

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 2, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 92 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing of the Montrose School. These students are under the direction of Mr. D. Gilfillan, Mr. H. Bauhaud and Mrs. V. Cooke. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs)(St. Boniface): I have a statement I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and here are the copies for yourself and Leaders of the Parties.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present further details of the plan to issue special courtesy permits to senior citizens who own and drive their own vehicles, to encourage them to use and enjoy Manitoba's provincial parks. The permits will be windshield decals similar in design to the regular \$5.00 seasonal park entrance permits but bearing the designation 65+73. Applicants must provide proof of being over age 65 and supply information on their vehicle registration. A qualified person who is owner of a currently registered vehicle will be issued a similarly numbered decal to be placed on the windshield of his vehicle. Only where such a vehicle is operated by its registered owner will it be given free park entrance. All other drivers of that vehicle will be required to pay the normal park entrance fee.

Application forms for the courtesy permits will be available initially after May 3rd at the office of the Administrative Branch, 409 Norquay Building. The decals will be ready for issue after May 10th. Arrangements are being completed to receive applications and issue decals at other points in the province outside Winnipeg. These locations will be announced shortly. We estimate that between two and three percent of park users are retired persons. On the basis of last year's park entrance revenues the Parks Branch will forego an estimated \$7,500 to \$10,000 by introduction of these courtesy permits for senior citizens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to file the 1971-1972 Annual Report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements or tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the question of the election of the mayor of the City of Winnipeg. I wonder if he can indicate how the government reconciles the position of the Honourable Minister of Public Works with the statements made by the First Minister that in effect legislation will be introduced by his government allowing a Mayor to be elected in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, there is no need to reconcile. I have declared government policy on behalf of my colleagues. That is the government policy.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation and it relates to the statement that he has made frequently that he takes full responsibility or the government takes full responsibility for the actions of the Manitoba Development Corporation. And in view of that, could the Minister indicate whether he has instructed or the Government has a policy relating to the sale of government-owned enterprise to non-residents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister indicated a day ago, and I don't believe my honourable friend was here, that each case will be judged on its merits.

Mr. Speaker, so that the honourable member has no misunderstandings as to what ministerial responsibility is, the fact that the Minister or the government ultimately takes responsibility for what happens in a department or under the aegis of the government does not mean that the government doesn't assume this responsibility in certain cases by assigning the work to be done to competent people.

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister, Mr. Speaker, Has the government instructed the Manitoba Development Corporation on its opinion or its policy with respect to the potential sale of Manitoba Crown-owned corporations to non-residents of Canada?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I again indicated in the House several days ago, perhaps my honourable friend wasn't here on that occasion either, that we have asked this particular matter to be dealt with by the board according to their best judgment and for them to make a recommendation to the government before it is proceeded with.

MR. ASPER: Will the government announce its policy on the sale of Crown-owned corporations to non-residents in this House during this session?

MR. GREEN: I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, that each case will be considered on its merits.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he is prepared to table the letter of resignation of Mr. Shreiber in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: With great pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would indicate whether the reasons for resignation as indicated in the newspapers, not in the House, the reason . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking the Minister to verify something in the newspapers. Would the honourable member rephrase his question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate whether the reason for resignation was because there was not a directive or a policy set by the government with respect to the sale of a Crown asset?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the board member who resigned called me and asked me to tell the board that they should not sell this corporation. He also asked me to tell the board that his position was one which I supported. I told him that I would not do that, that it was up to him to make his position to his colleagues on the board of the corporation and that I would not make a political interference in them exercising what they considered to be their best judgment and reporting same to the government.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder is the Minister in a position to indicate whether the policy that he is stating now with respect to the particular issue, that is the general policy of the government, was and has been the policy of the government during its term of office?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, from time to time different methods of operation are adopted by different people. The very first communication I had with the Manitoba Development Corporation at their meeting was that they were not to consider political problems of the government or otherwise, that they were to behave on the basis of their best judgment and where the government was involved or felt that it should be involved it would let the board know.

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

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the Mines Minister to have indicated to this House that the ultimate decision as to the sale of Flyer Coach -- Flyer Industries to American interests will be made by the Government of Manitoba and not by the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd) Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can review the statement I made and understand from them what he wishes. My position has been that the board of directors of the corporation in considering this matter will make a recommendation to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel . Order please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Does the Government of Manitoba -- to the same Minister -- have any policy with a view aimed at discouraging the development of a further branch office economy in Manitoba? Does it have any program or policy in that regard? I'm referring of course to Guidelines documents

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are always general positions taken but each general position has to be looked at in the form of a specific. And if, Mr. Speaker, we're convinced, and I wish to make it clear that we are by no means convinced, that a present operation even if owned by the company is unviable and will lose money, whereas if it was sold to a private institution and will become viable and will make money, we would consider that very heavily in making any decision.

MR. ASPER: A final supplementary. In making that judgment that the Minister just referred to, are the social and regional considerations a part of the decision-making process?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): . . . Mines and Resources, and ask him in his capacity as Minister reporting for the Manitoba Development Fund, in the consideration of the purchase of this plant by outside interests would he undertake to insure that the prospective buyers would be better employers of men than the present company and more considerate of the people in the Town of Morris than Western Flyer has been?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's really very hard to give any assurance as to how an employer will be regarded by his employees in the future. I wouldn't dare to make a suggestion that a new employer will be found more satisfactory than an old employer. My experience as a labour relations lawyer is that there are often complaints by employees against employers.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who I believe is responsible for the Manitoba Government Air Services. Is that correct? --(Interjection) -- Oh! Then I direct this question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Was a government aircraft used to transport the Premier and his family and a party to the north last weekend, to the NDP nominating convention at The Pas and the NDP rally at Swan River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: It would seem that the most elementary courtesy would require that the honourable member direct the question to me since I'm quite capable of answering for my personal movements. Mr. Speaker, I have never taken a provincial government aircraft out of the province on a skiing trip or on a masters' golf tournament trip as other premiers of this country may have done, but I make no apologies whatsoever when I travel to meet with town councils, local government district administrators as I did last weekend, among my other functions, to take my wife and family along. None whatsoever.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for the Government Air Service. What is the government policy with respect to family of Cabinet Ministers travelling in government airplanes? Are their passages paid by the Cabinet Minister or is it a free ride?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I must remind all members that in respect to policy it is against our procedure to ask for an opinion on policy. The honourable member may rephrase his question.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'll rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. As Minister responsible for the Manitoba Government Air Service is there a charge made for members of the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) Cabinets' family travelling on government planes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I am the one answering for my personal movements and judgment in the matter. The policy we follow is one which I believe to be in line with that practiced, for example, by the Government of Canada. I am aware of wives of members of parliament and their families who from time to time travel on the Canadian Forces aircraft, and not to mention passes on Air Canada from time to time, and this is a similar arrangement -- when on public business. I'm quite prepared to give the appointments calendar and diary of mine for the last weekend and the one before that and for the entire duration of my responsibility as Premier to my honourable friend. He can trace my movement in northern Manitoba any time he likes.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, seeing as how the First Minister is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . answering for his Minister then I ask him the question, Was there a charge paid or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I said if there was not, I said it was in conformity with practices in other jurisdictions in our country including that of the Government of Canada itself. If my honourable friend would like some precedents, some examples, I'll be quite prepared to give him, including Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament of all parties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In yesterday's Tribune I believe there was a story regarding some comments I had made in Calgary at a study forum, quoting me as saying that it's nonsense to suggest that Indians have been exploited over the past 100 years. I'm sure nobody in this Chamber would believe that I would make such a claim. I certainly never made such a claim. I believe I responded to charges made by Cardinel and Laurier La Pierre about oppression of the Frenchmen in Quebec and about the oppression and exploitation of the Indians in Canada and I think in answer I said that the Liberal Government in Ottawa in the last four years and the NDP Government in Manitoba have done more to help the Indians than has been done in the past generation, so it's nonsense to say that this exploitation continues. And I said I reject that kind of a charge and I went on to discuss the subject. The way the press reports it would indicate that somehow I am saying that the Indians have not been exploited and in fact taken a kind of a position against the Indians. It's simply not true and I'd like to make that correction here.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister confirm that the government has accepted the MMA's request for a new contract on doctors' fees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Accepted a new contract by the MMA? We haven't accepted a new contract.

MR. SHERMAN: May I rephrase the question without losing supplementary privileges, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that the government has accepted the MMA's request for a new contract covering doctors' fees and the fee schedule?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the government has accepted that it is negotiating in good faith with the MMA.

MR. SHERMAN: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is there no communication in existence between the government and the MMA at the present time accepting the MMA's request for a new contract and agreeing to negotiate a new contract?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is correspondence by myself, by the Premier, of recent date indicating what I just said in my previous answer to the honourable member. That

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) the government has appointed a negotiator and is negotiating in good faith.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that active negotiations are either taking place or about to resume imminently between the two sides?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that activities had ceased on the part of the government or the MMA. Both are scrutinizing their own positions and are looking at facts of the past and the present and the future, and that comes to say again that you know we are negotiating in good faith.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce I direct my question to the First Minister; and ask him, will the Department of Industry and Commerce, in the light of the transfer of Edson Industries from Neepawa to Rivers, attempt to assist in the location of another industry that will offset the dislocation created by the loss of employment for 53 workers in the Neepawa plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce did meet with persons from the Council of the Town of Neepawa. The position of the province is not one of direct involvement or purview in the sense that the decision as to whether or not to relocate at Rivers is one that is made presumably by the management of the industry in question and that move we are told does have the tacit and indirect support of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in that there would be additional DREE moneys available. It does raise the question as to whether or not there is anything gained, anything positive achieved by having an industry induced by DREE grants to move from one small rural centre to another. And frankly I make no pretense, or I make no effort to hide the fact that we regard this as an undesirable practice and we will advise the federal Minister that it is an undesirable practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye .

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that a submission to the Manitoba Milk Board was made by the Manitoba Fluid Milk Producers last Monday for an increase in fluid milk, can the Minister tell this House how soon he expects a report on this submission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Co-Op. Dev.) (Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this point in time.

MR. BARKMAN: Is it not true that the Chairman of the Board announced the next day that there would not be a decision for perhaps at least a month or six weeks?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the normal functions of the board are that they have to peruse and do research based on all the evidence submitted, and therefore I presume it would take sometime to do that and a decision can not be handed down overnight.

MR. BARKMAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since this increase is vital to the Milk Producers will the Minister undertake to find out if an early decision cannot be made by the Milk Board?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Milk Control Board has certain responsibilities that it must carry out in the normal way and I don't think it is right for the government of the province to insist that they operate under conditions which may place some constraints on the board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government on any occasion has objected to the federal government's position with respect to the application of DREE grants and the transfer of one business from one rural area to another. Has there in fact been any representation made to them that this practice should desist?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am not personally aware, although the Minister of Industry may be, of any other example of where an industry already existing in a rural centre, rural town, has been encouraged and/or induced to move from one such community

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) to another. This case that the Member for Gladstone has raised is the first tangible example of that I believe although, I'm not certain of it, and certainly we intend to, and I believe the Minister of Industry has already communicated this disagreement or opposition to such a practice being allowed to continue because we regard it as being sterile and nonproductive.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate when the government became aware that negotiations were taking place with the Federal Government for the removal from Neepawa to Rivers of this particular industry?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in a sense I would have to take that question as notice on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Speaking for myself, I became aware of it a matter of perhaps 96 hours ago, approximately in the last week, less than the last seven days.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the -- well in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the First Minister may want to take this as notice. Is it not the practice for the Department of Regional Development to indicate, sometime in advance, the probabilities of changes that will occur and new developments that will occur within the province as a result of grants to be given by the Federal Government?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak on the basis of my recollection of six months in that portfolio. I don't recall, Sir, that there was ever any consistent pattern of practice on behalf of DREE in terms of notifying the province in advance of their intentions to approve certain grants. In certain cases they did advise us, and in many many cases the first information we would have of routine applications being approved was in the sort of -- in their monthly newsletter of information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would also direct this to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the fact that there is a struggle to get an additional option -- the original lease at Rivers was five years and in recent days they have left it open for an additional five year option, and this may well have had some influence on it. Would he take that in conjunction with my leader's question regarding this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that point is something that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is aware of. He has addressed himself to that point and has been in communication with the federal authorities. So that while we agree with the objectives being pursued by the Honourable Member for Virden, nevertheless our support and sympathy does not extend to the point of standing by with equanimity as policies are followed which in effect raid one small town to assist another.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have for the information of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition the letter that was written to me by Sidney Shreiber. It's short, I'll read it and table it. "Dear Mr. Green: This is my resignation from the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Amongst the reasons for my resignation is the decision of the Board to sell the Morris Manitoba School Bus Division of Flyer Industries Limited. The decision was not only a poorly investigated business decision but the implied direction of the sale will be to one of two US bus manufacturers who have no allegiance to Manitoba or Canada. I cannot and will not be part of that kind of business mismanagement and philosophically I am opposed to that sort of direction of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I fault you as well for your refusal to discuss MDC matters with the Members of the Board and in particular your refusal to offer a spark of leadership with respect to the issue of Flyer Industries. Your attitude is one of acquiescence to the Flyer Board and a related indifference to foreign ownership, I believe that I have served this province well during the time I served on the board. Yours truly, Mr. Shreiber."

And, Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding. The board did not make that decision, the board is going to be making a recommendation to the government. I've received as a matter of fact a memo yesterday which I haven't thoroughly perused which deals with further negotiations. There has been no decision made to sell the plant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GREEN: Of course, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I deny the allegations made by Mr. Shreiber, I've put my position to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In that the First Minister appears, by the news reports, to have had my nomination meeting of last Friday evening monitored, did he arrange for the same service being applied to the Rail Service Abandonment Public Meeting. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Would the Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is very simple. The member in the preface to his question alleged that I had had his meeting monitored. I made no such arrangement whatsoever. There may have been persons there who attended his meeting who later related the contents of his meeting to me but I made, I can assure my honourable friend, and I do wish he would believe me, I made no arrangement whatsoever to have his meeting monitored.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record clear. I did not allege, I said it appeared. --(Interjection)-- Would the honourable gentleman answer my question with regard to the meeting in Bowsman on rail abandonment last Monday evening? Is he intending to get a report of that and do something about it?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, no doubt there will be someone in communication with my office or with my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is Chairman of the Transportation Council, and I would even expect my honourable friend the Member from Swan River to advise me of the proceedings of that meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this to the Attorney-General. I believe it to be a misquote in the Free Press under John McManus, April 24, Liquor Outlets Vital to Rural Areas . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please? Question please?

MR. MCGREGOR: The question being, and I'll send the paper over. Vendors Make 20 Percent on the first . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please?

MR. MCGREGOR: Is this correct? Is it 20 percent, or is it as I believe, 10 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is out of order. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and ask him did the Provincial Government make representation to the Federal Government not to grant a DREE grant to the Marr's Marine Industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly the Minister of Industry and Commerce has discussed this matter with me in the last 48 hours. I have already indicated to the House the Provincial Government's attitude to grants made in those circumstances of in effect raiding one small community -- not so small, Neepawa's not small -- but raiding one rural town in order to induce a company to move to another of equal size or slightly smaller or larger. It is a sterile non-productive exercise and that attitude will certainly be communicated to the Federal Minister.

MR. FERGUSON: I direct this question to the Attorney-General. Do the vendors get 20 percent on the first 40,000?

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is quite right in indicating that the article is in error and I believe that from his recollection and mine that the percentage figure should be 10 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit, Sir, there is just one addendum I would like to add to my reply to the Honourable Member for Gladstone - Neepawa, and that is that of course all of what I have said still applies but of course that does not take into account the attitude of the particular firm itself. The firm itself may have, and this has not been ascertained affirmatively as yet, the firm itself may have some, what it feels to be good and sufficient reason to want to move from one location to another. But that is another set

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) of circumstances Mr. Speaker, which is not at issue at this time.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM.(Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, My question is to the Honourable Minister of Highways. In view of the statement of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs that free entry to provincial parks will be extended to all Senior Citizens . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please? Question please?

MR. GRAHAM: . . . could the Minister of Highways indicate to this House, and indeed to the people of Manitoba, what measures this government is taking to ensure that the Senior Citizens of Manitoba do not lose their driving privileges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would make his question a little more clear. I have difficulty understanding him.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase it then, and I'll ask the Minister what policy his department is taking with regard to the examination of all people over 65 and their driving privileges in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any real changes in that policy. I feel that policy has been in existence for a number of years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell have a supplementary?

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that two years ago they were examining everybody over 80 years of age, is that program still in effect or have they lowered the age in their compulsory examination program?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think that the policy is such that if the individual, regardless of his age, is in a position and is fit to be able to drive a vehicle, that I don't think that his license should be taken away from him. But if there are certain problems that he has with either eyesight or whatever then of course that's a different matter, and this is a policy that's been in effect for many many years.

MR. GRAHAM: Another supplementary. Is there an arbitrary age set in this province whereby it is compulsory for every driver over that age to submit themselves to a drivers test?

MR. BURTNIAK: Once the person reaches the age of 65 I think that it's only fair for the person involved and for all concerned that he should be permitted or have the opportunity to take a test and to see if there's anything wrong with his driving privileges.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member has had two supplementaries. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that the Liquor Control Commission has accepted the recommendation of the Productivity Audit insofar as vendor slips are concerned, is there any other recommendations of the audit that will be put into practice, government policy, specifically the one about self-service in small country hotels?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the recommendation in respect to vendor slips and their elimination in use by hotel vendors was an administrative matter which the Liquor Control Commission could determine. There's really no basic policy-decision involved in that in respect to major program so far as the government is concerned. The other recommendations in the Productivity Audit do however involve some major policy changes or suggestions for change and they would be considered by the study group that will be set up.

MR. ALLARD: Following on this question, could the Minister give us some idea of -- is there a study group being set up and when would it be in a position to report?

MR. MACKLING: All of that will be announced in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. He took a question as notice about a week ago regarding the tax

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) forms for the City of Winnipeg. Is the Minister able to answer the question yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education and Urban Affairs)(Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House whether or not the province has yet approved the Capital Program contribution to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education, and ask him if he will be making an announcement with regards to the teachers pensions before his Estimates, and if so when?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could indicate whether there is any cancer producing DES - Diethylstilbesterol still being used in Manitoba for cattle feeding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, the product was banned by the Government of Canada some months ago, if not a year ago - it's probably less than a year ago -- and there may still be some animals that have not yet hit the market with some traces of it. But I gather it's in the final stages and should be finished with as of this month or next month. That's my recollection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of evidence found in meat that there is DES that causes cancer, is the Minister -- is his department running any tests presently in Manitoba meat to see if it does have residue of DES?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this responsibility falls under the Food and Drug Administration of the Government of Canada.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if the Minister of Health could indicate whether his department has been running any tests and also could he tell us if there are any contraceptive pills which used to have this same hormone in it, if there are any such pills still being marketed in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the answer given by colleague the Minister of Agriculture applies to both questions of the Honourable Member from Thompson. This does fall under the responsibility of the Food and Drug Directorate in Ottawa.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Mines Minister responsible for MDC; relates to the answer he gave earlier in the day to the effect, I believe . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please? We recall the answer.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is, as government policy appears to be that the Crown will sell Crown owned operations if their profitability would be increased by . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is expressing an opinion from an answer he received and then basing a question on it. Would he place his question only.

MR. ASPER: Will the Government of Manitoba review its policy now in the light of what has been said here today and consider the sale of the corporations which are owned or controlled by the Government of Manitoba directly or indirectly and which are losing several million dollars in the aggregate this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the honourable member has properly stated what I previously said. I believe that the answer in Hansard indicates that we would not decide in advance, that there would be a policy which guided us completely in one direction or in the other, and one of the things that we might look at as profitability.

With regard to the other part of my honourable friend's question, Mr. Speaker, we

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. GREEN cont'd) would also look at what the prospects of any Crown owned corporations were as compared with prospects if they were private corporations and how much moneys they would get from the public purse in the way of grants rather than showing red figures, and we would consider on the basis of looking at all those things whether it is wise to continue the enterprise as a publicly owned enterprise by the people of Manitoba or not to do so.

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that all of the government owned corporations are losing substantial sums of money, is the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I remind the honourable member he's expressing an opinion which may be debatable and which is --(Interjection)-- Well I'm not aware whether it's true or not but it's debatable and therefore I wish the honourable member would place his questions directly and not insert these opinions which may be debatable and which are contrary to our rules. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on your ruling I must comment. On a point of order, on a point of order. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I remind the honourable member that there is no debate, there is only a challenge that is open to the honourable member.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It was said in this House that I prefaced my question with an opinion. That, Sir, is incorrect. And the record must show, the record must show that what I said in this House is a fact based on documents handed and made public by the Mines Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I remind the honourable member that in what he just now stated, if the Chair wished it could take it as an affront to the Chair because he's challenging what the Chair has ruled. Now I'm going to overlook the fact and hope that the honourable member will during the question period direct his questions and make them explicit so there will be no argument as to whether an opinion is expressed or not. The Honourable Member for Wolseley. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Could the Minister tell us whether he has a system of inspectors as the Liquor Control Commission has to police the rules, the laws as they exist insofar as age limits, etc., and other infractions with respect to the entertainment industry. And if he has inspectors how many and how do they operate?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we are, as soon as this question period is over we're going in the Estimates and we're exactly on that question, so I suggest that it better be debated at that time.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could advise the House if there has been any further development regarding the seizure of Manitoba eggs by the Province of British Columbia?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, developments are occurring every day and today's development is a letter which I am sending to the National Marketing Council asking them to deal with the question and informing them that if they are not able to do so that the Province of Manitoba will have to undertake legal action, and that we are not prepared to enter into additional national marketing arrangements unless we have this matter cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate to the House what the per acre acreage payment is under the two-price system for wheat, and is there a maximum payment to any single farmer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that an announcement has been made by the Government of Canada. If they follow last year's arrangement I believe it was something in the order of 86 cents per acre. But again that's a recollection, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): To the Minister of Agriculture along the same line that the recent question was asked. Is the Minister in favor of an acreage payment to farmers?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is asking for an opinion.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, then I ask the Minister if he's changed his opinion as to acreage payments as related to a two-price system as was his position four years ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it correct that members of his department on full-time salary are operating a business of their own and devoting most of that time to a business of their own?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member to be very specific because I really don't know what he's talking about.

MR. WATT: I then ask the Minister of Agriculture a specific question. Are there members of his department on full-time salary in the Department of Agriculture devoting most of their time to a private business of their own?

MR. USKIW: Well I would hope that is not true, Mr. Speaker, but I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the Energy Council or Energy Board -- I'm not sure of the terminology -- has in fact met?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Energy Council, the Minister has met with the council and I believe that another meeting is scheduled to take place sometime this week, either today or tomorrow. I am sorry I can't give my friend the exact hour but it's some time, sort of in the next 48 hours.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the price of petroleum products will be discussed by the Energy Council?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is one of the terms of reference given to the Manitoba Energy Council to keep abreast, to try to keep abreast of all movements, all changes in energy prices, wellhead prices, the transmission costs and price of fossil fuels at various delivery points. All of these things are within the ambit of the Energy Council.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the price of Hydro - hydro energy in Manitoba will be discussed by the Energy Council?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter of hydro-electric energy is something that cannot be divorced from the total context of available energy forms and their relative prices and price movements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the Member for Arthur asked me whether or not there were members of my staff who have interests to which they devote most of their time and at the same time are employed by the department. I would suggest that rather than having me go on a witch hunt that the honourable member would submit me the information that he has.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: On a point of privilege. I did not say part-time work for the Department of Agriculture. I asked if there were members of his department on full-time salary who were devoting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: . . . to agree to give me the information rather than having me arouse the whole department on a witch hunt which may prove nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether or not the presentation that I made to him yesterday met with his pleasure or the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ENNS cont'd) pleasure of his good wife, Sally, and did she prepare it properly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question will have to await till tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when the question period comes to that point of harmony and levity it's appropriate that I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism, that you now, Sir, 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.

SUPPLY - TOURISM, RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 111 (a)-- The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is customary that I could go back -- there are just a few answers that I hadn't given yesterday, I didn't have them at the time and I took them as notice. I don't know if I need leave for that, to give the answers, about a minute or so? All right.

There was a question about billboards from the Honourable Member from Rhineland. The estimate for 73-74 was \$8,000 for seven billboards to be located on major highways including Interstate north of Minneapolis up to Winnipeg. Besides that there is Reader's Digest program where we cost share this with the Federal Government. The total cost for billboards was \$1,991 for 21 billboards to appear between July 15 and August 15 and our share of the cost in that was only \$200. We received credit from Reader's Digest because of some other advertising we had in there and also by the Federal Government. There were nine in Fargo-Moorhead, three at Grand Forks, one at Dunseith, North Dakota, three at Fergus Falls, four in Bemidji and one at Karlstaad.

Then my honourable friend from Emerson, my honourable friend from Emerson, I have some short answers for him. Boucher Hill: The Department has had a good deal of correspondence with the Piney and District Chamber of Commerce about the development of this location and our examination of the site indicates that it has potential to serve the local community for swimming, picnic and some winter recreation. Unfortunately the resources aren't suitable for the scale of development that the department will require to service regional needs at this time. We have offered the local -- interest planning and technical assistance should they wish to proceed on their own. I guess my honourable friend covered that, it is a question of priority and this is the best we can do.

And St. Malo . . .

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just at this point ask a question of the Minister on this particular thing. Would it be possible to make a feasibility study from your department, or has it already been done? And if it has already been done could they have access to it; and if it hasn't been done could it be done?

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know if the study that we've made would meet with your approval, but, Mr. Chairman, we certainly will look at it. The people in my department will get in touch with you and whatever we have I'm sure they'll be welcome to it; and as I say we'll give them the technical assistance and any help that we can.

In St. Malo, it's true that there were further electrified sites at camping last year. This is not something that we're going to do this year. Rather, the funds that we have will be used to control pollution improvement as well as installation required for staff accommodation and improved park management.

I might say that this is not the first priority that we have. For instance in B. C. they do not use electricity in their parks at all. There's a lot of people that feel that we're going to rough it up and so on. I know that some people want that and we still are going ahead with it but we think that with the money it will be better used at this time anyway for those other things.

The landing strip at Emerson. Well . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are not under the Minister's salary right now.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister have leave to proceed to answer other questions?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I did ask leave of the House. This I think has been customary . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? Order, please. The House determines whether a Minister has leave.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's going to be very short anyway, Mr. Chairman, but I didn't want to go without answering my honourable friend from Emerson. The landing strip at Emerson -- it is something that is not subject to -- it doesn't come under our department. I think that, I agree with him that a landing strip there would be of some convenience to the people around the area, but as far as serving the tourists I think it would be more than local people, the tourist, I think it would duplicate with -- most of the people are coming into Winnipeg where custom and aircraft servicing facilities are available because there's customs and so on. It might be difficult, but this is something we would encourage. We think it's a good idea but it is not really a decision to be made by the department.

Buffalo Bay. The department agrees that there is excellent potential in the area known as Buffalo Point in the Lake of the Woods. The area is wholly within Indian Reserve No. 36A and we are aware that a fairly elaborate plan for development was prepared for the Indian Band. Some initial work was undertaken on the site. More recently staff of the Parks and Tourist Branch met with the Indian Band to offer some guidance and assistance to them. We understand that this project is now being examined by the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for financial assistance.

Ritchot River. This is a beautiful little stream that enters Manitoba just east of Gardenton and enters the Red River west of Dominion City. For the most part it traverses an area that we feel is adequately served by the St. Malo Provincial Recreation area which is only some 15 to 20 miles from the rural community along the Roseau, but with all the people visiting St. Malo it might be that we should have a look at that fairly soon because I think we'll need more facilities in that area. The Gardenton Museum, we recognize the efforts of these people who are doing it. I might say that there was a grant made by our department not too long ago, a grant of \$1,600.00. This should assist. It might not pay for everything they want but it should assist them. And I think I did - I'm not going to go back, it's not the Minister's salary, but I talked about the policies that we would like to have set out for the museum development here in the program.

The CBC Program "Outdoor Fever" - last year the staff of the Parks Branch collaborated with the CBC to produce an eleven week full colour one-half hour series of TV programs on places to visit in the camps and here in the province. While the program focuses on the provincial park system, many of the private and municipal park areas and attractions were included in the program content. We appreciate the efforts of CBC Winnipeg staff, particularly the work of Ted Benoit, producer, Don Williamson, host, for making this program so interesting. This is aired Wednesday evening, for the information of my honourable friends, at 6:00 p. m. on Channel 6.

Oh, as far as the border crossing -- there was my honourable friend from Virden. This is something definitely that doesn't come under this department but we've made numerous representations to the people, the customs people. I think my honourable friend was also interested in that. We've met, our senior people have met with them; we're doing everything we can. We've had some certainly understanding at that level but the powers that be in Ottawa so far has not seen fit to follow our suggestion. We're still working on it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I was reading a report, I was practically finished on a report of the Classification Board. I'm positive that there's an honourable friend behind me who will ask me to repeat it so I'll sit down and let him ask his questions so we won't delay the work of the Committee.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister will remember that last year I was one of those who had some serious concerns about how effective the change in the Act insofar as censorship is concerned would work, how effective it would be. Now the information that I get, what I hear, is that what we had feared is effectively happening - I think it was three weeks ago that one of the newspapers carried an account stating that Winnipeg of all places was the sex haven of North America, which seems to be a little exaggerated but. . . And I understand that an unexpurgated copy of The Last Tango is going to be shown and I expect Deep Throat will be next. --(Interjection)-- The member is wondering what they are like. I have seen neither one but I'm told that they make The Stewardesses look like sort of a tour of a 1910 beach, really. So I'd like to ask the Minister what the record has been since the new, since the changes were put into practice. I hear that whoever is responsible for it doesn't seem to be quite as concerned about the age of persons who go in to see erotic movies as they are about the ages of those who go in to take a bottle of beer. I think that shows a peculiar sense of values on our part, ergo a bottle of beer is a terrible thing. I don't think it is, but erotic movies are fine and I mean 16-year-olds could benefit somehow from them. I'm sure that there are some people who do think this. Quite honestly I happen to believe that this is not true and I happen to believe that the very large majority of Manitobans don't agree with that point either.

I would like to ask the Minister whether he has an - how he monitors the situation, or how the situation is monitored, whether he has any inspectors or whether he waits for complaints, specific complaints, as they do in the case of abortion. You know, a public outcry is not enough; you've got to have a specific complaint saying so and so and in such and such a case there was an error made. I'm just wondering whether some parent has to come in to see him and tell him, you know, so and so under age was in to that movie, and then that it's only under those circumstances that he would start checking up. It's just -- I've never heard. I haven't seen or heard of the prosecution about under-age patrons being caught. I don't -- possibly the Minister has a number of cases to tell us about. I know that there are many cases of hotels being closed because they have under-age patrons and they are checked very closely. I understand something like three weeks ago that seven inspectors walked into one hotel and went through the whole place. It was the Village Inn in Assiniboia and, by the way, there was not a single one that was under age which makes it -- at least we know that that Act is being monitored very well indeed. Now I'm just wondering whether there's ever any checking of this kind that goes on with movies. I think with that, I'd like to hear what the Minister has to say about it, give us some idea of what the record has been in terms of convictions, how many theatres have been closed, and with that I'd like to hear what he has to say.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to answer this. I think that my honourable friend knows that the classification board started, the new system started I think approximately December 3rd. I can't repeat enough that we have received very good co-operation. I was pleasantly surprised with the co-operation that we've been receiving from the industry. They played ball with us on their own, they agreed to let us, help us set up the system. For a number of months they did not show any films that were, that had been classified "Restricted Adult". So that cut down the films that there is an age limit. Then, Mr. Chairman, we came in with an ID - we've talked about an ID card. I want to make it quite clear that this is not something that is compulsory, it's not something set up by government, but government has stated quite clearly that it would approve the content, it was something that both the beverage rooms, wherever there is liquor served and the movie theatre, will get together on this. They will collaborate and try to do everything they can to see that these cards are used. It's up to them. They'll only recognize - and that's their right - the one type of card, that's the two, the Hotel Association and beverage rooms and the theatres, and they are going to bend over backwards to make sure that as many people as possible will avail themselves of these chances of getting these cards. I think they will probably have some kind of a promotion, maybe give a free pass to a theatre and so on, so the ID card will practically be free. Now they are going to push that.

Now the people that we will - we have inspectors. I can't say that we have the same system as the Liquor Commission has, they've been operating for a long time. But at least

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . we have a system and before that we didn't have any. I don't recall in all the number of years where we had censorship where the kids - I think we just closed our eyes. Now they are well aware of what's going to happen if they're caught. They are doing a good job themselves of policing and besides that we're not relying only on the industry, I can assure you. Every single member of the board is automatically an inspector. They are - they're doing - my honourable friend has a smile on his face but I don't think there's anything wrong with that. As I say, every --(Interjection)--What do you mean how can they police it? --(Interjection)-- They are there like any other inspectors. They have the right to ask any questions, to question the person that sells the ticket or asks for an ID card or proof that there is anything, the same as any other inspector. They might do some spot checking; they don't have to go to the show. They might stand around the area where the tickets are sold and I think that I mentioned yesterday that we are trying - I must admit that there wasn't too many of these people doing the rural points so far, I admit that. And I did say yesterday that there will be funds and that we will have more people in this area.

A MEMBER: But you have no paid inspectors.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, we have paid inspectors. The people of the board are paid and they are inspectors. There is nothing unusual on that. I'll give the --this might be the time to give the names of the people on the board because the Honourable Member from Rhineland requested that yesterday. The Reverend Father John J. Pungente is the chairman; the Executive-Director is Mr. Charles Besette; then the other members are Maurice Doger, Paul L'Heureux, Sister Pronovost, Frederick Heinrich, Mrs. Anna Gordon, Mitchell Neiman, Mrs. Margaret Soltys, Mrs. Barbara Weselake, Mrs. Eileen Piasta, Mrs. Irene Spooner, Edwin Kanaroski, Mrs. Thelma Henny and R. F. D. Hanson. So these people are the inspectors.

Now there is something else. We don't have -- my honourable friend said well, are you going to police all theatres? You don't have to police all theatres. You don't have to police all theatres at all, you just police the theatres where the classification is Restricted Adult. That's all. And there are not that many that are being played at the same time. Now I might say that -- as I say, I think that the chairman has had good co-operation and he's gone on a limb, he's been doing things on his own, not officially. He was told that he couldn't do this officially but at my request, whenever there is something that he's seen and if there's any doubt, he's called in and there's more than three people that will review the film. They get in touch with the people, or with the industry, and they tell them that as far as they're concerned there would be danger, there is a chance that this Restricted Adult classification for that particular film, that there is a chance that they could be prosecuted under the federal Criminal Code. And when this is done, we get a list of those in that category unofficially, I get a list of that because I request it, and I discuss this with my friend the Attorney-General. So if there is something that is felt certainly shouldn't be seen, yes, it's going to be shown once. But immediately, without more publicity like it was before, the film will be seized and that place will be closed and then we will take him to court. Now this is the system that we have. As I say, with the ID cards and so on. I think it's going to be an improvement.

There is also certain things that I've seen myself, I've been trying to look at it quite carefully. I saw where certain theatres were using the definition of the classification, for instance Restricted Adult or something, to advertise. For instance the only - I'm thinking of one - the only cartoon -- Restricted Adult cartoon or things like that. That is forbidden now and we've told them, they agreed to respect that or we will not allow that kind of advertising. And then they had their sign, sometimes even with my glasses I couldn't read what the classification was. Well we told them that this wasn't satisfactory and they've improved the situation.

I am not going to say that I am fully satisfied. I'm not going to say, I'm going to say exactly what I said last year: that I would be satisfied only on one condition, if I could do the censorship myself. And that is not --(Interjection)-- No, I am giving you that. If you don't want to take it but I am giving you that because I feel that this is true of every single one here, because nobody is going to classify it or censor the same way. There is nobody at all, I'm sure, that the Honourable Member from Thompson and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will not see eye to eye on anything like that, and they both think that they are right so there's 57 people that think that they're right.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

Now, as I say, and I would hope that my honourable friend from Thompson will take this seriously, the people are maturing and I think that the government should not -- you don't regulate "goodness". You don't regulate goodness. This is something that the people - they've tried to have prohibition and what happened? I think that if the government, if the classification board, the first thing would be very careful in the choice of the people on this board. And I think that we have been . I still think that the chairman is probably the most qualified. That doesn't mean I agree with him. I think that he's more liberal than I am on those things but I think that he's probably more qualified than anybody in Canada on this.

Then I think that the thing is that once we've done that, we inspect that, we make sure that the law is enforced, and then we give the information to the public and that is the most important thing to do. I repeat again, you don't legislate goodness. You give the information to the people, and in fact the way I was taught when I was a kid, it's all inside of you because it could be a sin for somebody to see something and it won't be a sin to the other fellow, it's all a question of conscience; and if you're given those means, damn it, it's time that you exercised your own common sense and your own discipline and so on. I am not satisfied, I would never be satisfied no matter what kind of things we do. I'm pleasantly surprised at the way this is going. There are people -- somebody's made a statement. I don't like those wild statements that it's Sin City. All of a sudden we've had this for a few months and it's Sin City Winnipeg. This is ridiculous, whoever made that statement. I think it was a hell of a lot worse before. Because the classification board, the censorship board allowed everything in the past, everything, they allowed everything. And you know, my honourable friend knows that they allowed The Stewardesses, for instance, which was supposed to be the worst one there is. Now what happened after that? We did prosecute, we did prosecute then, and what did the judge say? Well you have a censorship board. They are the board named by the Province of Manitoba, so who are we? Now you want to change your mind, you want to convict them of doing something wrong. We can't do it. And the issue wasn't even studied. And I think that --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? One at a time please.--(Interjection)-- Yes, I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: It may have been asked before and if it has I apologize. The question is, would the Honourable Minister inform the House as to how many films the Censor Board disallowed during the past year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: No longer. I gave that last year. There's no censor board at this time. It's a classification board and they don't disallow any films. You should know that. They restrict some. There is another protection, that before you can have the protection for the kids 18 and under, now there is that protection because under no circumstances are they allowed to go where it's Restricted Adult. And if one of the films -- and anybody, anybody could lay a charge. And if there is a film, if you understand and if you want to be on the lookout and if you want to lay a charge, all right; the charge will be laid and then that film could be seized and then it will go - it will be prosecuted under the Criminal Code and then the law of the land. --(Interjection)--Eh? Well against whoever is playing this film. The theatre.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Ruperts-land.

MR. ALLARD: May I ask a specific question? I think that much of the question I asked had to do with whether, with the record of policing the Act in so far as age is concerned and whether there had been any closures, any prosecutions, any convictions in that respect.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I answered that yesterday when my honourable friend was here. Of course he was busy trying to have the bell save me of myself, I think, but I did say that no complaints have been received in the past regarding newspaper advertising of films. --(Interjection)--Well wait a minute, please, please, give me a chance to answer the damn question. There have been complaints from different people about too much violence or too explicit sex content in TV commercials for movies. The board is studying this complex problem to determine how its power can be used to effect a change. Theatre inspection maintained on a regular basis in the Winnipeg area will be stepped up in the new fiscal year in an attempt to cover all theatres in the province at least twice; and all occasional reports of underage persons being admitted to restricted films are of major concern to the

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . inspectors. Inspection to date have not found any such violation. The board believes the majority of film exhibitors are conscientiously trying to abide by the law in the Amusement Act. Theatres showing restricted films are being checked to the full extent, the extent possible. So that's about all I could tell him; it takes a while to - there will be more checkup as we go along, as we get organized and . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister advise the committee whether there's been any difficulty encountered and expressed by theatre owners and theatre operators with existence under the new law. At the time that the new legislation was being considered in Law Amendments Committee, as the Minister well recalls there were submissions made by representatives of the motion picture industry and there was some concern and fear expressed at that time that it was putting an onus on motion picture operators, theatre operators and owners that they felt was extremely onerous and extremely dangerous and that they would have difficulty coping with. I wonder if the Minister could advise the Committee whether there has been any subsequent complaint of that nature.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is something that I didn't buy at the time and I'm not buying now. I recall that they made that statement; in fact most of those people wanted us to retain the censorship because that to them that was a license to pretty well do anything and they were satisfied, they were even saying quite loudly that the censors in this day and age were letting practically everything go or society would laugh at them or something. We didn't buy that. And I doubted their sincerity at the time but I must admit that they are playing ball with our people; they are voluntarily taking - they are requesting these people to give them an opinion. And this is not the role of a Classification Board. So far I've allowed that, I told them that it shouldn't go . . . anything formal or officially but there is nothing that prevents a citizen who is one the board to telling his friend out there, look out, as far as I'm concerned you can be in trouble if you do that.

I was expecting test cases before and I know they're going to get them. I've had characters come into my office and what they were there to do, they were going to start all these cheap movies and so on, and while we don't encourage them we hope that we can stop some of those people at license time. There was talk of somebody coming from Toronto and setting up - what is it that Eve Theatre, I don't recall - All About Eve or something, and that was stopped; and we're getting full co-operation from the legit owners who don't want that kind of stuff in here. So so far it's been co-operation, and we have also - our chairman and vice-chairman especially, or executive manager or director have been very active. They've given an awful lot of time because they believe in this, they're conscientious, they've worked very closely with these people and they are doing more for them also and the people are leaning on each other. I think the industry have an awful lot of faith in these people and they are so far accepting their advice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: In other words, is the Minister of the opinion, or can he assure the committee that there is a mechanism working, whether it be voluntary or imposed is really beside the point, but that there is a mechanism working that prevents films with no redeeming social value let us say from being shown. In other words, the classification system permits films that certainly contain content that society deems inadvisable for young people. Those are restricted adult, but there is a film beyond that point, there is a type of film that has no redeeming social value at all and is the Minister saying that the way the system works now is satisfactory for keeping those out?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if what we're doing is legal but this is what we're doing. We're only dealing with restricted adult films. Now those films, they're classified, some of them, because they're restricted adult it doesn't mean that automatically they are all bad films and that they would be thrown out. Only a small portion of them would have been thrown out in the past. Those that in the opinion of the board are in that category, if there's a group of three viewing this board they will call in the chairman who will have a few people, maybe five or six, who will review this film. Now they will, if there is one in that category, this is what they do. At my request they inform me. Automatically, in case I slip up, a copy of that letter is sent to the Attorney-General's department. They also inform the theatre that they've classified it; they have no legal right to say you're not going to show it,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . that as friends, as a citizen to another, they're saying if I was you I'd put on the brakes. In other words, there's the red light. These people are free to proceed, to go ahead and so far they haven't done that. If they do that, these films, the Attorney-General is advised again, I'm advised again, we can do that on our own. An inspector will be there and it might be the police or something or somebody from the Attorney-General's Department; they have to see the film once because they can't classify - once the film is shown, they seize the film and we lay a charge against them. So it will be shown once, nobody under eighteen, but it will be shown once and then we could stop it. So I think that is an improvement. Now they are voluntarily playing ball with us. They are accepting this as a service and I must admit that I didn't give them enough credit, I think that I must give them all the credit, they are sincere. I think that these people, they might not have the same views as my honourable friend from Thompson, there are certain things that they think is a good film. They are, call it more liberal or broadminded, but they don't go to that extreme of just having a photographer with a man and a woman in a cheap hotel room and there's the film; they don't go for that kind of stuff, they think it's bad for the industry anyway.

So I say as long as there's this co-operation I think it will work. This is about all we can do but we would be on top of it immediately with the present Attorney-General who is - we're of the same mind. We don't want Winnipeg to become a place where they are going to dump everything. We're watching it quite closely. I'm surprised that we didn't have a test case before that.

MR. CHAIRMAN; The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: As the Minister is well aware, there's a whole new motion picture industry that's developed in the last two or three years now built around the high class, sophisticated, pornographic film. It used to be that pornographic movies were restricted to stags and backroom parties and back alleys but now as he well knows, color, techniques and the most highly sophisticated techniques of movie making have been brought to pornographic film making, and in fact there is a new class of actress and actor, so-called, in Hollywood and other film making centres who are becoming international stars of the pornographic film world. And the question I really would like to get at at this point is whether or not there are any strictures or there is any mechanism in existence in Manitoba that can keep that kind of film out. The conclusion I'm coming to, Mr. Chairman, is that the answer to that is no. That actually a film like Deep Throat for example which has gained notoriety in the United States and gained notoriety in Hawaii and other parts of the world, many tourists and travellers have seen it for a titillating experience and have wanted to see what highly developed pornographic movies are like and the film has become quite famous or infamous. It was shown in Duluth, Minnesota the other day and a projectionist apparently was arrested for showing it. Now the question that I'm getting at is whether a film like Deep Throat can be brought into Manitoba and shown in Manitoba?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we would be aware of that. We couldn't do anything, I must confess, we couldn't do anything without the co-operation of the people. If they want to show it, all we can do the Classification Board would have to say Restricted Adult. Then they would show it. But I'm saying to my friend that there would be somebody there from the Attorney-General who would seize the film immediately and who would lay a charge. So it would be shown once - it might be a bad thing, but it'd be shown once, they'd have to watch the film, the whole film, it would be seized, they would lay a charge, and then it would come under the Criminal Code. And I expect that we will have a test case like that fairly soon. I've been keeping my fingers crossed. I thought we'd have it before, and I would hope that -- I know that there's an act that we want to bring in some minor changes in there and I certainly would suggest that we license theatres also, like we license beer parlours and things like that, and if this is done we could keep some of those people out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to waste very much time. I think we already know what the nudie smutniks on that side like and what they approve of. There is not much point of me haranguing them over the dirt that's been brought into Manitoba and the escalation of smut and obscenity. The Minister can get up and speak all he likes about things are better now than they were under the previous government or under the previous Censor Board. I don't know how he can make such a statement. The evidence is there and if he doesn't

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . believe me he should talk to the Morality Squad - the City Police Morality Squad - and they will tell him if things are getting better or worse, and he should talk to the people in the Attorney-General's Department. He takes a great deal of satisfaction in saying that we've got only - I believe he said 20, 20 restricted movies, I believe, was the number he used - whatever the number was, indicating there is less now than before and of course they're using the same gimmick they use in Denmark where they said after they've legalized obscenity that all the sex crimes and rapes dropped, and of course statistically that was correct, because suddenly what was a crime yesterday is not a crime today, and that is precisely what's happening in Manitoba. What could not be shown or the theatres were scared of showing before, they're showing now, and so the Minister can get up here and say things are really improving. Anybody who goes to theatres - I don't go, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister goes either, he probably doesn't have time like myself, but we have friends who go and we have different people that report to each one of us and I'm sure he has people that report to him about some particular movie that they found very offensive.

Things are getting bad, Mr. Chairman, and I think when you see immoral American, which is wallowing in filth and garbage right up to their nose - and I'm not talking about the Watergate scandal, I'm talking about the smut explosion that is drowning that nation. Even they have started cracking down with a vengeance and I would like to read a few press clippings that I have in my smut book here, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister can come to his own conclusions whether things are getting better or worse.

The first article I have, and unfortunately it's not dated but it's of this month: "Obscenity and films under fire. Washington Associated Press. The United States government is making a broad national attack on what it says are obscene movies shown in commercial movie theatres. Federal officials are going after advertised films in established movie houses. The productions include explicit scenes of various sexual acts with close-ups of male and female genitals. Last November 16th the Memphis grand jury indicted three film distributing companies and four men for allegedly shipping pornographic films across state lines. On February 14th the same grand jury indicted Serafix Incorporated of New York, the largest adult film distributor. In all, 15 persons and ten companies were named in their indictment for allegedly distributing X films." I'm not going to read the names of the films.

And another article, and this is one who thinks that things haven't gone too far. He asks the question, "Have sex films gone too far?" He goes on to defend it but ends up by admitting. "The reaction to Last Tango in Paris has also indicated the public's concern about obscenity. Although not comparable to Deep Throat, Tango presents stronger language and more sex than have been heard or seen in a major film. A cover story about the movie in a news magazine, " and I assume they're talking about Time Magazine, " drew 8, 000 letters of protest. Trans America Corporation, parent company of United Artists, was so concerned over the reaction to Tango that it removed the Trans America trade marks from the film."

And here's another quote from the Morality and News Media, this is a New York-based anti-smut organization something similar to the anti-abortion groups that they have established throughout the United States, and the headline is: "Deep Throat ruled obscene in New York. New York County Criminal Court Judge J. J. Taylor ruled on March 1 that the film Deep Throat is obscene. Judge Taylor called the film indisputably and irredeemably obscene, a nadir of decadence, a Sodom and Gomorrah gone wild before the fire. The city's case was brought against Major Enterprises Incorporated which operates world major theatres. Judge Taylor found the corporation guilty of promoting obscenity. The law says the corporation's fine can be up to double the amount of net profits since the film opened in August 17th."

Mr. Chairman I've seen a half page ad in a local paper saying that the Last Tango is going to be playing in Manitoba and, according to an American court decision and people who are in the prosecution business in the United States, they're telling us that the Last Tango is worse than Deep Throat, and yet it's coming into Manitoba. And under the present system, under the present system they're going to have to be allowed to come into Manitoba and, contrary to what we've been told by the Attorney-General and the Minister, nothing is being done and I suspect nothing will be done unless there is a real protest from the public. In other words, they're going to have a - how does the House Leader call it - applause meter around and they're going to use it. If there's enough hollering from the public, they're going to say "we will apply the law", if there isn't a high enough reading on our applause meter or the protest meter,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . they're not going to do anything. The Minister can sit there and explain away the situation all he likes, the fact of the matter is that the films are getting filthier and dirtier and more obscene and offensive and nothing is being done. We were told that if we passed that bill - and he should read his own speech and read the Attorney-General's speech - that if we passed this new legislation, this Classification Board, it will be much easier to prosecute. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know that that is a complete falsehood uttered by both of the Ministers. We know, and you don't have to take my word for it, I suggest you go see the picture. We know that the films are dirtier. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege has been made. Order, please. A point of privilege has been raised by the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: The honourable member can say that he interprets what I say as being false, but when he indicates me of interpreter saying falsehoods in this House, I think that is going too far and I would ask him to retract it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the Attorney-General is prepared to say in this House that he never made the comment that it would be easier to prosecute under the new legislation, I would be very happy to withdraw. But I think if he reads his own speech he will see that he said exactly those words or approximately those words, that the new legislation would make it easier for his department to prosecute, and that is false. And he know it's false.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would reflect on what he had said, he indicated that I had said something which was untruthful, and if he recalls what he said in his remarks I would ask him to withdraw because I never said anything that was untruthful. I indicated that in my opinion the administration of being able to enforce, for example, the law in respect to minors attending movie houses that are restricted, would be strengthened, and without this kind of change in the act we wouldn't be able to enforce the law. And I talked in the generality, and the generality has not been changed, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw because he's accusing me of telling lies in this House.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence is there. It is -- I don't like to offend my friend by calling him a liar but perhaps he was mistaken. Perhaps the statement he made he regrets making it, he shouldn't have made it. Maybe it's a case of bad judgment. Maybe the bill has not lived up to his expectations. The Minister had an opportunity to tell us how many prosecutions have there been, --(Interjection)-- how many prosecutions there have been of minors and how many prosecutions. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege, I have asked the honourable member to withdraw. He's accused me of lying to this House and I ask that he withdraw that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm really surprised that the Attorney-General should get offended because I've heard members of that side call the Conservatives liars in this House, in this Session, and they got away with it. And worse language, and I am being very kind. I really could use much stronger language. I won't because I consider him a friend of mine and I will not say anything stronger. I am telling the Attorney-General and I'm telling the Minister answering for the smut board that he set up, that it's not working, that it has not resulted in toning down the type of smut that's brought in there, it has not resulted in prosecutions of distributors or importers or minors, and if it has I would be very happy to withdraw if the Minister can get up, or the Attorney-General, and tell us how many charges are pending of kids under 18 watching restricted movies, which he knows is going on every day in this province, and is going on because they haven't got any inspectors. They got money to blow on other foolishness but they haven't got money to hire inspectors to enforce a lousy law, in my opinion, but nevertheless as bad as that law is, as bad as the act is, they do not have any inspectors and the Minister has admitted that. He's even made the ridiculous statement, Mr. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, he said that the board members, that the board members are doing the policing, and that is absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard, I have never heard such a comment or such a statement anywhere that people who are hired I don't know what the pay is, it's not very much to pass judgment on a classification, that they now should walk around from theatre to theatre to see if the theatre is complying with their initial classification on that, and to go around and I suppose to look into the mouth, into the

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . horse's mouth, to see if they're 18 or not. This is incredible. The Attorney-General with his liquor inspectors doesn't rely on a board. He's got high-priced inspectors with cars going around the province making darn sure that our liquor laws are being observed. But the Minister, you know, he says that the board members are doing it. Well if they're, first of all if they're doing it, then I think it's wrong, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, if it's true - and I really have great difficulty believing that this thing is happening to the extent that it is - would he give us a rundown like he has on how many films they viewed? How many inspectors have gone out, what theatres, how many times per week, per month, per year. How many inspections have they made? How many reports have they turned in? And has the Attorney or has the Minister had any requests for prosecutions? Has the Minister had any request to change certain things? You know, he can get up and talk in generalities like, you know, nobody's going to be satisfied unless he is the censor. That is so ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, that it's insulting. Nobody in this House wants to be on the Censor Board any more than they wanted under the previous government. We allow 12 jurors to send a man to jail for life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. A point has been raised and we're waiting for the honourable member. Now I'm going to read him the Citation, Citation 155 of Beauchesne, Sub (1) Sub (3): Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood, the word "calumnious" had generally been held to be in order but the honourable member, if I understood what he said, claimed that the Honourable the Attorney-General had been guilty of a falsehood in this House and I think that the honourable member should withdraw that remark.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order I was just checking the same citation and I think there is a fine degree of interpretation that must be placed on that particular rule. Now if you'll check Citation 154 subsection (5) it says, and I quote, "It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House," and the Citation that you quoted, Sir, 155 subsection (3) said, "The charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood is unparliamentary". I did not recall that the honourable member said that the Minister or the Attorney-General was guilty of a deliberate falsehood, and I think there is a significant difference there. The Minister is capable of uttering a falsehood without his knowledge, and it may not be deliberate, it may be inadvertent. And that, Sir, according to the Citations that you have quoted, is not unparliamentary.

A MEMBER: I've got a question for the classification board.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order that has been raised, I would agree with the contention that was raised by my honourable friend and I'm sorry I wasn't here when the member made his original remarks, but I've heard him speaking since then and I think he could make his whole case without accusing the Minister of having told an untruth knowing it to be true. And if that's what he's doing I wonder if he would just make that clear and let us proceed.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . what he has done in the initial instance. I did not hear him accuse the Attorney-General of uttering a deliberate falsehood. He said the statements that were made had proven to be false. Now that could well be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the niceties I believe I do of parliamentary debate as well as the Honourable Member for Morris, and I pointed out to the Honourable Member for Thompson that --(Interjection)-- Now the Honourable Member from Lakeside wishes to assist me from his seat. I'm able to do well without him. The Honourable Member for Thompson did not use the technique or the language that the Honourable Member for Morris suggests he did. He accused me of misleading and deceiving this House and --(Interjection)-- no, no, not inadvertently. And at that point I rose and I asked the honourable member to retract. He did not but continued on in his argument.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I really don't understand why the Attorney-General gets so exercised. I did qualify after, you know, particularly after the charges they've hurled against the opposition, to get up on such a nothing, a picayune thing, to get up and try and make a major case is just --I just don't understand. I believe where I started saying that the Attorney-General made a statement last year that under this legislation it will be easier to

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . prosecute smut-pushers or theatres. And I said that has not happened, there hasn't been a single prosecution, therefore the Attorney-General had misled or had stated a falsehood. --(Interjection)-- Well, he maybe believed at that time that this would happen but it didn't happen, so whether it was stupidity or he just didn't know or maybe he hoped the bill would do more than he thought it would do.

The fact is it did not result so he did mislead the House. Maybe it was through ignorance and if it's through ignorance I forgive him for it. I mean, you know, anybody can make a mistake particularly a Minister of the front bench in that position, and I - I really don't know why he's getting upset. I think he should be more upset, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that some of the worst hard core crap is being brought into this province. He should be upset about that. Now I know his record in prosecuting celluloid trash is good, and I think he's indicated in this House that there's more prosecutions of printed and pictorial garbage than there is in the stuff that's shown in theatres. And I commended him for that and will do so again, particularly the City Police Department which is largely responsible for doing this thing here. They are fairly good in that area but in the area of films, the record, Mr. Chairman, it's clear there has been absolutely nothing happening and the theatre owners are laughing all the way to the bank every week. That's bad, Mr. Chairman, but even worse is the fact that there are violations of this act going on. The Minister knows it, the Attorney-General knows it, and they're not doing anything and I suggest they will never do anything until they hire some inspectors to see to it, to see to it that these laws, as loose as they are, as permissive as they are, that they are being enforced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate at any time to rise during the course of a colleague's estimates and I have consistently refrained from doing that, and I would like the Honourable Member from Lakeside to have the courtesy not to interrupt me while I make my few remarks.

But I felt constrained, Mr. Chairman, to rise and to indicate my concern for the kind of commentary I've heard from the Honourable Member for Thompson. He in his own way pillages and seeks to destroy the honour and integrity of a person in this House, and still say, you know, "I mean no harm because I have some affection" and so on. Well now that is not my style and I repudiate that kind of style. Now if the honourable member wants to be reasonable, then he should state the facts as they are, and the facts as they are is that when I spoke in this House in respect to the Classification Bill, I indicated we had a system that was highly inadequate, that we had a system whereby the motion picture industry quite frankly were happy with a government agency acting as a censor board, and wanted a continuation of that system because by virtue of that system they were protected from the rigours of the law and the rigours of the Criminal Code. And that was made clear. And classification, as the honourable member knows, by this board is no protection of any theatre in respect to the law.

Now the classification has been in being for a brief period of time, but already the honourable member is attacking the integrity of the Attorney-General's Department in respect to some failure to prosecute bills at this date. Now the honourable member knows and he heard it argued in this House, that in respect to the whole area of censorship or determination of what individuals should see and what they ought not to see, that's a matter for the personal assessment of individuals in society to some extent, but not completely. And I have indicated that where there has been a complaint that a particular motion picture or a particular periodical or whatever the case may be is objectionable and is, in the opinion of the law officers, obscene, then prosecutions will proceed and we continue to operate on that basis. There has been no change, and the honourable member sat in his place and heard during the course of my Estimates my indication that this government had made no change in respect to that, and as a matter of fact the list of activity in the courts is formidable, and that's not something for which I have great pride. I have indicated I am concerned about what I consider to be a slackening and a lessening of the moral standards that we ought to have in society, but that's my opinion. I'm not going to seek to impose my moral standards on anyone, but the parliament of Canada has passed a law and that law is being rigorously enforced in Manitoba. The honourable member says it is not. Then the honourable member can lay a complaint - can lay a complaint, with the police authority that has authority in the City of Winnipeg, and if that complaint is justified in the eyes of the police authorities then prosecutions will proceed. And that is the basis of operation, and the

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. MACKLING cont'd). . . . honourable member knows it, and there's been no deviation and there's been no backing off from the responsibility that is ours, and he knows that as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I should say a few words on this subject especially after the statement of the Honourable Member from Thompson. I might say that I give him credit for good intention, for sincerity, but I think that it's about time that he should be lectured a bit also. I'll be go to hell, Mr. Chairman, if somebody's going to try to take me in a corner and tell me this is the kind of person I am and this is what I believe and this is what I like, and this is exactly what my honourable friend did just a few minutes ago. If he doesn't want to accept my guarantee on this or my statement, that's up to him.

I've never tried to say that he wasn't sincere but he makes a statement on anything and if we don't agree with him 100 percent we're all a bunch of either fools or liars or immoral. I will not accept that I've brought anything dirty in this province at all or that I like it. And I'm telling my friend that I don't like these things any more than he does. Not because I'm virtuous, I just don't like that kind of stuff. I don't know if I'm too old, I don't know what's the matter. I'm not interested. I've gone because I'm charged with the responsibility of this board. I've gone to some of these movies. I've walked out. Both my wife and I've walked out more than once because it's a waste of time and I can't see anything at all in it, and there are an awful lot of people in Manitoba that are like that. My honourable friend, I say to him, should I get killed crossing the street today that things are not going to change. The moral or the immorality that we have in North America or anywhere in the world is something that has come by different steps and so on, and it is not my fault that I certainly, this is too heavy a load for me to accept to carry.

We have said, both the Attorney-General and myself, we have said this and we believe in this, that it will be easier to prosecute under this setup because we will not have anybody tell us, "You have a Censor Board who accepts it." This is the reason we said, and to prove it the people that are supposed to be so immoral that are laughing all the way to the bank did everything they could to retain the Censor Board because it was a joke as far as they were concerned. Because it was a license to do what they want and then to save face and not to be bothered, and this is what we stopped, Mr. Chairman. Now I think that -- all right. Now my honourable friends say well, all right, prove it. What have you done? I've tried to tell them what we've done. I was criticized. I went out and got, not necessarily because he's a priest but a Roman Catholic priest, the same faith as my honourable friend, as the Chairman of this Board. We've got a nun on this board, so those people, if nothing else can, apart from their work on the Censor Board or Classification Board, they could give the information to certain people to say, no, don't go.

And morality is something that comes from within, Mr. Chairman. We have a conscience, we're born with a conscience, and the Catholic Church, that my honourable friend and I belong to, are very much going in that direction now. And they don't damn people anymore. It's not black and white, it's not black and white, it depends what it does to me. It's funny though, every single one of us says, well not for me ; I'm smart enough, I can go to those things. Like I said just a minute ago, if I'm not interested I walk out. But we don't want to give credit to the people at all and that is wrong. That is wrong and it's not the way to stop these things. My friend said, they are laughing all the way to the bank. During the prohibition there was killing, there was all kinds of things. There was a law then stopping this immorality. What happened? There were more underworld, there were more things going on that shouldn't have been going on.

Yesterday we heard that we had massage parlours, and not the kind that we would like to send our children to. There is no law that says that is against the law but these people will find a way. Say to somebody don't do it, and they'll do it.

And as I said because of my involvement in that, when I was on holidays I looked at sex shops and different things. There was nobody in there, nobody anymore. A few years ago these things were packed. It's a waste of time. The people haven't got - what kind of people are we that we think that everybody's got one thing in mind, one thing in mind all the time.

And it might be that something is wrong for my honourable friend. It might be that he will be shocked, that he will be hurt, or that he'll go out and commit an act because he's seen something, I don't know. And it might be that it will not work the same on other people.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . We are not always of the same background; we are not affected the same at all. We're dealing with people.

And I'm saying to my friend - I start by mentioning that I don't like it. And every time I say this he still doesn't understand what I'm trying to say. Every time I've said I will not like it until I censor it myself, he thinks it's a big joke he makes the statement that it's a ridiculous statement. I am saying that nobody can tell me but myself what is right and what is wrong. It's not because my honourable friend will stand up and say this is wrong that it makes it wrong for me. No. You know God didn't create everybody and put one conscience on earth. Every single one of us has a conscience and we can use our conscience, and I resent the fact to say that I'm a smut peddler because I'm charged with some damn job that I don't like. And I'm trying to do everything I can. I've done everything I can.

For instance one of the members of the board has made a statement that as far as he's concerned there is a redeemable factor in this -- The Last Tango and he's going to be chastised because it is none of his business to do that because I don't -- if we ever prosecute this, to say well he said it was good. We don't want that. We're being careful. We don't start by saying everybody is wrong; everybody are sinners; everybody have one thing in mind, they want smut. We give credit to the people. And we play ball with the people, we try to co-operate with them.

Now my honourable friend said, well why didn't you prosecute? Well tell me which film he wants us to prosecute. You know he says he doesn't want to be a censor. He has some deep belief on this abortion thing. He is going all across Canada lecturing and doing everything he can. Let him do the same crusade instead of standing up here and telling me that I'm a smut peddler, that I'm responsible for the whole world's morals in society in this time and age. Let him get up and go to the show and lay a charge against these people, and then we will see. We will see what happens.

There are some judges of the Supreme Court that will say that holding hands, like my honourable friend is probably wrong, and others don't care what the hell is going on. We are human beings. Until there is a God that can walk around here, that can solve everything for us we'll have to do the best we can --(Interjection)-- with a little bit of sincerity on our part. If my friend doesn't agree with me, if he thinks that I am wrong, why doesn't he have the courtesy, the courtesy, and not only the courtesy, but - he believes in Christianity, he believes in goodness, he believes in charity, the charity to give me credit for wanting something better for the people of Manitoba, wanting something better for me. I don't like the setup here, I don't like the movies the way they are. What the heck can I change? Can I change what is in the mind of everybody, of most -- you know when it's going to be changed? When the people themselves will say we don't want that. We can legislate anything and everything. Well then if they are saying it I'm glad and it's a damn good thing because soon those kind of films will not be wanted here, like in many places in the world, because they will not attract anybody at all. It is the only time -- we have faith in the people of Manitoba in many ways. There are not 57 great Gods or geniuses in Manitoba and the rest of the people are not good. This is not the thing at all. We have a conscience--(Interjection)-- All right. We have a conscience and . . . that my honourable friend talks about charity, about imputing motives. And that - when he is has said his catechism what he's doing there, that was also a sin. This was also a sin. You need a towel, not -- this was also a sin. So I'm saying to my honourable friend I believe in your sincerity. I believe that you're trying to do the same thing. But if your methods are not the same as mine or mine are not the same as yours, that doesn't mean that automatically that I'm a smut peddler, that I'm responsible for the kind of movies that are going because I don't -- they don't get my money, I don't encourage them. And if the people all encourage the way I do, they will starve to death.

There is nothing -- and then evern in that we've tried - I've asked the board to have something that you see in the television columns, they tell you the kind of movie because we go there, we're going to go and see Midnight Cowboy and it's a sex show, and I think it's a cowboy show, or somebody else thinks it's a cowboy show. So once a week co-operation with the newspapers, again everybody is not wrong all the time. The newspaper, the Board, and so on, they are giving us an idea of what this film is all about, so we don't waste our time. They are not - I agree - they are not - I wish they'd bring in the Great Waltz and some of these,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . Ten Commandments and that, those are the kind of shows, I like - not that I'm virtuous. I don't take any credit for that at all. I love those shows. I think they are good shows. There are some of these shows that I cannot stand, but I am trying to say to my honourable friend that there is a law in this land here that said you will not have obscenity, and it's something that a lot of people .

A MEMBER: Enforce it.

MR. DESJARDINS: We will enforce it. Tell us which one. You are talking about what's going to happen. The Last Tango has not been here yet. This other one that my honourable friend from Fort Garry is talking about, has not been here yet, and let me tell you the way we've talked what we've tried. There has been one show, there is one movie, Fritz the Cat, or something. We were going to bring this in and what we were told the court will laugh at you - from legal advice - because these are -- who's going to say that a cat should have clothes on or some damn thing like that. So we figured the first one, the first one, because it's results that we want. (Give me my water, I'll need it, I'm yelling at this jackass) What I am saying that the first one that we want will be one we hope that we'll make it stick. That is why. And right now we are waiting -- there'll be a test case, and so on. They're going to throw one at us, fine. But I'm asking my friend to be a little charitable, give us a little credit, and wait a little while to see what's going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise and report. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

. . . . continued on next page.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION 16

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 16. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Before the honourable member proceeds. I neglected to announce that there is a need for a meeting on private bills merely to advance the times for which private bills can be received. I believe that can only be done under our rules, to extend the time, by the Committee making such a resolution, and I wonder if the honourable members would co-operate with me and meet, let us say, tomorrow at a quarter to eight, quarter to eight, just to be there, pass the resolution and then come into the House -- (Interjection) -- Tomorrow evening. Or we could do it at 2:15. I think tomorrow evening at a quarter to eight would be fine.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) Very well. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye.

WHEREAS this House recognizes that people living in northern or remote areas face a higher cost of living than those citizens living in urban and southern areas and that such cost of living increase is not presently taken into account in the tax and wage structure laws in Manitoba

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government give consideration to amending the minimum wage regulations in Manitoba to provide that in northern and remote areas the minimum wage shall always be not less than ten percent higher than the minimum wage in general use throughout the province.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we ready to proceed? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was proposed by myself a year ago and at that time the government gave the reasons as to why it was not practical and subsequently the resolution was disposed of and not passed. So I thought I should bring it forward again because I really believe that there is a situation here where government can help by way of the adjusting of the laws with respect to the minimum wage in the province. I find, Mr. Speaker, that in the intervening year that I have gained a measure of support from certain members of the NDP Party. I have in front of me a news clip from the Tribune, I think it's December the 16th, 1972, where at their convention the NDP delegation from northern Manitoba proposed a similar resolution, only they went considerably further. They said that the minimum wage should be raised by 75 cents in the north which is far more than what I'm asking for in this resolution.

And there was a great deal of debate at the convention and the Minister of Labour led the rebuttal and he had some interesting things to say. "Labour Minister Russ Paulley in opposing the resolution said if the minimum wage could be raised in one region due to special circumstances, then a less than standard minimum wage could be argued for regions with less than average living costs." Well this is kind of a ridiculous argument. It's the law you change, you don't just make the change because someone asks for it.

I am submitting that the north has a special problem in high transportation costs, a longer season of winter where their costs of living are higher by way of heating costs, lighting costs, food costs, clothing costs, and so on. So I don't think that argument holds at all. But what really surprised me that he closed his argument with what he thought I suppose was an unassailable point and he says, "Employees in the north through union negotiations are able to meet the differential by obtaining higher wages anyway."

Well I don't know on a percentage basis how many workers in the north have union coverage or union protection. My guess is oh, 20 or 25 percent if that. There's no union representation on the reserves or in the small communities. Certainly there's strong unions in Lynn Lake and The Pas, Thompson, and places like that where the mines are, there's no question about it that the unions are quite capable of negotiating for their members and obtaining wages that they consider fair for their work. But I'm surprised that the Minister of Labour would take that approach and ignore, ignore the needs of the other people of the north. And I'm sure that in his travels up north, I'm sure that some of the northern members of this House, NDP or otherwise, know, just know that the limited labour market there allows employers to hire waitresses and cooks, and people who work in retail establishments, mostly the wives, because they need the money in the family, and because of the excess of labour for that type of work that certain employers can get away with paying the bare minimum and that's all. So I really think that there is a need for this.

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd)

Further, I'm surprised also that the now Minister of Northern Affairs has made the statement on December 15th of 1972, just a few months ago, and this is quite a definitive statement, it's not a general thing. But he said that public hearings into the price of retail goods in the north will be called by the Provincial Government if prices aren't reduced as a result of lower northern freight costs this year, said Northern Affairs Commissioner Ron McBryde. Well I notice the Minister isn't in the House, and as I recall the defence put forward by him and others in his party about the fiasco on the winter roads up north, and we all know what happened there. Every place where a road was contracted by a private contractor the road was built and the freight was hauled over the road. And this applies into northern Ontario; it also applies in certain parts of Northern Manitoba where private contractors by bid did their usual thing and built the roads and goods were hauled in. But where the Minister of Northern Affairs got into the act, and under government supervision and government guidance the winter road program was a disaster. The winter road program was a disaster. I repeat that.

Now what is happening? Hundreds of thousands of pounds of freight have to be flown in at exceedingly high cost. We're talking now about building supplies, food, clothing, everything that the remote communities needed are being flown in and estimates have been placed at a half a million to one million extra in freight. Now surely this would dictate the fact that the people who live in those communities who didn't receive their heavy supplies by normal, in the normal fashion over the winter road system, are certainly going to be paying more for gas, for clothing, for food, for building supplies because of the high freight costs.

It will be interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister keeps his promise and will call hearings into the high retail prices in the north, because he made the flat statement, early in November I believe it was, that through government program on the winter road system that they were going to definitely lower the prices of freighting the commodities into the north, and we know what happened to that. So I'm looking forward with interest to see if the Minister does call his hearings into the high freight costs into the north for the past winter. -- (Interjection)-- Yes, the Member for Thompson has said to me, yes, they probably will after the election but there'll be no action taken before the election, that's for sure.

Mr. Speaker, I have not much more to add to my resolution. It has been talked about before. No doubt the government will say well where would you draw the line even if they were going to try to do this. Well there's the geographic area of the north, my guess is starts just south of The Pas and goes on up from there because anywhere where there's a highway system and a railway system and an air system, there's competition, there's competition, and it's pretty fierce competition. I notice in some of the retail outlets that the prices aren't that much different to southern areas but I do notice in the places like Brochet, Island Lake, Ste. Therese, and places like that where the only method is either winter road or air freight, that there is a great deal of difference in the cost of goods and services. So I suggest to the government they could - this is not an insurmountable problem in defining where the north is, and where the increased minimum wage should apply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am really not going to deal directly with the question of minimum wages but there are other related problems in northern Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Well I will use the same criteria for dealing with it as did the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I assume that if he was in order, I assume, Mr. Speaker, that I will be, because the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie described the winter roads system, or the winter roads that were not put in by private developers this year as a fiasco - I think those were his words - and I am unaware, and of course I run the danger here of venturing into an area which I was not directly responsible for at the time but I believe I have some knowledge of it, that there were no winter roads built by the government this year, that they were all built by private contractors; that I am unaware of any winter roads that were built by anybody but a private contractor. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Is it not a fact that certain civil servants were placed in charge of overseeing some of the contracts?

MR. GREEN: In every case the governments has roads built by private contractors, whether in the Highways department or in the winter roads, and even with the ones that my

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. GREEN cont'd) honourable friend says were done well, there had to be inspectors, or civil servants, who were paying for the roads to see that they were put in as contracted. That is the way they build winter roads; that is the way they build summer roads; that is the way they build roads, period. And I am unaware of any roads being built by the government. The honourable member said something, you know, he wouldn't really come right out and say what he intended to say. He really wouldn't come out and say that one of the roads was contracted to a native organization, that that was the Me Ke Se - I believe that that is the name of it - Construction Company, and that he really wouldn't say that that particular contractor created the fiasco. He withheld from saying that -- I don't know why. If that's what he intended then I don't know why he didn't say it, but that was a private contractor. I mean it wasn't a Ukrainian contractor; it wasn't a Jewish contractor; it wasn't an Anglo Saxon contractor; it was an Indian contractor, but it was a private contractor.

Mr. Speaker, my impression is that it was not a fiasco. My impression is that they said it was a fiasco and that they weren't doing the job, although I believe that there was some self-interest in the people who said that, that then Colin H . . . took a bus and travelled from Winnipeg -- I believe to Island Lake -- on that road and there were television pictures of it, and they said it was a good road. But then came, Mr. Speaker, the government involvement. You know what the government did? The government created sun and warmth and that had an effect, Mr. Speaker, that had an effect of making this road unusable for a period of time which it would normally have been more usable had it not thawed as quickly. And my honourable friend calls that a fiasco.

Now I want to make my honourable friend the Minister. Now I want to put my honourable friend in the position of being the Minister and let him solve the winter road problem in his Portage la Prairie style. You come into government in 1969; you are told that for years the winter roads had been built as a matter of exclusive property of the person who built them, and I have nothing against the person, who made for years his living by carrying products over winter roads, which he got a government permit for. Once he got that permit he was entitled to the road and I certainly wouldn't argue with that if he was going to put the money into building it, he was the one who was entitled to carry freight over it, and I wouldn't let somebody else carry freight over a road that he built and didn't pay for, that is the other person didn't pay for. So the style was that this person was given a permit, told to carry freight on those roads; he paid for them and he charged the cost of the roads to the purchaser, and for years they yelled about high prices in the north. I don't blame that person. I am saying that the prices were probably as a result of two things, one he had to build the roads, and secondly, he had a monopoly. And when you are in that position you as a good businessman, and if the honourable member would read the history of Standard Oil, or the Robert Barons, or the Nationalization of Industry in the United States, he will find that the people who have a monopoly make good money, and this man was in that position, for which I do not criticize him. But there were screams about the cost of goods in northern Manitoba. And the previous administration made an arrangement, and again no criticism, that they would pay half the cost of the winter roads and that this would keep prices down. And here my figures are a bit hazy, and I'm going to try to be as honest as I can with my honourable friend. The first year that we paid half the cost of the winter roads, the figure was \$60,000, and it was the previous administration under the previous Minister of Northern Affairs - I believe it was Mr. Lyon -- (Interjection) -- It was Northern Affairs yes.

A MEMBER: Commissioner of Northern Affairs.

MR. GREEN: The Commissioner of Northern Affairs, yes, who paid the trucker in question \$60,000, being 50 percent of the cost of building the roads. The next year we were in government; I was the Minister, and when the bill came for 50 percent of the costs of the roads the bill was and, Mr. Speaker, I hope I'll be forgiven if I'm wrong about the exact amount, but I believe it was approximately \$120,000.00. What was 50 percent last year was \$120,000 this year. The honourable member is now the Minister. Let him be the Minister, what was \$60,000 was 50 percent last year, \$120,000 is 50 percent this year. I said, well we can't go on this way and furthermore -- and here's the important thing that happened -- other people said now that the government is paying for half the cost of the roads, they have no right to keep us off the roads - and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was like - and I hope I'm not over dramatizing - gunfight at the O.K. Corral. There were the two truckers standing there, and I believe that weapons were involved, as to who could use those roads. But that wasn't a fiasco

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. GREEN cont'd) that was delightful, that was elegant, according to the Member for Portage la Prairie. That was lovely, that wasn't a fiasco. And this fellow said if the government is putting \$120,000 into the roads, why do other people not have the right to use them?

So this rather, and I suppose for the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie a fiasco-creating-Minister - it happened to be myself - I said okay we have to resolve this problem. From now on the government will pay the costs of the roads but they will be open to everybody, and everybody will be able to bid on them, and as a result of the bidding coming in lower because it is competitive, the \$120,000 that we put into the roads or the 240, because don't forget the 120 was only 50 percent - the \$240,000 will be money well spent because it will result in a benefit to the people of northern Manitoba. That was how this Minister dealt with it.

I suppose the Member for Portage la Prairie if he was the Minister would not have dealt with it that way, he would have paid the \$120,000 and waited until next year until the bill came in at 240,000 for 50 percent. The honourable member smiles like maybe that wouldn't happen. Well, Mr. Speaker, it did happen, because next year when we asked for people who build the roads - I admit that we probably didn't look at it hard enough - and the only person that could do these roads was the man who had been previously building them before, or at least we were so led to believe. I'm rather sorry that we didn't take the chance and build them ourselves, and we asked him how much would be the cost of building these roads. It wasn't \$240,000, it was more like, and again I may be a little hazy about my figure, it was more like between 500 and 600,000 dollars for 100 percent of what was \$240,000 the previous year. Now when that man presented the bill or these figures of between 5 and 600,000 - I suppose the Member for Portage la Prairie would say, well he's a fine free enterpriser, he knows how to build roads, give it to him. As a matter of fact give him 650, why be cheap about it? Well we didn't do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege. The Minister is attributing various thoughts and statements to me that I did not say in the debate at all, and I don't mind him attacking me, that's fair, but let him not set me up as a straw man and then attribute all sorts of statements that I would have said, or would have done, in a hypothetical situation. Let him talk about what happened and that's all.

MR. SPEAKER: The other thing to the Honourable Minister, I do hope he will relate this to the resolution in respect to wages, minimum wages.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if it related to the resolution when the honourable member said the system of building winter roads was a fiasco this year, then it is related to the resolution now. And if the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It's not . . . Order, please. I would suggest that I can allow a certain amount of latitude but not a total debate on one particular aspect of the last speaker's debate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to you, this relates to the prices in northern Manitoba and the minimum wages there for having to be set higher, and the fact that I would like to spend a little longer on it than the honourable member spent on it does not make it irrelevant. And I'm suggesting to the honourable member if he doesn't wish to be a straw man, then do not set himself up as a straw man. Because he was the one who said the system this year was a fiasco and I am suggesting to him, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to him . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Seeing as how he's taking a great deal of latitude on costs of winter roads, could he tell us the total cost this year of the winter roads system paid by the government?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that figure will certainly be available in very due course. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't have the costs right now and I'm not obliged to give it to my honourable friend right now.

I want to continue with this \$600,000 figure because then we told this person that we would not build that road. We told this person we would not build that road, we would see to it to get the freights to that place in another way. And you know what happened? The costs suddenly dropped by roughly \$200,000 and the roads were built at a figure, I think, of approximately \$400,000 - about 400,000, and again I am quoting from memory.

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, what happened the following year, the year that my honourable friend said was the fiasco. This time we acted a little quicker and we put these things out for tender in the month of perhaps, oh, maybe it was June or August, around that time in any event. We did it in good time to see what the figures would come in on. The figures from the same private enterpriser, who my honourable friend said that we created a fiasco by not proceeding with, were about \$800,000 for the same roads that had been previously done for the figure of approximately 240, and I suppose we could have submitted and lay down and hid under the table and paid the \$800,000 and did nothing. We didn't. We ran around; we tried to figure out how we could get it in alternatively by air traffic; we tried to figure out where else roads could be bid, and one of the things that we did is we contracted with a private contractor, the Me Ke Se Construction Company.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say that they did themselves proud with the way in which they performed on that road, and for the honourable member to hold that up as a fiasco is a discredit to those people, and merely partisan position in favor of his compatriot in the Liberal Party, who by the way ran in Selkirk almost totally on the program that the government had confiscated his winter roads. Has anybody heard of anything so ridiculous that the government had confiscated his winter roads? Since when were they his winter roads? Since when did that land stop belonging to the people of the province of Manitoba? He was given a permit from year to year to operate those roads, and he ran in Selkirk on the program that the government had confiscated his . . . and the people of Manitoba told him what they thought of that position. It was a close election, Mr. Speaker, but the closeness was between the Conservatives and the New Democrats, and we squeaked through, and I hope it will happen in the future, but the guy who made his campaign on the basis of what my honourable friend is now pursuing he ran a bad third.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the honourable member would like to get up and present to this House as a fiasco. He presumably would have dealt with it differently. When prices go up by a hundred percent from 60,000 to 120, he would accept that with equanimity and pay it. When they go up to \$240,000, he would accept that with equanimity and he would pay it. When they go up to \$800,000, that's just delightful, he would pay it. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Instead of seizing, or refusing to renew a permit for land use, why didn't the government build their own instead of taking from someone else?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are different ways of doing it. The honourable member says, why didn't the government make the road? That was a consideration. We choose to see whether we could get people who could do these roads. We also looked, Mr. Speaker, at the alternative of air freight transportation. What we at all costs wanted to avoid was to be under the, under the power of one single person in the area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the, that the road that the honourable member is talking about is our own road. And when I say "our" I refer to the honourable member too, that road belongs to the people of Manitoba. It was given on a one-year permit basis to a man who has earned thereby an exclusive right to deliver freight. When that permit was up it reverted to the people of Manitoba, of which the honourable member is one, and I would think that he would be happy that he owned it. We then hired people to build it and, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, rather than being a fiasco those people did themselves proud, and what has been started in northern Manitoba as a result of tearing ourselves away from the power of one person, and one single proposition with regard to road building, will accrue to the lasting benefit of the people of northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say about this. Before I start talking about the resolution itself dealing with higher minimum wage, which has been discussed in this House for many many years, I would like to simply briefly comment on what has been discussed on the winter roads which were supposedly going to lower the cost of goods. I was one of those who probably was closer to the problem of high cost in the northern remote communities as a result of the freight transportation than anyone else. And we know there was a monopoly, and not only was there a monopoly but there was a problem of another person living

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . in Wabowden who were constantly fighting each other and attempting to run each other off the road. And this is one which we did not know how to resolve. And the government took certain steps to resolve it, always with the objective in mind that those communities would get lower costs. I really think that was what the whole issue was about. Whether the professional Indian Dave Courchene achieved that for them, or the government, or some other contractor, we couldn't care less. And I don't think the communities could care less. I think what we must know is whether the program that that Minister is talking about, has it resulted in lower food prices, and oil prices, and gas prices. That's really all I'm concerned about; I couldn't care less who did it. I know that the old system was no good and if the Minister can get up and tell us here today that the program they have gone to, which unquestionably has hurt this contractor that has been referred to - there's no question it hurt him economically because his livelihood depended on it, so I don't think that anybody is going to dispute that it has hurt him. But if the Minister can get up in this House and tell us that as a result of making a sacrificial lamb of that contractor the people are truly benefitting from the program, then perhaps we can accept it, and I'm sure that the people of those areas will be happy. And that's all I have to say on that, Mr. Speaker.

I want to now talk about the minimum wage, which I have talked about many times. I haven't had a chance to go through Hansard dating back several years but I believe that that resolution was probably brought in by the NDP Government when it was in opposition -- (Interjection) -- It wasn't. I see. I'm told that they had never brought it in. I know that we have discussed it at conventions, and we have discussed it in the north, and I think down there the New Democrats and the trade unionists are pretty unanimous. They want higher, a higher minimum wage because everyone knows, everyone knows that the cost of everything is higher. The government gives us one thing. There's one area we have equality in, our price of our liquor is the same as it is down south; the same price whether it's beer or whiskey, that is equalized. But everything else is higher whether it's car gas, heating fuel, lumber, cement, you name it. Everything is higher. And I think that those people are entitled to higher wages.

We certainly - when the unions negotiate with the company they tell the company that we want more money than the boys at Sudbury because our costs are higher, and the company doesn't argue any more like it did originally. They say yeah we recognize the fact that it costs more money to live, and other companies, I believe the Hudson Bay Company pays its employees a northern allowance for working up there because it costs more. The Provincial Government, various departments, including my former department, we pay a housing allowance I believe of \$75.00 a month and living allowance of \$50.00, because the government recognizes when we send a man up there, we hire a man, that it costs more money. I, you know, I don't think that anybody is going to dispute that fact.

Therefore it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's logical that the government should, should bring in legislation setting out a higher minimum wage, whatever it is, if it's \$1.50 down here, it should be ten percent, I believe, the member who introduced the resolution said it should be ten percent higher. It's certainly a lot more than ten percent on what the government is paying through their housing and grocery subsidies. So I think that ten percent is really being very reasonable, and a very very conservative figure which perhaps could be upped at some future time, but I think to be fair to the employers that we don't hit them with a huge increase at one time.

And the government can say, as the Minister attempted to say when we discussed censorship, we don't like it and we don't think it's good, however. Well I suggest to the government that that's a luxury that's reserved exclusively to the opposition. Only they can make that kind of a statement that we don't like it, because the opposition can do nothing, only the government can bring in that type of legislation to do these things, and I suggest rather than getting up and making speeches that they agree with us 100 percent, and all the rest of it, however there are problems, I suggest that they do it. And if they can't do it, then I suggest that they get up at the next election and say to the people, "look we know it's right but we can't do it!" Let them tell that to the people. They've been telling it into the House, let them go out in the hustings and tell the people that they can't do it. And if they can't do it I think -- I'm optimistic enough to think that we can find 57 other people that the people can elect that will do it. And I suggest to the Minister who is in charge, who is not here, that he had better move on some of these things that the people of the north are asking for or he'll find out that they'll lose what little they've got left there. Thank you.

RESOLUTION 16

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make quite a number of comments in relation to this resolution and some of the comments that have already been made. I'm sorry that I was tied up in my office and not able to hear the apparently interesting submission of the Member for Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, maybe I'd better first touch on the aspect that was under discussion when I came in, and that is the winter road situation in northern Manitoba. And I think it would be worthwhile to say, Mr. Speaker, that the outlook, the Guideline to determine the policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, is the guideline what is best for the people of the Province of Manitoba, what is best for the people who happen to be in a certain area of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, these are the considerations that guide us when we try and come to policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain individuals who would disagree with our programs, there are certain individuals who would be affected by our program. Mr. Speaker, we have to put above that concern, the concern of what is in the general interests of the people of Manitoba, what is going to have the most positive effect for the people that we're supposed to represent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie who had the opportunity, because after this government was elected we were interested in northern Manitoba, we were interested in northern Manitoba, and one of the first things we did was establish a Northern Task Force to travel throughout northern Manitoba, and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was one of those who was on that task force who had the opportunity to see what the problems were, to hopefully have the opportunity to come to some understanding of what the problems were. I'm sure the Member for Portage la Prairie had the opportunity to recall that we discussed the cost of living in some cases and the cost charged by various companies, and I think he as one of the members of the Task Force suggested to the people in one community, well if you just didn't have one store here you might have lower prices because you'd have two stores and you'd have competition. This was stated by some members of the Task Force, including those who sit on this side of the House.

When we got to the next community, Mr. Speaker, there was two stores. There was one a large company that operates in many areas of northern Manitoba and another, an individual trader. We asked the individual trader well how are the prices set here, it must be better here because there is competition, and he said well I go over to the other store and I find out what price they are charging, and I charge the same thing over here. So, Mr. Speaker, the answer might not be as simple as members opposite would like to think and like to consider that they are.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in regards to winter roads has been somewhat described by the Minister of Mines and Resources fairly accurately, and he was quite intensely involved in these when he had that responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I think it must be realized by honourable members here, and when the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie shouts across, why didn't you build your own road? Mr. Speaker, there is some difference between the winter roads in northern Manitoba and the road that he travels back and forth on between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie because, Mr. Speaker, one is a road that is built to a certain standard, and it's a road that stays there so it can -- you can have title to it, it can belong to somebody.

Mr. Speaker, the winter roads we're talking about in northern Manitoba didn't start out to be roads at all. Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of someone getting a cat train, putting sleighs on it and making some kind of trail into communities in order to haul supplies into those communities. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a number of different trails followed. There are hundreds and hundreds of trails throughout northern Manitoba that various cat train operators followed. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie would like to leave the implication that somehow somebody came and took something away from someone.

Mr. Speaker, if there's a 100 foot paths through the woods and the Member for Portage happens to walk on one quite often, does that mean then that that path belongs to him? Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that is the case. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I know that many many pioneers in northern Manitoba, many many pioneer freighters in northern Manitoba, were involved in developing trails in the communities in northern Manitoba for the purpose of winter freight haul. And, Mr. Speaker, then another freighter would come along and start using the other freighter's trail, and then another freighter would come along and start using his trail, and, Mr. Speaker, there was quite often disagreement who should use whose trail,

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) and whether or not you could go where I had happened to get my tractor train through before you got your tractor train through.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that apparently the company or the individuals who he has most concern for, Mr. Speaker, and this is his concern not for the people . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: That is not true. I did not say it. I addressed myself to the minimum wage and transportation costs. If he wants to attack me that's fine, but let him not attribute the fact that I come in this House as a member with a special concern for one person. That's a damn lie.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion arrived at by observing the words and actions of the honourable member that he comes under representing the point of view of a very small number of people.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, they voted for me.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I assume that some of them probably did and, Mr. Speaker, if the member puts it that way the number's probably going to get smaller as time goes on.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk on the subject we were talking on. So the winter roads, Mr. Speaker, were not a property of somebody. However, Mr. Speaker, the province did at a later date begin to give permits, to say to somebody, yes you can put your road into that area. And, Mr. Speaker, there was a real fuss at that time because many many of those freighters were very upset because one company would get permits in areas that they thought they should have permits to. Mr. Speaker, at that time those freighters thought somebody was confiscating their rights. I think, Mr. Speaker, that points out that people's rights were not being confiscated. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that might have happened in winter road construction is that it was a certain monopoly privilege that was given, Mr. Speaker, ceased to be given.

Mr. Speaker, what had developed, what had developed on the winter roads system, and the Minister of Mines and Resources has gone into it in some detail, but what had developed, Mr. Speaker, was not only a basically monopoly situation on who could build the winter roads, Mr. Speaker, but an exclusive right to haul on that road. And, Mr. Speaker, this isn't new in the Province of Manitoba. We have the Motor Transport Board that sets, allows people to haul into certain areas, and, Mr. Speaker, then the Motor Transport Board sets the rates that the people can charge to haul into that area. But in a situation of the winter roads Mr. Speaker, we had had a monopoly situation where a person could have exclusive rights to haul and no regulation of the rates that were charged. And that's the situation we had to deal with, Mr. Speaker.

In attempting to deal with it, when the Minister of Mines and Resources mentioned the rates came in for the proposed construction of winter roads far beyond what we thought were reasonable costs for construction of those winter roads. They were far beyond I think what we thought we could fairly say to the people of Manitoba we are justified in paying this kind of money for a winter road system. So, Mr. Speaker, we had to come up hopefully with a cheaper alternative. And, Mr. Speaker, you know maybe we did not look at all the facts at the start because what we looked at, Mr. Speaker, was the cost of ground transportation into those communities in previous years. And, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the cost of ground transportation into those communities in previous years you can get the goods shipped in there by large aircraft for just about the same costs as the cost of ground transportation in the previous years.

But, Mr. Speaker, other freighters, other trucking companies and other contractors came to us and said, (1) we can build the road a lot cheaper, and (2), we can haul the goods in a lot cheaper. And, Mr. Speaker, this changes the situation somewhat and it was our decision then to go ahead in some cases with putting in some airstrips to see what the actual costs of air transportation would be, and to put in the winter roads at a lower cost than had been estimated, and to see, Mr. Speaker, get some comparison between the costs of these various methods of transportation.

And, Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for some costs, and I did some costs for members, and I gave one for the Member from Portage la Prairie and one to the northern Affairs critic for the Conservative Party, and one to the Member for Rupertsland, and I would have given others out if I'd known people were interested but nobody else seemed to be that interested.

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd)

But, Mr. Speaker, for example here's what we're faced with. In the Ilford-Oxford House-God's Narrows road we are faced with a bid for \$159,000 and we then had a subsequent offer to construct that road for \$95,000. In the case of the Ilford-York Landing-Split Lake road we are faced with a bid of \$39,870, and we subsequently entered into an agreement to build the road for closer to \$20,000.00. So, Mr. Speaker, we did find that it was quite possible to build those roads for a lot lower costs than the tenders that came in. And, Mr. Speaker, this is probably because the tenders came from - there was only one person in a position to tender on some of those roads.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member state his point of order?

MR. FROESE: Would the honourable Minister table the report that he's reading from, that he's quoting from.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll table that. As I've said, I've already given it to some members of the House and I wasn't aware of the overwhelming interest of the Member for Rhineland in this particular subject matter, and there's no problem in giving him a copy of that document. I'll have to get some copies made off and give one to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the basic situation in regards to winter roads.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we did then, in some cases we accepted the tender that was given. Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about one or two roads, we're talking about around 10 or 11 winter roads in northern Manitoba, winter roads, Mr. Speaker, that we hoped, by which we hoped we'd be able to lower the cost of living for people in remote northern communities. And, Mr. Speaker, some of those roads we accepted the tender that was offered through private companies; some of those roads we accepted the responsibility for constructing and had our own, and had our own people supervise those but hired local equipment to build them. In some cases we contracted with other contractors who came in with lower costs. And Mr. Speaker, one of these contractors was Me Ke Se Construction. And Mr. Speaker, they came in with cost estimates that were quite a bit under the bids that were received and they had some advantage in that they should get some federal financial contribution in the construction of roads.

And, Mr. Speaker, what happened then? My friends in the Liberal Party in Manitoba got a number of complaints -- I have to assume, Mr. Speaker, that they got a number of complaints from certain friends of those who had been familiar with this industry. Quite a number of complaints. And Mr. Speaker, they reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of a sort of a pack of wolves waiting for one of the deer or one of the elk to get weak so they could attack it. Mr. Speaker, they stood by waiting and hoping that one of these programs might fail so that then they could stand up and say it was a fiasco, it was a mess, you should have let our friend do it, and it wouldn't have been such a mess if you had let our friend do it. And, Mr. Speaker, that's what I believe the position of the Liberal Party in Manitoba is.

Mr. Speaker, we've dealt a fair amount with the winter road policy. Mr. Speaker, this resolution that we have before us today, which the Member for Roblin would like to have us deal with, is a resolution calling for an examination of the minimum wage in northern Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to look at the minimum wage, to look at the minimum wage throughout the Province of Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is presently a study being undertaken by the Department of Labour throughout the entire area of the Province of Manitoba looking at the minimum wage, how it affects different areas, how it affects different industries, how it affects the people in those areas. And this study is presently being conducted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, and it was here before, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the Liberal Party have played a bit of a game. Being in opposition they looked for a little thing here, or a little thing there that they might be able to attempt to champion, that maybe this is one thing the government might have overlooked. And, Mr. Speaker, we had this kind of resolution before, we had a vote before on this resolution, and the Member for Thompson at that time ducked the vote, Mr. Speaker, because he didn't want to vote at that resolution. The man of courage and conviction who always stands up for what he believes in, ducked the vote at that time, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- So, Mr. Speaker, we have a bit of a game here and then the Liberal Party, the Liberal Leader sent news releases to all the small northern papers saying that now the Liberal Party was the champion of the people of northern Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party might be the champion of someone. They might be the champion

RESOLUTION 16

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) of a few people in northern Manitoba but, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that anyone's fooled that they are the champion of the majority of people in the northern part of this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, what this resolution is dealing with is the real cost to people, the real cost to people who live in the northern part of this province. Mr. Speaker, so I would like to take a short look, a short look at some of the things this government has attempted to do to really come to grips with this problem of the cost of living in our northern areas. And, Mr. Speaker, of course it relates to my constituency so I'm entirely familiar with it. One of the problems we really face in northern Manitoba was right in the community of The Pas, Mr. Speaker, where the town was on the verge of bankruptcy. And, Mr. Speaker, this government made representation to Ottawa and was able to get an agreement with the Federal and Provincial Government, a special area agreement, to attempt to deal with the serious financial position of that community in northern Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, if that agreement hadn't been reached the people in that part of northern Manitoba would have been faced with such a tremendous cost that bankruptcy of a town in northern Manitoba probably would have resulted.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that we did almost immediately on assuming office was expand in a dramatic way the Airstrip and Landingstrip Program that affects the remote communities in northern Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, I understand for the Member for Rhineland that there is now some assistance available as well for communities in southern Manitoba that have road access as well. But we have undertaken, Mr. Speaker, to build airstrips in those communities without road access where there is a population of 50 or more people. And, Mr. Speaker, this has been an expensive program. It's a program we moved forward with as quickly as we could. But, Mr. Speaker, there is still some question as to the exact nature of the saving to the people in the isolated communities as a result of this program. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we have asked the Department of Northern Affairs, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to jointly study the various pricing in the communities in northern Manitoba to try and get some idea of the effects that these programs have on the local prices of goods in northern Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that some cost reduction has come about, has come about as a result of our airstrip program. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that it hasn't come to the benefit of the certain business interests rather than to the benefit of the general population in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the resolution I would like to move if you want to -- okay I better move it right away.

Mr. Speaker, there are very many things I would like to deal with in a real and concrete way, not in some pretend way, but a real and concrete way deal with the cost of living in northern Manitoba that have been undertaken by this government. But, Mr. Speaker, the costs are still high and we still have to deal with that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the proposed motion be amended by striking out all the words after the words "in southern areas", and adding thereto:

"AND WHEREAS the present government has undertaken many important and worthwhile programs to lower the cost of living in Northern Manitoba and,

WHEREAS the minimum wage is one aspect in the cost of living,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba is presently conducting an impact study as to the effects of minimum wage areas within the province, the effect on business, including the number of persons involved, the matter of application of the minimum wage in various areas of the province be deferred until such time as the finding of the study are known."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I do wish to say a few words on this amendment.

MR. GREEN: Five-thirty, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GREEN: . . . stand in the Member for Assiniboia's name, Mr. Speaker, as if he had just taken the floor.

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