you had mentioned in response . . . the Minister, Mr. Chairman, had mentioned in response to me on the subject of cowboys and Indians, and that type of image. The Minister made the point that we have now redressed the balance where the cowboys were beating up, or killing the Indians, and we've redressed the balance, and I agree with that, and it's a good thing that we have, and I asked him why? Obviously because enlightened thinkers in our society recognized that there was an unhealthy stereotype being created here, and it was creating and perpetuating an unhealthy and an incorrect attitude. And I ask him whether the same thing cannot . . . the same argument, the same logic, the same reason cannot be applied in the case of films of violence that perpetuate an unhealthy stereotype and whether the, you know, whether some kind of redress of the balance is not equally applicable there. It's the same argument in my view.

MR. TOUPIN: How does it happen? It wasn't legislation.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, no and I'm not asking for . . . I'm not specifically asking for legislation. I'm asking for leadership. I'm asking for consultation. I personally don't want to see the government standing over the movie operators and the movie industry in a paternalistic authoritarian pose telling them what they can show and what they can't show, because that will be the end of the movie industry if that happens. I'm asking for some leadership and some moral persuasion where the Minister and his colleagues are concerned. I'm not asking for an elimination of the adult film. I hope that the Member for Ste. Rose and others are not misconstruing my remarks. I'm not concerned . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm not concerned with massage parlors, or any of the other diversionary tactics that have been employed here, and I do not want to see the elimination of the adult film. What I am concerned with is some general and family entertainment that would redress the imbalance a little bit. I say to the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that one area that's got to be looked at is this area of classification criteria between adult parental guidance and restricted adult, because age has a great deal to do with the problem that we're facing right now. I don't know whether the Minister had an opportunity to see that item on the CBC national news last night from the Massachusetts State Legislature where they are looking

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) at the possibility, the advisability - in fact I think they introduced legislation to raise the drinking age above 18 to a higher age, possibly they suggested even as high as 21. The reason being this, and this applies to my argument on this subject, Mr. Chairman. The reason being this, that as some of us, I think, suggested at the time when you lower the drinking age to 18 - there's nothing wrong with an 18 year old drinking - but when you lower the drinking age to 18 what it effectively does is lower the de facto drinking age to about 14 because of the kids who with fake ID's who would get into drinking establishments all over town. And the Minister, if he talks to any beer waiters or cocktail waitresses in the city, will be cognizant of the fact that there is a brisk trade in fake ID's.

Now when you come down to this type of movie that's "Adult Parental Guidance", what that says in effect is that it doesn't matter how young the younger partner is as long as one of those people can prove that he or she is 18 years of age. And that means that there are many youngsters - by youngsters I mean children of 14, 15, 16 - getting into this type of movie, and this is what I object to. I think it's very difficult to, with an age limit of 18, and with that kind of an umbrella clause, adult parental guidance, it's very difficult to keep 14, 15 or 16 year olds out. The same difficulty applies here as it applies with the drinking age of 18 and that is, you lower the effective age of participation to the early teens. And it is here where the wrong attitudes, the wrong prevailing standards are set, and I think that a much stiffer criteria should be adopted.

I'm not criticizing the Classification Board in its present terms of reference because I know what it has to work with, and I would expect that they would be happy to work with tougher terms of reference, within tougher parameters if they were given those tougher parameters.

I would hope that something can be looked at in this area towards making it much more difficult for young people to have the kind of free and easy albeit illegal access to those films that they now have, and I think that the classification Restricted Adult should be imposed to a much broader range of films than it's presently being applied to. I don't want to eliminate the adult film. I just want to make sure that the kids are getting a chance to come up with some standards and some values.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've had the privilege I can say to have quite a few private conversations with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and his comments are to say the least, well taken, and he's being very consistent with himself and with his colleagues, and his comments are recorded and will certainly be considered.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I'll try and wrap up the debate and we'll vote on the issue. Mr. Chairman, there is still room for good clean entertainment in this province, and anybody who was out to the Shrine Circus last week will find out real quick the place was stormed with people, a full house every night. There's still room for that type of entertainment in this province, and God help the day that we will never have the Shrine Circus come back and clean up some of our morals and our principles, and let us get back to the day we can laugh at a clown. Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly there has always been the day when you can go . . . I remember when I was a kid you could go and look at a blue movie, and certainly we had the experience over in St. Boniface here not so long ago where some four and five gentlemen decided they were going to look at some blue movies one night, and unfortunately they got caught, and I wonder how the Minister can justify that they were prosecuted for looking at blue movies in St. Boniface. Now have they got a different law over there, or have they got a different police force? How come that that jurisdiction can regiment that kind of . . . But nevertheless it's in the record and it happened.

I'm not satisfied with the sentiments of the Minister. I'm not satisfied with the legislation. First of all, I'll ask you, Mr. Minister, to give us a definition of pornography in the Act. Give us a definition of obscenity in the Act. In my knowledge, the word obscenity is that it hasn't been defined in the Federal Act or any Provincial Act. The last definition that's on the record of obscenity goes back to England, I think it's 1868. Now my gosh if we're serious and we want to clean up and help this board and clean up the bill, let's put that in the regulations, a definition of obscenity. Let's put in a definition of violence. Let's put in a definition of indecency. We can do that, put it right in your Act. If you can't do that, well then let's set up a committee, a committee of the members of the House, or let's set up a judicial committee,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)or let's set up a Royal Commission. Because it's a serious matter and if the government is not prepared to do anything about it, we in the opposition are most concerned, Mr. Chairman, and we feel that the people of this province are so concerned as of today, that the matter is very very important and it deserves the full attention, not only of this committee, but the attention of the Minister and of the government, and all the members, including me, of the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has before him a list of films and the country of origin of these films, where these films were produced, and how many we classified, and from what country. And from Canada, English Canada, we got 14 films. Canada French, with English subtitles, two films. United States 248 films. And it goes on for 492 films that were classified. Now the honourable member mentions in his remarks that he wants us, we, to define what seems to be classified as being obscene, whether it be pertaining to sex or violence. He says, we, and then he asks me to define what I believe to be obscene or violence. Now the honourable member will not get that definition from me, even if I am responsible for the Film Classification Board, because the Film Classification Board, Mr. Chairman, - although the honourable members would like to suck me in to something that they'd want me to say publicly - they have guidelines, they have an Act to follow, and that's it. If there's to be changes in the Act, changes in the regulations, changes pertaining to the rules that are followed by the Film Classification Board, it will be done by a majority of the members of the House and the honourable member well knows that.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister wanting me - I'll put the legislation in, gladly. Are you telling me tonight and the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that you're not prepared to give a definition to the people and to the committee, the Film Classification Board, a definition of pornography, a definition of obscenity, a definition of violence, and a definition of indecency? Then if you are, then you shouldn't be in that chair, you should resign. You don't deserve to hold the Portfolio of Minister of Tourism and Recreation because that's your right, you are the government, you are the Minister. I'm not the government. You have the authority, you have majority - either you do it or we'll throw you out and we'll do it.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we're not dealing with a bill pertaining to what the Film Classification Board may or may not do. We're not dealing with the sections of the Criminal Code this evening where certain things will be defined as being violent or not violent, sexually objectionable by some people. This is not the item that we have before us. If the government one day decides to bring such a bill before the House, if the honourable member through his freedom that he has decides to bring a private member's bill or a resolution - yes, I'll get up as a private member and discuss it. We have before us a section that deals with the Film Classification Board and its present responsibility. And that's what I'm prepared to deal with. And that's not abdicating my responsibility as a Minister.

MR. McKENZIE: I ask the Minister to read the sentiments of the Chairman and the Board, and if they're not pleading for a definition, such as I'm asking you and the government of tonight, a definition of pornography, a definition of obscenity, a definition of violence, a definition of indecency, what else . . . can you read the thing? My gosh, there it is black and white and the board is, the Film Classification Board, then if you give them that definition and clean up the Act, maybe they can give us a hand to attack this problem which we think is so serious in Manitoba today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Chairman, this debate I never expected to continue for this length of time but it seems to me obvious that from the reporting in the news media yesterday, or rather today, that the opposition finds it one reason to continue debate because they're getting considerable publicity. However, I think what it is going to do . . .

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, we've heard everything right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . the debate has continued and obviously for the reason that they figure that this may gain a lot of publicity. There used to be a lot of publicity about the number of drug users and the marijuana smokers and the glue sniffers, and so on, in the schools.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) What really promoted that major interest among the students is the fact that there are people like you, self-righteous people like you, who are advocating and giving that type of publicity and they interest the children to find out what it's all about. And this is continuous. And the fact that there has been less publicity about it, I know that in the schools this particular type of interest has declined, and it is only you people who promote this, because it is in your interests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. Would members direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other members. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I can match my record anytime against you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have been in the other committee but what I have heard since I came in here is the request from this side, of the Members in the Opposition asking the Minister to fulfill his obligations as a Minister responsible for what goes on within his department. I think it's a reasonable request that has been put forward, and I would hope that the Minister would act on that and give members of the Chamber the benefit of his wisdom, and his definitions of what the Member for Roblin has asked him to do.

I don't think it's an unreasonable request. I think that a Minister has to be responsible. That is one of the things that he has accepted when he has taken the position that he has. I would hope that he would live up to those commitments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, again it's unfortunate that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was not here throughout the debate that we've had for the past hour and a half. The request made by the Honourable Member for Roblin is not a fair request, in the sense that the honourable member would like me to formulate changes to the Act, changes to the regulations, which I will not do in this committee, while we're dealing with the responsibility of the Film Classification Board. If there is a bill that is intended to be presented either by the government or by the Opposition, this Minister will see fit to stand up and make his views known; if there is to be amendments to the Film Classification Board regulations, this Minister will make his views known in Cabinet, and that Order-in-Council is made public, and then the honourable member can talk all he wants on the regulation that is accepted or rejected. But not this time, not on this item.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I understand a report from this Film Board has been tabled for our perusal. The report is not one of glowing commendation of the Minister at all, and I would hope that the words given to the Minister by the Board, which obviously seek further action, should be acted upon, and this is all that members are asking, that the Minister some time, some place, somewhere, has to do something. I would hope that he would give us some indication of what he intends to do rather than just sit there and say he's going to do nothing (Hear, Hear).

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very simple to get into a committee and yak all you want, and that's what I'm hearing from the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that's only yakking. This Minister is taking responsibility. The honourable member well knows if he searches the Act that the report was not tabled. It is not required to be tabled. The report was circulated to those members that signified a desire to have a copy of the report. The responsibilities of the Minister are not challenged in the report. The recommendations contained in the report itself are made to the Minister, and the Minister has avenues to take pertaining to changes of the responsibility of the Film Classification Board, and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell can yak all he wants, but he knows that those changes are not made in this committee. They're either made in Cabinet or the House, and that's where it stands.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister then give this portion of the Legislative Committee the assurance that he is going to act.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to repeat what I said in an hour and a half in answering and making comments of my own. There is certain indications that I indicated that I would take, especially in regard to the comments made from the Member for Fort Garry,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) and a lot of the comments made by the members of the Opposition and the members of the government will be considered, will be looked at. There is no undertaking by one Minister that an Act will be presented, that amendments or regulations will be put forward. The honourable member being part of a party that was once the government well knows that a Minister does not take that type of attitude in a committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I had to say was to address some words to the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, but however he has left. I'm addressing it to you, Mr. Chairman; the fact that not so very long ago the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney made a speech in which he advocated violence, and he was going to bring people in to show their displeasure from his constituency, and I can see that that is the type of attitude that they're advocating right now, because they want to continue some controversy over an issue that does not deserve the type of debate that we are carrying on right now. We're dealing with the Film Classification Board and I believe, as the Minister indicated, that it is simply to deal with the estimates and we are not in a position at this particular time to make any kind of changes or recommendations. There can be suggestions made but that has to be made in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Mr. Chairman, I gather from the remarks of the members of the opposition that there's something in this report, the annual report of the Classification Board that . . .

A MEMBER: No, I raised this before we ever had that.

MR. DILLEN: Well, now you know what I read in the annual report is nothing more than what any person who walks the streets today would find in any major city in Canada. It is a report of what is acceptable.

When they point out in this report - and I haven't spoken to anybody from the Classification Board - but what was pointed out here is that in the true free enterprise tradition those things that will sell and make a profit are those items that the Classification Board has pointed out. And those things that are selling and making a profit are murder, films on murder, sadism, brutality, viciousness, criminality, and all that is vile, crude, vulgar, grotesque, degrading. Those are the things that are making money, you know, and how can you condemn somebody who worships at the idol of free enterprise from doing what free enterprise has done for years, and that is to take a product - and in this case it is . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: . . . take a product and attempt to make money with it. Surely to goodness you can't worship at the idol of free enterprise one day and then condemn it the next. That is what I am receiving, the reading I'm getting from the members opposite, that all of these things in films are what make them sell, what make them attractive. And the purpose of the Film Classification Board is to place a classification on those films so that the parent will be advised, and the individual will be advised, that as a result of the classification he can make up his own mind whether or not he wants to see it, and whether he wants to part with his money at the ticket office to see the movie that is described. In another sense it provides the leadership for the churches, the ministerial people to advise their group, or their following, as a result of the classification that is established there, whether or not they should see the movie.

Now, you know, that I too am very concerned about the attitudes of the Canadian people towards - the Canadian and American people - North American people in particular to all that is wrong with our society. About three years, you know - and this is for the members of the committee - I attended a convention in Atlantic City and we were diverted because of bad weather and ended up in Philadelphia and took a limousine service across to Atlantic City. The cab driver asked me what hotel I was going to stay in, and I said, "I'm staying at the . . ." I forget the name of the hotel anyway. But he said, "Oh, my God, I wouldn't stay there if I were you." And I said, "Why not?" He said, "That is not a Mafia hotel." Then I said, "Well, you know, what's the difference?" I thought a hotel is a hotel. "Well," he said, "if you stay at a Mafia hotel", he said, "you never have to lock your door. Nobody bothers you. Nobody says anything to you. Nobody touches anything that is yours in that room." The minute we got out of the car, the guy that opened the door for you gave you a rundown on what

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) . . . was great and available in the city. You know, he said that there are girls of any colour, whatever you want, anything, any pill, any dope, anything that you want is yours for the right price. The elevator operator solicits you on the way up to your room, you know, and this was an acceptable norm in that country. Nobody opposed it. And when you're going into the Convention Centre there is a big sign with an arrow that says: "Deposit all Firearms here." So that you walk in and if you're carrying a firearm or a weapon you're to leave it at the door and pick it up on your way out.

All that I can see that the film industry is doing is showing what people would like to turn a blind eye to in what is happening in the world. And all of these things that this report provides for, murder, sadism, brutality, viciousness, criminality, were all evident in a war that has been going on in Indo-China for the last 20 years. You know, I didn't hear any hue and cry from anybody in the opposition about the, you know, the acts of violence and death and destruction of children and women, and those non-combatants in the country. The same thing that is being described in this report went on there for years and nobody said a word about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we're probably into an academic . . . at the moment, because I think there was some intention to vote on this Resolution, but we can't vote after 10 o'clock.

I was just going to say that - but first of all I reject out of hand the Member for Thompson's suggestion that you can't have freedom to enterprise and still have morality. I reject that totally and any attempt to sort of link the money-grubbing movie promoter who is flogging the kind of material that he thinks he can make a fast buck on with free enterprises and freedom to enterprise generally, is not acceptable and I think it's a distortion of the philosophy involved. There can be illegitimate practitioners of the free enterprise system just as there can be illegitimate practice of the socialist system to which the Member for Thompson subscribes. But that's another argument, and that's another committee meeting, Mr. Chairman.

What I wanted to say was, it's my intention when the vote comes to vote against this particular appropriation, but I want to say for the record that I do not consider that I am voting against the Minister or against his performance of his duties, I am voting against what I think is a weakness in the structure of the Film Classification Board. If it were a matter of voting on the Minister's salary, that would be a different question entirely. We're not voting on the Minister's salary here. My point is related entirely to the criteria for classification employed by the board, and that's what I will be voting against when that vote is permitted under the rules. I wanted to make that point for the record and for the Minister's information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are now hung up on the Film Classification Board; and as I also understand, we can't have a vote after 10 o'clock. So consequently it starts to look like we were into kind of a fruitless discussion. This is the point that I would like to bring out.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman. . .

A MEMBER: You haven't got the floor, Harry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're . . . at all. I think we can continue with the estimates and at least get a commitment from the Minister that he will take the concerns of the opposition under surveillance, and if necessary set up a committee of the House, or some committee, whichever he chooses to do, to investigate the many concerns. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I hope you'll keep the member under order . . . that if necessary he will set up a committee to investigate the many concerns that have been registered to us in the opposition regarding film classification, violence, dirty movies, profanity, etc. Now, if we can get that kind of an assurance from the Minister that he is concerned and he's going to do something about it, then we can proceed to the next item and we won't have a vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to be very brief in my apologies for not being in this particular room until now. I've been in the other room, but I have had from my colleagues many comments of what has gone on here. I think what has been talked about here tonight, and for the better part of this afternoon and last night, is basically

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)...this. I can say as a member of my political party that when I approach the film industry or pornography, etc., within the film industry, they say to me that it's terrible. And I say to them, "Well, I'm of a political philosophy that says that people must have the freedom to do as they please." So they, you know, they basically turn it against you. They don't want it but as a member of a political party or a member of philosophy they say that you're not going to tell me what to do. I would say the government is in the very same position. The government is in exactly the same position when they go out and they talk to their members. and I'm sure the Minister has had many letters saying that I am opposed to pornography and I don't like it, but they still say, "Please don't tell me what to do." So we have a position of having a group of people on both sides, or many parts of the public, or the majority of the public saying, "We don't like what's going on" and on the other hand they say, "Don't tell us what to do." So we're in a position as legislators on both sides of the fence, having probably most of the people in both our parties not liking it, then saying, "But don't tell me what to do." So we're really left in the position that we are this: We are legislators and there has to be a decision made as to whether the pornography which is being put forward on films today, is the right thing. I would say the decisions that would be made by the government will not be popular with anybody because they don't like, most people don't like being told what to do, and on the other side of the fence they're saying, "Do something about it."

So the Honourable Member from Roblin has a very good point. That we have tried the censorship system. We are now trying the classification system, and obviously neither one has worked. So let's look at it. I don't think as legislators we are going to please all of the people in this particular argument. But you know, let's face it, most of the people, most of the people when they say, "Don't tell me what to do," do not want pornography in films. They don't appreciate them, and I think the Minister has to take that into consideration. I think the Minister has to say, "When I make my decision people are going to say, "Don't tell me what to do," but they might even be happy with it. So I say to the Minister, that's the position all the legislators are in at the present time. People don't want it. They don't want pornography, but they don't want to be told what to do. And really, really, that is the reason we're here in the Legislature, to make a decision on it. I think the Minister has to make that decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I think that he's reflected pretty well what the general pulse of society is in the sense that there is a desire to have certain freedoms in society and yet there is a desire to respect the opinions of those that would like to have a type of society that is not as obscene and not as violent as they'd like to see it. And yet it seems to be in some cases a non-winner, as we had when we discussed highway laws awhile ago, where you have a limit on the highway. and whether you impose 55, 60 or 75, you'll always have people that are prosecuted and people not happy with the government of the day.

I go to the comments made by the Honourable Member for Roblin in saying, and I say it again, that the comments made by all members of the committee will certainly be considered by myself, but the honourable member has to appreciate that in regard to the responsibility given to the Film Classification Board, those regulations were not ministerial regulations. If we're talking about park regulations where you tell people, "Listen you can't throw a can. You can't bring your dog to the waterfront," well, that's ministerial discretions. The Minister can make regulations pertaining to the coming and going of people within parks, but here we're talking about a regulation that is determined by the government. We're talking about an Act that was decided by the House, and I'm sorry if the honourable member doesn't like it. But I'm not in a position to determine future policies. But I am in a position to the best of my ability, and with the staff that I have around me, to say exactly what the Classification Board has done in the past fiscal year under the terms of reference, under the regulations. and under the Act that they now have. Now, if the honourable member wants a commitment that I'll review Hansard. review the comments made by honourable members, I give him that commitment, but I can't at this stage, without having my colleagues around me, commit that a regulation will be passed either way, for or against, that an amendment will be presented to the Act. I cannot do that, and I will not do that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister. He is in no different position

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . than I am at the present time in my constituency - and I'm sure he would agree with me on this - where he can stand with a group of people, and he can stand in a cocktail party, or wherever it may be, and have most of them say, "Why are you allowing this on the screen"? If the Minister turns around to that same group of people and says, "All right, I'm not going to allow it, and you can't go in and look at it," that same group of people in five minutes will turn on you, because they want the freedom to do what they like. So all I can say to the Minister, I don't really, I don't really, you know I don't really think that your position is an admirable one. You're position is to decide, you know, really what should be best for society regarding pornography. And when the Honourable Member for Roblin says, "Maybe we should look at the situation of censorship versus classification, and look at something else," I don't think there's anything wrong with that. I think the Minister just said to me, that I appreciate the problem. You can't win. But unfortunately that's the position you're in, and you have to make the decision.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that's the only difference of opinion that I have with the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, a Minister of the Crown who makes a public statement in a lot of cases it becomes government policy because his colleagues will in most cases give him support to the announcement that was made. Now, that's not the way to run a government. And a Minister of the Crown does not run the government, does not determine policy. That is done by the Cabinet in Session. Now, if it's a question of changing the Act, well that's done by all members in the House. So that is a difference that we have between us.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, just to answer the Minister, I think the question of moralities, or question of pornography, was in our theatres and what effect it may have on social society is not really a situation where we're talking about the government versus the opposition. I could basically see it as a free vote, if a decision was made by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. McKENZIE: I apologize to the Honourable Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honourable member on the list. The Honourable Member for Radisson, please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, if I left the Honourable Minister and the committee with the impression that he had to make that decision here tonight, I do apologize. I thought I phrased it very skillfully, well knowing that he has to go back to Cabinet, he's got to go back to committee, he's got to go back to Caucus. I think I phrased it that he take our concerns under surveillance and hopefully come back with a decision, and no way. . . I well understand the responsibilities of the Minister and what he can do and what he can't do, and I apologize if I left the impression that he had to make that decision tonight, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Manitoba Film Classification Board, Line 1 . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I still haven't got the assurance from the Minister that he's going to do it.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, I did give you that assurance awhile ago, and it'll be in Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Manitoba Film Classification Board, Line 1, - Salary, Wages and Fringe Benefits, \$9,700--pass?

A MEMBER: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention to honourable members our Rule 65(7)(a), it says, "Where the Committee of Supply is sitting after 10 p. m. on any day, the Chairman of the committee shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates of the government". And further to that, part (9), "Where the Chairman of the Committee of Supply refuses to accept a vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates, he shall put the motion as the first order of business at the next sitting of the Committee of Supply." In accordance with that rule the Chair cannot accept a vote on this item, and it will be put over until our next sitting tomorrow.

Line 2 - Fees, \$33,200--passed, Line 3 - Facilities and Equipment, \$1,100--passed; Line 4 - Specialized Equipment, Service and Supplies, \$100.--passed; Other Operating Costs, \$1,600--passed. Total for that section with the exception of Line 1--passed.

Grant Assistance - Grants (Transfer, Payments) \$473,000 - The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I would think this sum to be the purse structure on both standardbreds and thoroughbreds and breeder incentive programs for

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) . . . both breeds, so to start with: what portion of this either in dollars or percentage would go to the standardbred - the thoroughbred purse structure? The thoroughbreds first, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, the indication that I get is the 110,000 to standardbreds, and 200,000 to thoroughbreds.

MR. MCGREGOR: All right. Then to go further, for the breeder incentive program, if I had read Hansard on Friday I would have some of that, but it isn't out yet, so could you repeat what goes to the thoroughbreds and breeder incentive, and does this come out of this fund indeed.

MR. TOUPIN: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is 43,800 to a thoroughbred. and 16,700 to a standardbred. I'd like to qualify that in saying that, as I indicated to the honourable member in the House when the question was posed, we do have a small amount, as the honourable member well knows, that is held in trust, that allows us flexibility to possibly look at a change in policy that would allow us to increase either to the standardbred or the thoroughbred in the upgrading in this fiscal year.

But that's the amount, 43,800 to thoroughbreds, and 16,700 to standardbreds.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes. On the 40,000 or 50,000 that's in trust, is that indeed part of this 470?

MR. TOUPIN: No.

MR. MCGREGOR: So that's outside of that.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. MCGREGOR: Well, there was some concern of thoroughbreds getting that extra pie sweetened last week, and they got nothing. Is there any further consideration that - and I would have liked to have had Hansard - because certainly you were influenced by the thoroughbred people more than you were the standardbred in the relation to the cost of raising a colt, that I would hope someday that some of us who are a little the other way could influence your thinking in fairness to what it costs, and certainly I'm supporting the harness people. I do believe they're getting the short end of the stick, Mr. Chairman. At the moment I do realize you give back the pari-mutuel bet in the rural circuit and you take it at the Downs here. And to further that, I mean if you just look to the amount of horses - I know your thoroughbreds go south in the winter to a large extent, where the harness people generally stay here and train as soon as February starts, and they do employ a lot more people and the boards seems to be influencing you as to how many - and again I wish I had Hansard to read you back what you said, and where you were wrong. In that case I think I could guess closer.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, again the comments made by the Honourable Member for Virden in the House, and again here this evening are certainly well taken pertaining to the revenue derived from thoroughbred or standardbred racing, and necessarily the grant structure which seems to be reflected on that basis in a sense. I personally believe that we should review that this year. We have, as the honourable member knows, an amount set aside of \$13,000 for the rural circuit in regard to the standardbred. In addition no tax, which amounts . . . oh, yes, the tax waiver, as the honourable member's aware, which amounts to another \$13,000, you know which is another incentive.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, and I'm sure the Minister's familiar, the harness racing is increasing much faster than the thoroughbred is, and I hope that this will influence his future decision. I think there is some hope in that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I had a question, Mr. Chairman, but it's been answered, thank you, it's been answered in the dialogue that just preceded.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have one question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes. I'd like the establishment now of the number of racing days. Has that been established now for the thoroughbreds and the standards, or for the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the standardbred there, to my knowledge, has never been a limit on the number of days. It only has been limited by the number of racing days by the thoroughbreds. There is a bill before the House, presented by the Honourable

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . Member for Flin Flon, that would take out of the Horse Racing Act the number of racing days, which is 56, as spelled out in the Act, and the number of days would be determined by Order-in-Council. The owner of Assiniboia Downs has indicated that they would desire to have 70 racing days for thoroughbreds, and he's actually let out pamphlets to that effect, that it has to be confirmed by legislation, but that it would be his intent to have 70 racing days.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, then we likely are - this is the question - so it likely will be 70?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, approximately how much goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund from the mutuel take?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Approximately a million and a quarter - that was total revenue.

MR. McGREGOR: I suppose there's no way of estimating what comes from tourists to the hotels, to the cafes; it would be several millions I would take it.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, we have no indication to that effect. The only indication that I left with honourable members when I introduced my estimates is that there was approximately - and I have my notes here - about approximately \$ 194 million that we figured came in through tourists from outside of the province.

MR. McGREGOR: Yes. I'm thinking of what that must influence with horse racing coming to the Downs.

MR. TOUPIN: No, we have no breakdown of that.

MR. McGREGOR: Three or four million probably.

MR. TOUPIN: Oh, I would say more than that.

MR. McGREGOR: Okay. All the more reason you should sweeten the pot.

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

MR. McKELLAR: I was just wondering if Assiniboia Downs has given you any indication of how many racing days they're going to have per week. Did you indicate that? What days in the week are they going to race this year?

MR. TOUPIN: Four days per week for thoroughbred racing. Four days, the same as last year.

MR. McKELLAR: What days are they?

MR. TOUPIN: Every day but Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

MR. McKELLAR: I see. What days are the harness races then? They were racing five days a week last year, weren't they?

MR. TOUPIN: That is correct.

MR. McKELLAR: The same number of days this year?

MR. TOUPIN: Yep, the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, in considering change, does the Commission indeed set down that say next year the thoroughbreds desire five days. Is this in the jurisdiction of the Commission or is this indeed the Minister, Mr. Chairman?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, it's based on the recommendation of the Horse Racing Commission, but the decision, ultimate decision, is taken by the Cabinet by an Order-in-Council, by passing the regulation.

MR. McGREGOR: Yes. But, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just say, in talking to the people there does seem to be a feeling that a stable would come here, a little more liable to, if it's running five days a week rather than four, because larger stables have stable hands they have to pay all week, so if they're running, you know, it's more attractive if somehow you could influence again a five-day race per week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the owner of the track is contemplating such a possibility, and he in turn would make a recommendation to the Horse Racing Commission and they in turn would recommend to myself.

MR. McGREGOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grant Assistance. Grants (Transfer Payments) \$473,000--passed.

I refer honourable members to Page 16 under the Provincial Parks System - Management Services. Line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits \$440,600. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the committee how many staff involved in this item are on salary and also on contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this item before us, the salaried staff are 37 permanent staff man-years plus two managerial, 10 professional, 11 technical and 14 administrative supports, plus .33 term assistants. There is no contracts under this appropriation. The total increase of \$30,600 is due to general salary increase and necessarily the annual increments, 52,700 offset by the abolishment of two professional positions, equaling \$22,100. The provision for office equipment rental \$2,600; printing and stationery supplies, drafting supplies, plan reproduction etc., \$34,200; posters and telephones \$4,500; and building maintenance supplies 400. The total increase of \$5,100 is due to price increase of printing and stationery \$4,400, and workload increase of \$600. I'm going through the whole amount there that we have before us, Mr. Chairman, to give the explanatory notes so we don't have to dwell on each item, because it's all-inclusive in the amount here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, rather than get into the, you know, specifying the number of trucks or cars and stuff, can you give me any idea of the inventory in equipment that's required to look after the parks in this province?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that that will come up later. It's not in this provision, Mr. Chairman. We can supply the honourable member with that information when we get to it. It's under Park Maintenance and Operation.

MR. McKENZIE: Okay. Well then, under the present schedule of fees that you've established in the province, what kind of revenue are you expecting this year?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the . . . I haven't got the exact amount but it will be approximately 18.2 percent of the total cost of operating parks that will come back in revenue, which is \$1.3 million.

MR. McKENZIE: So that's roughly 200,000 bucks.

MR. TOUPIN: 1.3 million that will come back in revenue.

MR. McKENZIE: Eighteen percent of that is roughly . . . Mr. Chairman, what's the wildlife policy of the department regarding wildlife? This is something that's of concern. I'm not a hunter, never was and never intend to be, but I'm around in some of the parks from time to time and they're recognizing real quick - while there is basically very few deer out in the open areas, they're flocking to the parks real fast, and the deer, it's a pretty brilliant animal and it's recognizing real quick that he's safe there and he's not going to be hunted I daresay. Last Sunday evening my wife and I, Saturday evening, drove down to the Shellmouth Dam - I never saw deer like that in all my lifetime. There were hundreds of them. I usually see three or four. So it's quite evident that they're going to flock to that area. Also, I think some of the finest habitat, deer habitat, in this province is on the west banks of the Assiniboine River there. So, are these animals now going to be all protected in the parks continually? You know, where are we going? Are you working in partnership with the Wildlife Management people, who today I don't think are doing nothing. I think the Minister, Mr. Green, has . . . We lost all the Wildlife Management people so there's been a shift from . . . with this province where Wildlife Management was a top priority but now I'd like to know, are you prepared to pick up that slack and give us some kind of indication of the policy of Wildlife Management that we can expect from the tourism and recreation in our parks?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the question at hand is not under this appropriation but we can deal with it now if you so desire.

MR. McKENZIE: Well you have Renewable Resource Management in there.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, but I am informed that it will come under a different section. The responsibility of determining the criteria used pertaining to parks in the Province of Manitoba falls under Renewable Resources, but there is a committee of Cabinet between the Minister

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Renewable Resources, and myself, pertaining to what should be desired in regards to wildlife protection in the Province of Manitoba. I signified to the public in the past month my personal feelings in regard to the protection of wildlife and I have no fears in indicating to the committee that I feel that in parks, in provincial parks, wildlife should be controlled, that the hunting of wildlife should be a controlled one, where there could be an attempt to balance the number of species that we have in regard to our provincial parks. But the policy that was established many years ago, apart from the banning of the hunting of deer and moose and so on like we've had for the last two years, has not been altered since we've taken office, to my knowledge.

MR. McKENZIE: Well I apologize for raising it, but I saw, Mr. Chairman, the comment Renewal Resource Management Programs in Park Lands under the item which we are dealing with. Now can I ask what you're going to do about bears then?

MR. TOUPIN: Well again, Mr. Chairman, that is a question of attempting to control the number of bears that we have in parks, and those that cannot be controlled we have to do away with some of them. We've had to do that either directly through officials in our parks, or have it done by others who have that responsibility. Some bears can be trained to stay away from cottages and so on. Others can't, so they have to be done away with.

MR. McKENZIE: Well then, you just transfer them . . . put them in a wilderness area . . .

MR. TOUPIN: Well sometimes yes, but sometimes they come back and we have to shoot them.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering . . . You mentioned, I think, the changes in the daily rate for camping this coming year, and I'm just wondering if you could tell me the cost per day and the cost per week or per month - is there a monthly charge too on the parks? What is the maximum length of stay?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll call on Mr. Danyluk, my Assistant Deputy Minister, to give the details. There was a press release made on that, I guess about a month and a half ago. Unless he has a form here that I can . . . The new rates as accepted by Cabinet are, for daily rates, unserviced sites, \$2.50 per day.

MR. McKELLAR: That's unserviced.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. McKELLAR: What's serviced?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, I'll go through it. Electrical sites \$3.00; fully-serviced sites \$4.00 per day.

MR. McKELLAR: \$4.00 eh?

MR. TOUPIN: Now weekly unserviced sites - that was dropped, so there's no weekly rate for unserviced, electrical or fully-serviced sites on the weekly basis. It falls under the daily fee.

MR. McKELLAR: There's no monthly, eh?

MR. TOUPIN: The seasonal . . . No, no monthly. The seasonal unserviced sites is \$85.00, and the electrical sites \$125, and the fully serviced sites \$200. Now the main reason we dropped the weekly and monthly fees is that we have a great demand for sites in our different parks, and we're attempting to roll as quickly as we possibly can to accommodate as many people as we possibly can. We're not able to build parks as fast as we should, really, to maintain demand.

MR. McKELLAR: Well I had it brought to my attention, Mr. Chairman, by a senior citizen, and he was wondering, because of the fact some of the senior citizens they have no set schedule and he wanted to spend three days in Spruce Woods and go on to Turtle Mountain and spend another three or four days, they are just wondering if there's a monthly rate, or something of that nature, that they could just move from place to place and that monthly rate would cover them at all places. In other words, what you're saying is that you pay on a daily rate and then you go on to the next park and then you have to . . .

MR. TOUPIN: We have no present policy, Mr. Chairman, in regards to senior citizens, apart from making a free pass available to them to provincial parks, and that was done I believe for the last, how many years? The last two years.

MR. McKELLAR: But that's not camping privileges. That's just daytime.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. TOUPIN: No. That's entry to the park.

MR. McKELLAR: Hm hm. And the seasonal is \$85.00, then, for the whole season, eh?

MR. TOUPIN: That's for unserviced sites.

MR. McKELLAR: That's right, unserviced. And \$125 and \$200 eh? What increase, percentage of increase, is that over what it was previously?

MR. TOUPIN: It was \$50.00 from 1970 to 1974, and increased to \$85.00.

MR. McKELLAR: And the electric, the ones that are electrical, what was that percentage?

MR. TOUPIN: That was \$75.00 for electrical site to \$125, and fully-serviced \$125 to \$200.

MR. McKELLAR: Oh I see, yes.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, the question relative to the wildlife that was raised awhile ago, and it was mentioned that the bears that became a nuisance around cottage sites were transported to other areas. Is it the parks people that do this or the wildlife people, and are the animals marked when they're moved away to another area, and are they moved in the park or are they moved out of the park?

MR. TOUPIN: In most cases, I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that we do this ourselves, apart from the North where we get officials from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources to do that function for us. And when a bear is moved from one given area to another, the bear is marked, and if it happens too often, well then he has to be disposed of.

MR. ADAM: He's just moved from one area of the park to the next?

MR. TOUPIN: No, no. Mr. Chairman, if I may . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: From one area that he shouldn't be in because there's cottages and what not, to another isolated area which is considered to be primitive.

MR. ADAM: Within the park?

MR. TOUPIN: It could be within the park.

MR. ADAM: And have there been any cases where you have moved him out of the park somewhere else?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. ADAM: And they still come back?

MR. TOUPIN: Some of them.

MR. ADAM: Has there been any research done insofar as the predators of the deer? How is the balance maintained there?

MR. TOUPIN: We have no count on that.

MR. ADAM: You have no count on the wolves, the timber wolves, who are predators of the deer?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, we have it, I'm informed, for our own records but that is a function of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, now Renewable Resources.

MR. ADAM: In the parks?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you. I just would be interested in knowing, with regard to the lengthier leases on any campground facilities with regards to trailers being parked, is the department more or less scrapping that particular plan? I know that some people who presently have trailers in different trailer court areas, when they sell their trailer, the lease, or the particular arrangement that they have with the government, is not transferable and the owner then uses the right, and I think for awhile there has been the practice of, if somebody did sell a trailer in a specific spot, that he would maintain that rental agreement with the government under his own name and keep on paying it even if the new owner was there. I'm wondering if there was any five-year term leases signed with reference to this type of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, we have such arrangements, I'm

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) informed, in three parts in the Province of Manitoba: Falcon, West Hawk and Dorothy Lake. The system that was established quite a few years ago is being phased out by attrition, in the sense that we do renew the leases on a yearly basis for those that are now within those sites, but they're not transferable and, if the individual passes away, he can't pass it on to anyone else, because again of the same comment I made awhile ago, because of the great need for those sites to roll over more often. But we haven't taken the policy decision and I'm not recommending - I haven't last year and I will not this year, say . . . cut away or do away with these leases on the yearly basis to accommodate, say, the daily users. But it will be done by attrition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Do I understand then that people who are presently occupying lots or spaces for trailers will be able to get this one year lease but people that are - let's say if that person would sell his trailer, would not be able to be on a weekly or a seasonal basis as mentioned.

MR. TOUPIN: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 1 - Salaries, Wages - The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on the point that was raised by the Member for La Verendrye. My understanding is that - I'm referring to Manipogo now, Manipogo Park on Lake Manitoba - and the question was raised whereby a person came in and rented a lot and he had a camper trailer on the truck, and we rent for a week or so many days, and they choose a spot, and they get accustomed to that spot, and they have their little environment there, and you know, their little tables and their barbecues, and so on, that are provided for by the park, but because of the fact that he doesn't have a detached trailer, he has a camper trailer, a camper on the truck, and he drives out during the day, and he comes back at night to get into his slot and he finds it's occupied by someone else, then he has to look around for another slot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that if that individual notifies the park attendant, you know, of his comings and goings into the park, that his site will be reserved for him, so he has free entry and exit to the park. But he has to notify because otherwise there's no other way to control it.

What we're looking at equally in the park system is some sort of a name tag, where a lot is actually given out to an individual, if he takes it for say, four or five days, and it is predetermined that he's going to be there for that time, that he could either have a number or name there inserted. You know that would certainly rectify the problem that you have in saying that it is occupied, it's busy, it cannot be used. And I'm informed equally, Mr. Chairman, that it is now in force in quite a few of our parks already, but we haven't covered all of them.

MR. ADAM: What about policing, Mr. Chairman, in the parks? I notice that we've had to close the gates at certain hours - and I'm, of course, quite in favour of that, because I don't think it's very pleasant for anyone that's camping overnight to have outsiders or extras coming up and down the lanes and roads, . . . and so on. Also, is there any plans for dust control?

MR. TOUPIN: Again, Mr. Chairman, in regard to policing of our parks, a lot of the problem stems from the fact that we allowed the overload or - I don't know if it's called the overload, the overflow - part of the park to reach a level where it is impossible to control. So last year what we did is that we cut that down drastically, and it is my policy that if it continues, and it hasn't from a certain level, that the overflow itself would be cut completely.

Now, in regard to control of dust within the parks, well, there's an attempt to, wherever possible, and whenever funds allow, to spread oil on . . . especially the parts that are used more frequently. But it's impossible to cover all the different roads, the road system in the park itself. There's oil, and chloride is used in busy parks where there's a lot of dust.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I have a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speak into the microphone please.

MR. McKENZIE: Oh. Mr. Chairman, the Minister and the department now have - how could I say - you've established a policy for designating the use of the parks in the province today. I think you've got what? - natural parks, wilderness parks - I think there's six classifications. Are you considering further zoning of - you know, you've gone that far now - are you considering further zoning?

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, there is five classifications now, I'm informed, primitive use and intensive use, and ranging from one to the other. There's no present contemplation to add to that.

MR. MCKENZIE: So in other words you're going to stick with the - what is it? - the natural parks, the wilderness parks, the recreational parks, the travel - there's six of them, isn't there?

MR. TOUPIN: Five. Mr. Chairman, it's difficult for me to relate exactly. I'll call on Mr. Danyluk, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks.

MR. MCKENZIE: There's Heritage, and the other one was special use, wasn't it, if I remember.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Danyluk.

MR. DANYLUK: There are 13 park types that we use all told, and within that we have a land-use zoning scheme which zones the park in five different land-use classifications, ranging from intensive use areas through to resource areas, through to primitive and wilderness areas.

MR. MCKENZIE: But the reason I raised it, I wonder, the master plan that's being developed now for the Riding Mountain National Park is like the - I'm wondering, have you made any submissions to the hearings that were held around? Has the department?

MR. TOUPIN: The officials of my department have had discussions with officials of the federal department responsible. I've equally sent correspondence to the Minister in regard to what we felt would be an acceptable guideline.

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes. I think it's an excellent way to listen to the people. It's three phases, as you well know. They went around first, then they came second, and they're coming back now after they've analyzed it, and try and put it in the computer. I'm sure that maybe you had this paper that came to me the other day. You know, the information they've picked up there is invaluable, in this document. Even we could use . . . Maybe you've picked up a lot of the interested people in parks already, and I do hope that when the policy does come, it's one we can live with, because I live in the area and part of Riding Mountain National Park is in my constituency, and it's been a disaster since Day One. Can I get some understanding now, what kind of deal you have with the City regarding the Assiniboine Park?

MR. TOUPIN: That will come, Mr. Chairman, under a different section, where we'll indicate the amount that we pay the City of Winnipeg in regard to . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Which section, Rene?

MR. TOUPIN: Page 18.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We've had some brief mention about policing in provincial parks and I don't know if this would be the proper section to deal with this particular matter, but I think it's of concern to all people using the facilities. I appreciate the problems that the Minister has had, and I refer specifically to the Whiteshell area, Falcon Lake, West Hawk, which experiences fairly heavy camping usage during the long weekends and, as the Minister expressed, the overflow facilities are sometimes overflowing themselves. I think this has been our experience in the past, at least that I have noticed. This last year we did have considerable problems on those long weekends with regard to people driving around and smashing bottles, and I know the parks authorities had their hands full as well as the RCMP.

I would like to say that I wholeheartedly endorse the Department's efforts in giving the parks authorities as much authority and latitude as they can as far as dealing with these noisemakers and people that create disturbances, and I think this is probably a problem that we'll be facing much more in the future if, as the Minister said, indeed we are really not keeping up with the rapid growth of people that want to get out into the outdoors and camp.

I am wondering, has the Department got a certain liaison or a certain agreement with the RCMP in these different areas with regard to the policing of that, or is the government intending to add certain personnel to the parks authority to make sure that a reasonable amount of order is kept in the provincial facilities?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I am informed that that matter would be better dealt with on Page 17 under Park Maintenance.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to open a can of worms but I want to talk about worms and spraying. What Department would I . . . ? What section of this book will I . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the Department of Agriculture is given responsibility for that type of spraying and in some cases we do it ourselves.

MR. ADAM: Well what section can I talk under?

MR. TOUPIN: That will be under Maintenance and Operation, Page 17, next page.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. I'll bring it up later then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. Use the microphone please.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, are you talking on Page 16?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you use the microphone please.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll speak on 17, Page 17, once we've passed 16.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, we're still on the Provincial Park System, Management Services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PATRICK: I wondered if the Minister has given any consideration to consider Bird's Hill Park as an urban park. I know there's no fees charged for Assiniboine Park and it's utilized to the fullest extent. Now Bird's Hill Park, Mr. Chairman, is also utilized quite extensively and it's utilized by many senior citizens and many people that have no means of transportation to, or have no means to get to parks like Falcon Lake or some of our other parks in the province. I feel that Bird's Hill Park is so close to the City of Winnipeg, close to an urban centre that has 600,000 people, I think it's something that all of us and perhaps the Minister can give some serious consideration if it can be considered an urban park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly it can be, but it hasn't been up till now. The honourable member is aware that all senior citizens in Manitoba receive free passes to our provincial parks, including Bird's Hill Park, and all those that come from Winnipeg, say, in buses do have free entrance to the park. In a lot of cases - well I'd say most cases - those coming from the urban part of Winnipeg would come by bus, so that would not be a cost to them. But it is a policy that can be looked at, but we haven't contemplated it.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad that the Minister says that he would be prepared to look at it, because aside from the senior citizens there's many people in this city, on low income, that never get to a park, never get to a provincial park, and if they knew that they can get to a park free of cost with transportation that we have now between Winnipeg and Bird's Hill, I'm sure . . . But I hope that the Minister takes this quite seriously and I'm glad he's saying that he's prepared to look at it.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes. Again, you know, we must indicate that there is the subsidization of the City of Winnipeg Transit System that goes to the park itself, and apart from that, the honourable member must recognize that if we did have such a policy to have access to Bird's Hill Park free of charge, that the 18.2 percent of the total costs of running our provincial parks would be much less, and that means that we'd need additional revenue. So it's something that we have to look at equally.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister indicate what is the revenue from . . . ?

MR. TOUPIN: 18.2 percent of the total cost of running our parks comes by way of revenue. The balance is paid out by expenditures that we raise through expenditures . . .

MR. PATRICK: What would that figure amount to, say, for Bird's Hill Park? The people, the cars that come into Bird's Hill Park?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, for park entrance fees, you know, totally we raised approximately \$420,000.

MR. PATRICK: Total.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, total. We haven't got the breakdown for Bird's Hill Park. That could be had later.

MR. PATRICK: To me I think it makes sense, Mr. Chairman, because it's not only a park for picnicking and everything else, but it's a nature park as well. It's a place where you

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) have 9,000 acres of beautiful scenery and it's a beautiful site, and I'd say it's one of the best things that happened this close to the City of Winnipeg with a park of that size. I hope that the Minister will really give it serious consideration.

MR. TOUPIN: It's going to become nicer.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, while we're on the sort of issue of urban parks, I have had the opportunity in the past to pose some questions to the Minister about the intentions of the government to develop a program for rescuing much of the rapidly vanishing open space that we have in parts of Winnipeg, particularly those which are along river banks and which cover some of the very critical historical points, such as Fishermen's Point and the junction of the Red and Assiniboine, and other areas. I recognize that there's a split in jurisdiction, with the city taking some responsibility, but as they often claim, they are hamstrung financially. But I also believe that the Federal Government has indicated in recent statements that they are now prepared to look at the whole question of the financing of urban open space.

I simply want to point out, Mr. Chairman, while we have a chance for a little bit more informal dialogue, that the situation in this city is reaching a very critical state. I would say that probably Winnipeg has less open space per population than almost any other city in Canada, and certainly that's true in older Inner City areas. In my own constituency, which covers both sides of the river, both the Assiniboine and the Red, we are almost virtually without any open space at all, and yet we have the highest density of population of anywhere in the city. I think that in my own constituency, which has close to 35,000 residents, we have two small parks and that's about it. And if you compare it to cities like Saskatoon, Edmonton, Calgary, and Ottawa, we're simply not even in their league. We're not even close to the amount of space that they have in proportion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member, but I've been informed that this item would better be raised under Provincial Park Development on Page 17.

MR. AXWORTHY: I'd be quite happy to . . . If the Minister would like to wait until the discussion at that point, I'm quite prepared to wait too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Otherwise we tend to get debate on . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: I just thought that with the question by the Member from Assiniboia this was a natural follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 1. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Yes. The master plan of the Duck Mountains. Is it satisfied it's going to work okay and everything's going ahead as prescribed by the plan or . . . ? What happened to the lodge? It looks like it's been scrapped. A lot of people keep asking me when the lodge is going to get off the ground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it hasn't been scrapped because it hasn't been printed yet. They should be printed very shortly where I can have a look at it and make certain comments before I make recommendations to my colleagues.

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

MR. TOUPIN: I'm sorry, can I make a correction to that? I'm just informed that it's been printed but I haven't actually given it consideration.

MR. McKENZIE: Fine.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to comment on the comments made by the Member for Assiniboia. I'm not sure whether I understood him correctly to say that he wanted the Bird's Hill Park to be an urban park and a free park, where no charge would be . . . Am I correct on that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, that was certainly the deduction that I got from the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and we take it in that vein.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, was he referring just to senior citizens or the general public at large?

MR. TOUPIN: The general public.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. ADAM: You know, speaking as a rural member, I would tend to object to that suggestion, because I fail to see where the people in rural Manitoba should be obliged to pay for park services and the people of Winnipeg would have free services. So in that context I would have to be opposed to the honourable member's suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the comments made by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose are equally well taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Management Services was read line by line and passed, total \$575,700)

Field Administration, Line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits, \$578,300 - passed. Line 2, \$111,700. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Line 2. I'd like a breakdown of that \$111,700, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: The provision for office equipment rentals for regional and district offices, \$5,200; printing and stationery supplies, \$13,500; postage and telephones, \$23,000; furniture and furnishings, warehouses, staff cabins, etc., \$5,300; building maintenance supplies, janitorial supplies, \$8,900.

MR. McKENZIE: That's a long way from \$111,000 - 46, 56, 64, 65.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member will hold. That was the increase that, you know, that we have here. I'll get the details on the total amount.

MR. McKENZIE: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions while we're waiting for that?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have the information here. The breakdown is furniture and furnishings, Office - \$5,200; printing and stationery supplies \$13,500; posters(?), telephone, telegraph - \$23,000; furniture, furnishings - \$5,300; building maintenance supply - \$8,900; utilities - \$31,500; fuel, heat - \$24,300.

MR. McKENZIE: What was the last one?

MR. TOUPIN: \$24,300. That's fuel, heat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: How much of that utility item then is electric heat? All of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. McKENZIE: Well then, Rene, the other item then, the fuel heat - that's wood eh, or . . . ?

MR. TOUPIN: . . . wood. I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that about a third would be electric heat. The balance would be oil.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 2, Facilities and Equipment - \$111,700 -- pass? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, could you explain why Specialized Equipment, Services and Supplies \$186,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's line 3? The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, purchase and servicing of specialized equipment, equipment for renewable resource work, boats, outboard motors, power toboggans, \$28,800. Purchase of gasoline and lubricants for power toboggans, boats, chain saws, etc., \$7,200; and rental of government-owned vehicles for regional staff, 150,900, which is an increase of 32,800 and that's due to price increases of 28.4 and work load change, transfer of three positions from manager of services activity, \$5,400.

MR. McKELLAR: Are those trucks -- are those leased from Public Works, are they?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 3, Specialized Equipment--passed; Line 4, Construction . . .

MR. McKELLAR: What is involved in that \$17,000?

MR. TOUPIN: Purchase of building materials for maintenance in regional and district offices, equipment shops, warehouses, \$6,900. Materials such as gravel or asphalt for regional and district offices' parking lots and roads, landscaping materials, etc. \$10,800. That's an increase of \$2,500 due to price increases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 4 - Construction--passed; Line 5 - Other Operating Costs - passed; Line 6 - Citizens and Other Employee Assistance and Services - \$4,000--pass? The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, that covers the cost of uniforms for regional staff, \$4,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Fine. I was just asking if they were the new ones or the old ones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: The answer has been given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Line 6 - Citizens and Other Employee Assistance and Services, \$4,000-passed. Total for the section \$938,700-passed.

Top of Page 17 - Park Maintenance and Operation. Line 1 - Salaries, Wages and Other Fringe Benefits. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the area indicated yesterday when I asked a question about the type of maintenance service that is being maintained in Grand Beach, one of the largest beaches in Manitoba. In fact, I would say one of the largest inland beaches in North America as far as I've heard, and one of the most beautiful beaches, yet there is not the type of maintenance service on the beaches to the type of motorized sweepers which they have at Falcon, which has a very small beach in comparison, yet my understanding is that there are two motorized vehicles. I know the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has a cottage there but--(Interjection)--No? He says it's not true, but it's my understanding there are two vehicles stationed in Falcon and the garbage pick-up. There are the type of garbage vehicles, I've noticed, the same as they have here in the city, and garbage pick-up is fairly regular. At Grand Beach there are many cottages in the west beach area and I had occasion to stay there for some time last summer and found that garbage does pile up on the corners. There is no adequate provisions to fill all the garbage cans that are . . . you know, not provided, but at the same time the pick-up is only once a week in an area which is certainly visited by many many thousands of people from the Winnipeg area because it's the closest large beach and has good access. However, it seems to me that the maintenance sometimes leaves something to be desired. And I know I've had, last summer, discussions with a number of people. It was not my idea to bring up the topic but they chose to acquaint me with the situation.

One of the problems that they were faced with is the insufficient washroom facilities. There is one closer to the beach but none further away from the beach area, and they find that the people are not . . . Very often it's flooded because of the over-use and because of, I'd say, vandalism on occasion. I have seen it once in the East Beach area, and this occasionally happens in the West Beach area. I just wonder how the Minister is proposing to improve the facilities in that area, which is certainly a very popular area for many people from Winnipeg.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, whose side is he on?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, I'm on the side of the people, many of my constituents, who visit the area and do complain to me occasionally about the sometimes lack of adequate facilities, and especially on the beach, where there is not enough maintenance of raking and sweeping, the type of mechanical device that you use in Falcon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, seriously, the maintenance at that given area of the province is - well the garbage pick-up, as an example. The policy is to pick up garbage as needed - as need, you know, is apparent. Now there could have been a problem there. The type of sweepers, as an example, is the same type of sweeper as we use in Falcon or West Hawk Lake and the power rake equally is the same type as we use on Falcon and West Hawk Lakes. There is a planned construction of washrooms, one more washroom in that area for this summer. We are aware that there is need to improve the facilities, not only there, but in many other areas, and we are planning according to the funds that we have available.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that there are some improvements going to be made as far as the washroom facilities. But you mention that there are the mechanical sweepers. When are they used? How often are they put out on the beaches to clean up the beach?

MR. TOUPIN: About twice a week.--(Interjection)--

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I never do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to bring up the matter which I mentioned previously with regard to the policing in the provincial parks and, as I mentioned, we did have some problems in the Falcon area which was in my constituency last year. Again, I would like to say that I would wholeheartedly endorse the parks authorities to deal with the noisemakers and people who create public disturbances in a manner which I understand they have, and I don't think that any of the people using the facilities mind if the parks authorities come in with a half ton truck and load up these noisemakers, tent and all, and evict them out of the park. I think it's a thing we should get tough on because there are people there that are there to enjoy themselves for the weekend and they shouldn't have their weekend ruined by a couple of people that just are out for a lark.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, it's not on the point of order, but the honourable member made his comments a while ago and I believe I can recall pretty well what he had to say and it is, you know, on Hansard. I would like to indicate to him, well the same comment that I said a while ago pertaining to attempting to control the overflow, which we've done in Falcon Lake and I believe elsewhere in the province, and we have very good co-operation with the RCMP but, because of the overflow going to I say approximately what? - 600 at one time - it was completely impossible for the RCMP - I believe there were 14 officers involved and about 20 of our own staff involved in that case - to control 600 people when they started to roll. So the decision was taken to reduce the overflow and that certainly helped the problem that we had at Falcon Lake. We are adding police control in the troubled areas that we have in the province, but I think that the answer lies mainly with the utilization, the wide utilization pertaining to the capacity of a given park. That will certainly help in regard to problems that we now have.

MR. BANMAN: A further point, Mr. Chairman. With regard to, and I would speak specifically to Falcon Lake because I'm familiar with the area, I would like to ask the Minister, with regards to the keeping of the grounds and the general concession area in Falcon Lake, has there been a sort of a standstill as far as the budgeting goes for the maintenance of that particular establishment?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Shopping Centre itself, there are plans to refurbish the Shopping Centre. In regard to the grounds generally, I can appreciate the comments by the honourable member. In a lot of cases last summer it left a lot to be desired, and we're hoping to have possibly a better system to keep those grounds clean during the year. But it's sometimes very difficult to follow those that happen to just be passing through the park and cause some of that problem. But I wasn't pleased with what I saw, especially in some given areas in Falcon Lake. We're attempting to rectify some of them.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, speaking to some of the people in charge of the area, I know they're trying their best but I noticed throughout the years, if we go back a number of years with regard to the facility at Falcon Lake, it was one of the nicest we had in Manitoba and I think everybody was proud of it. But I notice that the grass and that type of thing, the flowers that they used to plant, and the upkeep, just isn't there that was there a number of years ago, and I understand it's a lack of again budgetary and physical means. --(Interjection)-- No, there's just problems with regard to the maintenance of the present facility, not with regard to litter or anything. And I was wondering if the Minister has discussed anything possibly with the Youth Secretariat as for getting some of the people. We're expressing concerns about high school people and university people getting jobs, and maybe the Minister could consult with the Minister of Education with regard to giving some of these young people a job out in that area, because I think there is a definite need for a certain type of clean-up and beautification to be taking place. I would note, and I am pleased to hear that the Shopping Centre area and the concession area in the Falcon Lake area will be upgraded, because it's been fair run down in the last little while. Anybody walking there under the sort of mall that they've got there right now, with all the barn swallows that are there, you make sure that you're wearing a hat otherwise you could possibly be in trouble. The grounds around it and everything, I think, have sort of been let go and I would encourage the Minister to go ahead with those upgrading facilities as soon as he found it possible.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I could inform the honourable member that in regard to some of the problems that he outlined that we are adding staff to the ability that we have through the estimates before us. In regard to giving more emphasis to patrol and through training of individuals, we have approximately 135 students employed during the summer months through

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) our park system. Some of them are assigned to Falcon Lake, others to West Hawk, and to all the other parks that we have in the province. It's a question of making our requirements known to the Department of Colleges and Universities. There sometimes is a problem with students in the sense that we don't get the ongoing, how should I say, responsibility on the yearly basis, and it is sometimes difficult to train and have services at the same time. So we don't always get the type of people that we need for an orderly servicing of our parks, but students are employed, and employed to the best of our ability. I could inform equally the honourable member pertaining to Falcon Lake, that I am discussing with the Minister of Corrections to have the inmates back at Falcon Lake, pertaining to the golf course and the upkeeping of the grounds in the golf course, and possibly surrounding areas.

MR. BANMAN: The Minister mentioned the golf course. Would the funding for that particular facility come out of this? I'm wondering if the Minister could tell the committee, I understand this is one of the few golf courses that the Tourism Branch runs, what the financial return is on that particular golf course.

MR. TOUPIN: \$90,000. Last year we received \$72,000; we're estimating \$90,000 revenue this year.

MR. BANMAN: There's been talk, Mr. Chairman, about different things, about terminating different golf courses, and with regard to Riding Mountain and different things, I wonder if the Minister would elaborate a little bit as far as the Falcon Golf Course is concerned, since it does employ a fair number of people in the area, not only in my constituency but his also.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, we haven't got a present policy and no contemplated policy to, say, do away with the course, and it's classified for those who golf - and I golf - to be the second best in the province.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief because the Minister answered some of the questions that I had in mind. I just would like to indicate to him it may be false economy not to completely keep the buildings and the grounds in good repair, because when he mentioned about students, I know that in St. James when we had the STEP program we had many students painting and doing a tremendous job; in fact were doing as good a job as any best painting company could give. And since some of these can be used in the summer with some supervision, for instance buildings, perhaps they can be painted every second year, and with bulk paint buying it probably wouldn't be that expensive, and I think that's one thing.

I think in Manitoba we're most fortunate, Mr. Chairman, that we have the parks system that we have, because it's the best in Canada. There is no other province that has the system that we have and I think we're fortunate. But the Member for La Verendrye's correct, that, you know, there has been - some of the things have been sort of let down, not so much last year, I know the golf course, not so much last year because there was a tremendous amount of repair, just the water system was installed, but prior to last year, I don't think we cut the grass as often as it should have been cut and sometimes when we feel that we'll save money, when you have a lot of tourists around, they just won't play. If the course is not in good condition, it just discourages them. They may play 9 holes and say, well, it's not good. On the other hand, if that course - because it is a beautiful course, one of the best in Manitoba - I think if it's in good shape there will be line-ups every day to get on it. So I think it would be false not to keep it in good shape because I think it is one of the best parks in the province.

The other point, the Minister indicated the revenue is \$90,000 from the golf course alone.

MR. TOUPIN: Projected.

MR. PATRICK: Projected. Can the Minister indicate, what is the operating costs of the golf course itself?

MR. TOUPIN: About \$50,000.

MR. PATRICK: So it would carry itself.

MR. TOUPIN: More than carry itself.

MR. PATRICK: More than carry itself. I'm satisfied with the other answers that the Minister has given, that it is something that the department staff is concerned about.

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

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It's indicated here in this section that there are 44 provincial recreation parks, and I presume that Methley Beach on Lake Dauphin would be one of those. I received several complaints last year. Methley Beach is quite popular for the residents of Ste. Rose and in that area, as well as around the Methley area, and I'm told that there was quite a deterioration last year. I understand that a lot of the facilities there, the constructed facilities, were moved away to other areas and I'd like the Minister to indicate just what are the plans for this particular beach.

I have a couple more questions that I could probably ask at the present time. I mentioned awhile ago, when we were on the previous section, about spraying for the caterpillar tent worms. There was quite a heavy infestation last year, and I'm just wondering . . . I notice that at Manipogo the beach was free of this particular worm but the surrounding areas were not, and I'm just wondering how much of a buffer zone is sprayed to protect the park; who sprayed it, whether it's the Department of Agriculture or the Parks Branch; and my understanding is that the majority of the camp owners, the privately-owned cottage owners, are going to spray this year for this particular little animal.

Also, one of the previous Ministers had indicated the intention to erect a cairn at the Kergwenan Wayside Park, which is on the 51st parallel; in fact the Minister had indicated that the cairn was already constructed and ready to move. I'm just wondering what happened to that cairn. Has it been placed? It may create some interest. Kergwenan Park is six miles south of Ste. Rose - a wayside park.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Minister, in regard to Methley Beach, the area was vandalized, I'm informed, severely several years ago, actually damages to furniture that had to be removed. No current plans to actually re-do the whole thing, but there is a policy to gradually replacing the damage done in that given area.

In regard to spraying for worms, we do that. We usually check with the Department of Agriculture and we use a buffer zone of approximately 300 feet of surrounding area, a surrounding given area, where we feel that spraying should be had. But there is a buffer zone of about 300 feet.

In regard to Kergwenan Wayside, PTH5, it was a marker denoting the 51st parallel of latitude and it's not erected yet, but it will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to hear that there is a fairly good revenue derived from the Provincial Park at Falcon and that the idea of a maintenance program to improve the facilities there is very good. However, I'm wondering, when is the department going to move to establish that long-promised golf course at Bird's Hill? Bird's Hill is within travelling distance of most Winnipeggers. There is a regular bus service, I believe, during the summer months. I know that there have been plans for many years about building, I believe it was a 36-hole golf course. I don't believe that the costs would be anywhere near what the costs were in the construction of the Falcon Golf Course because the Falcon Golf Course was built in absolutely virgin land where there had to be a lot of clearing, a lot of the brush cleared out and so on, and a lot of sodding, whereas Bird's Hill is pretty well sodded and there is natural terrain for the development of a golf course.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, there are no present plans within the estimates before us to add a golf course in Bird's Hill. There have been plans prepared by the department for same, but it has not been compensated as being desirable by the government for this fiscal year. It was considered that the number of golf courses, either in or surrounding Winnipeg, were enough to accommodate a need for the time being in regard to the priorities that we have elsewhere in the parks system that had to be accommodated in this fiscal year, and equally in regard to the funds that we had available. So the answer to the honourable member is that there is no contemplated move to build a golf course in Bird's Hill this year.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Chairman, I'm very disappointed to hear that there's no contemplation in the near future to build a course. My understanding was that there were plans a number of years ago that there was supposed to be construction on a golf course, and in fact there had been even a sign, and it still is there I believe, which raised the hopes of many people who come to Bird's Hill that they are going to be able to enjoy the swimming, the children would be able to go swimming, and the parents, whoever wishes to go golfing would be able to take in all of this in one very easy accessible reach from the city, that this was the plan. I beg to

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) disagree with the fact that say the priorities have been established to proceed with the Hecla Island Park, which is quite far removed from the city. The one in Falcon is quite far removed. It's what? Some 80, 90 miles. And here is one You know, the city municipally-operated golf courses are used to capacity and I think that this is one of the priorities that should be reconsidered, or should be considered as a priority, to establish that long-promised golf course at Bird's Hill.

On another point, Mr. Chairman, I know that there are some 44 provincial recreation parks, and I just wonder if it would be possible to give a breakdown of the type of expenditures under that sum you have - I guess it's Facilities and Equipment, Specialized Equipment, Services and Supplies - you know, a breakdown of the type of expenditures that are made in the various parks. Primarily I would like a comparison, say, between Falcon and Grand Beach. These are the two largest recreation parks in the province. They certainly have the largest attendance, and I would venture to say that possibly Grand Beach has more people than any other provincial park in the province. I'd like a breakdown of the type of expenditures that are made, and I'm not going to refer to the expenditure of a year or two ago of the store facilities that were built in the East beach. But just right through the whole area, what is the expenditure based on the present estimates provided for us? A rough breakdown between these two major . . . and the revenues, if you can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we're on line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, the last question of the Honourable Member for Radisson will be taken as notice and we'll attempt to get that information for the next sitting of the committee.

In regard to the golf course in Bird's Hill, well the honourable member is quite aware that we, as a government, have not promised that. I've been the MLA for the area since 1969 and I've never made a promise. I'm not aware of any previous Minister in the Department of Tourism and Recreation, Recreation Department, that has. The only thing that we did commit ourselves on was the ski slope in Bird's Hill and that's going ahead. It's now got a slope of 130 and the policy is to bring that up to approximately 260 feet. It's impossible to fill all desires of people at the same time. I did not indicate to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that it was not the intent of the government to look at it on a long-range possibility, but it was not included within the estimates for this year.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I realize that Bird's Hill Park is within the constituency of the Honourable Minister, but I do not expect that there are as many people of the Honourable Minister attending that park as there are from my constituency and members in the urban ridings, so it would certainly be in the interests to have this priority upgraded that we can look forward in the very near future where this contemplated, long-promised golf course would be proceeded with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd rather than continually asking this question on staff, maybe the Minister with the help of his staff could just break down the whole staff and give it to us in one shot and we won't have to continually raise the item. And we can do that at the next meeting.

MR. TOUPIN: Well I have that, if you want it now. The salaries for

MR. McKENZIE: This is the total department.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes. For this section

MR. McKENZIE: The whole department so we don't have to raise it all the time. Just add it up and you have so many people in your department, that's it. And you can get it tomorrow or the next day. I'm in no hurry for it.

MR. TOUPIN: Well we can give you that now too for the whole thing it you want it.

MR. McKENZIE: Okay.

MR. TOUPIN: Now in regards to the total department's permanent staff, 259, term 118.83, departmental staff 529, for a total of 907.31 - that was for 1974-75. Requested which we have in the estimates now, for the total department 258 permanent staff, down one; term 141.02, and that's up; departmental staff 632.44, and that's up; for a total of 1,031.46 staff.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you. The next question, Mr. Chairman, a lot of this Crown land that the parks of this province occupy now was formerly under the jurisdiction of the

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Now, have you assumed all this land under your department? In other words, if there's a flood damage or some unforeseen Act of God that takes place in one of the parks of this province, are you responsible, or is the Department of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for any damage that may occur?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's still a shared responsibility and there is collaboration between the two departments of government now, but the responsibility of flooding would be dealt with, you know, by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and not by our department. The transfer did not include all Crown lands pertaining to, that was originally in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources or the Department of Renewable Resources.

MR. McKENZIE: Can you advise the committee, is there any of these parks that's listed here that you have full jurisdiction over? Or the wayside parks? I'm sure the wayside, you must have.

MR. TOUPIN: Most of the parks south of Riding Mountain we control totally.

MR. McKENZIE: North of that you don't, eh?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes. It's a shared responsibility north.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line 1, Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to refer to a question that I asked of the Minister in the House a couple of days ago, and this is with regard to the opening of new summer home lots. I think the Minister is aware that in the past while, the prices of cottages in any lake area, especially fronting any lakes, of course have skyrocketed and I think it's almost out of the reach of anybody that wants to buy them at the present going rate. I'm just wondering if the department has a program or a projection which they will be proposing over the next number of years, opening different lakes and either by public auction or by tender allowing people to take an extended 20-year or 49-year lease on those lots. Because I know there's a lot of people in my constituency that would be interested in buying a lot or leasing a lot for an extended time and building just a modest summer home on there, and this at the present time, of course, is totally out of the realm of anybody's hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's been indicated to me that our colleagues in the House are about to rise. We'll join them.

* * * * *

MR. GREEN: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Osland): Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, reports progress, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Walding): Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSLAND (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.