



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 18A

2:30 P.M. Monday, March 12, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 12, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER: by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed I should like to draw the Honourable Members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 80 students of Grade XI standing from Churchill High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Alex Sabeski and Mr. Hatcher. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Honourable Attorney-General.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Craik): Mr. Speaker, I have three reports that have been previously distributed to members: Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1978; Report of the Provincial Auditor for the year ended March 31, 1978; and the Report of the Public Trustee of Manitoba for the year ended March 31, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this occasion to just briefly indicate to the honourable members that I have distributed today the Department of Highways and Transportation Construction Program for the coming year. I won't bother to elaborate on it, inasmuch as we are currently in the Estimates of the Department. I would simply point out for the members' information that the first 16 or 17 pages of the program list some of the carryover projects from the previous year, and the new programs to be undertaken by the Department can be found from Page 17 on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK introduced Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act, and Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Provincial Auditor's Act and Certain Other Provisions of the Statutes of Manitoba respecting the Duties of The Provincial Auditor, for first Reading. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

MR. JORGENSEN introduced Bill No. 20, The Personal Investigation Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER introduced Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2).

MOTION presented.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS introduced Bill No. 22, The Public Schools Act, and Bill No. 23, The Education Administration Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the member got leave? (Leave.)

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to advise the House in case some of our colleagues are not aware of it, that the Barry Fry Rink from Deer Lodge Curling Club from the constituency of sunny St. James shone last week in Ottawa and shone to the extent that he brought back the Brier, emblematic of Canadian curling championship, to Manitoba. Barry Fry's Rink is made up of Barry Fry as the Skip, Bill Carey, as the Third, Gordon Sparkes, or Gordie Sparkes as I know him, as the Second, and Brian Wood as the Lead. And I'd like to just mention that it's an oddity that somehow the Deer Lodge Curling Club Rink seemed to have a hold on every 25th year at the Brier, because the last Canadian championship team that came from Deer Lodge Curling Club was Jimmy Welsh's team, which was exactly 25 years ago. And, as you may or may not know, this was the 50th year of the Brier that we have going on. I would believe that you, Sir, along with the House, would join with me and the rest of Manitoba, in congratulating Barry Fry's Rink for the excellent record that they had both as professional curlers last week, having a record of ten and one, which I might add is the first time I think in the last seven years that such a good record has been achieved by any rink. And as well, for the ambassadorship that they put played for Manitoba because they were perfect gentlemen in my opinion as representatives of our province. Their record was further amplified by three of the members of the team being elected to the all star team for the Brier and the other member being elected to the second all star team, so I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues in the House and the rest of Manitoba, wish them the best of luck in the forthcoming challenge at Berne, Switzerland where I'm confident and sure they will return with the world Championship Silver Broom. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this is a non political announcement as well. On behalf of the opposition members we would like to, on this side, express our feeling of empathy and sympathy to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation upon her recent loss. I'm sure it's a feeling that's shared by all members in this House and we would so like to extend that to her.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, the Member for Fort Rouge and my own colleagues for all their very kind expressions this past week.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, question to the First Minister. Would the First Minister confirm that Manitoba's minimum wage presently in Manitoba is a percentage of the average weekly wage in this province, approximately 48 percent, the lowest level, the lowest percentage since the mid-1960s.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Premier)ell, Mr. Speaker, (Charleswood): W/ I can't confirm that allegation of my honourable friend. I can confirm that the minimum wage in Manitoba up until approximately two or three months ago was higher than that of Ontario, one of the richest provinces in Canada, but is now I think, five cents below that of Ontario.

MR. PAWLEY: The First Minister confirmed that since the last raise in the minimum wage in

the Consumer Price Index has risen by some 22 percent.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the First Minister would wish to confirm that Manitoba's relationship insofar as minimum wage to other provinces is such that it now has slipped to the 4th lowest in Canada.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question then to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister of Health and Social Development advise as to whether or not a decision has been made in connection with funding for Osborne House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health

MR. SHERMAN: Basically yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity to remind my Honourable friend that the initiative to suggest that Osborne House be closed was taken by the YWCA Board of Directors, as he knows, independent of investigations and discussions that were going on with the Department of my colleague, the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

Now, since that time Department officials have met with the Board of the YWCA with representatives of the YWCA with respect to Osborne House. The problem is in hand. The situation is in hand. There is assistance coming for Osborne House and it's coming independent of any groups either demonstrating on behalf of Osborne House or not demonstrating on behalf of Osborne House. It's coming as a result of initiatives undertaken by my office and the board of the YWCA and the office of my colleague, the Minister of Housing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Minister at this occasion then wish to detail the form of assistance that he makes reference to?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest that perhaps that type of question was better asked when we are considering the estimates of the department. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister would be prepared to table the latest report of the Minimum Wage Board in the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take that question as notice on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Labour.

MR. JENKINS: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable First Minister. Is the Cabinet actively considering the abolishment of the Minimum Wage Board at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that of course would be a question of policy and as such is not a question that would be answerable on Orders of the Day.

MR. JENKINS: The third and final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Would the First Minister be prepared to tie the minimum wage into an average weekly wage as a percentage as is done with members' indemnities at the present time?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that, and I'm sure a myriad of other suggestions will be receiving consideration by the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister as well. In view of the announcement made by the Premier of Alberta that the Province of Alberta intends to spend \$25

to \$30 million a year to develop medical research facilities, and in view of the cutbacks in medical research funding in our own province, can the Minister indicate what steps this province intends to take in order to protect and insure that our own medical research facilities in the Province of Manitoba stay here and are not attracted away to the Province of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has more familiarity and I congratulate him on it with statements made by the Premier of Alberta who's certainly one of the outstanding statesmen of this country, than I have at the moment. —(Interjection)— No, I don't think he needs my help at all. The Premier of Alberta doesn't; my friend from Fort Rouge obviously does. But, I'd be happy to look into the question or my colleague, the Minister of Health, look into the question of funding for medical research. It happens that this government, I think along with any other government in Canada, shares the desire to see that proper medical research is fostered and carried on within the province. The steps that were announced last year by my honourable friend, the Minister of Health with respect to certain items in this regard, I think, is evidence of that fact.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, considering the lack of communication that exists between the Premier of Alberta and the Premier of Manitoba and the Minister of Health, do you think the First Minister might undertake to write to the Premier of Alberta indicating that we would not look kindly upon any head hunting for medical researches in the Province of Manitoba and at the same time and at the same time to convene meetings to establish the kind of program that would be necessary to ensure that our own medical research facilities stayed in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Manitoba, on the 11th of October 1977, did as much as they could to ensure that medical research would stay in this province, and we will try to carry out that trust that was accorded to us at that time.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, considering the people of Manitoba now know what they didn't know on October 11th about what this government intends to do about research, could the First Minister also indicate, or give us this kind of assurance, that the Province of Alberta would be discouraged, or that submissions would be made to them, not to use their obvious financial incentive or advantage to secure medical research facilities from this province, and in fact, go beyond that and determine whether the Province of Alberta is encouraging other forms of moves to the Province of Alberta in the corporate and business world, which is also part of their program.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, but I can speak for myself and I think for all people who are concerned about health matters, that we should not be trying to discourage any province in Canada that is trying to advance the cause of medical research on behalf of the health of all Canadians.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance. -.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, there was a series of questions from the Member for Inkster regarding succession duties, and I want to reply to his questions. The essential questions dealt with Section 41(3) of the Act, and the first question was, was I applying Section 41(3) with legal advice. Mr. Speaker, to answer the member, I said I'd have to look at Section 41(3), and the section says that upon receiving a notice of objection, the Minister shall, with all due dispatch, reconsider the assessment to which the objection is made, and vacate, confirm or vary the assessment, or re-assess, and the Minister shall thereupon, by registered mail, notify the person by whom the objection was taken of his action.

So Mr. Speaker, that is Section 41(3) and the section under which the Minister acted.

The next question had to do with whether or not a notice of objection had been considered with regard to the state of Earl McKellar, and the question was whether or not legal advice had been received. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, legal advice was received.

The next question was, was relief granted? And Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with that in a moment. The other question was, was the matter initially taken to Cabinet to be dealt with by Order-in-Council and then returned to the Minister to be dealt with by him, the answer is no. The matter was never

taken to Cabinet, the matter, in fact, Mr. Speaker was never even discussed at Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, the next question was, did the Minister, at his discretion, grant relief of some kind of to beneficiaries of the estate? Mr. Speaker, the initial assessment on the estate was \$28,000 and some hundred dollars of estate tax, in the re-assessment, one-quarter section of land of a total of a section of land was regarded to be in the interests of the widow, in which case the estate was changed in value by a matter of \$22,000 that reduced the estate tax to some \$21,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, a further question again dealt with the Order-in-council, and then there were a series of other questions from the Member for St. Johns which were dealt with at that time, Mr. Speaker. I want to state here that, in dealing with this particular case, it was a case that was on the desk of the former government, was unresolved at the time. Mr. Speaker, I also have to state that I have some reservations in dealing with some aspects of the case at this time because it's still unresolved. The settlement offered to the widow in this case has been rejected so, Mr. Speaker, the case is still open.

But I did want to answer these questions because I felt that to some extent the questions were somewhat unfair — I think that the member could have asked me privately about this matter to determine whether it was still open or whether it was closed. I take exception to what are alleged statements of his outside the House, Mr. Speaker, which are not true and I think that, going a step further, that what this reveals is that the House really has to reconsider what is to be answered in the House, what is to be stated in the House and what is to be said in the hallways because I think in this particular case it changes substantially the relationship and the axe is going to cut both ways.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SYDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister has alleged I made untrue statements in the hallways. Mr. Speaker, I made no untrue statements in the hallways or in this House on a question of privilege, no untrue statements in the hallways or in the House, and I challenge the statement of my honourable friend that I had made untrue statements.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask a question to the Honourable Minister who says that the item was not taken to Cabinet. Was there not a proposed Order-in-Council sent to Cabinet whereby this estate would be given relief by virtue of the Cabinet's power to grant relief under any circumstances rather than under 41(3)? Was there not a proposed Order-in-Council proposed by the Department of Finance, signed by the Minister, or somebody else representing the Minister, to the Cabinet?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I answered the question. There was never any Order-in-Council taken to Cabinet. This matter was never even discussed at Cabinet. When I was considering the ways of dealing with the matter I looked at various procedures, including an Order-in-Council. (3) Mr. Speaker, upon referring to the Act the Section 41 is imminently clear and the action was taken under Section 41(3). There is no reference in Section 41(3) to taking this through Order-in-Council.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister. I'm quite aware of that, that under 41(3) you do not go to Cabinet. I am asking him whether it was not proposed that it go to Cabinet under the Cabinet's general authority to waive taxation?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the matter I looked at a number of alternatives of dealing with it, including the mechanism of going to, under undue circumstances, or whatever it was, by Order-in-Council. But the Act is extremely clear, Mr. Speaker, there's absolutely no need to have gone to Cabinet, and I repeat for the third time, not only was an Order-in-Council never taken to Cabinet, this matter was never discussed at Cabinet, and those two things were both said outside this House by the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement. I did say to the press what I said in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Question of Privilege. You are not now going to permit the member to say I made an unfair statement. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Minister of Finance that questions arising from statements outside the House, questions that are printed in newspapers, are not proper material to be dealt with in this House. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: On a Point of Privilege now, the honourable member has said I made certain statements. I said to the press, Mr. Speaker, exactly what I said in this House, that my understanding was that they had proposed an Order-in-Council to Cabinet that, at the Cabinet meeting they said that an Order-in-Council would be made public, and therefore it would be better to proceed under 41(3). That was my understanding, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the statement of my understanding is perfectly correct. That is still my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. Mr. Minister, due to the fact that children in Snow Lake have had bus service for the last five years, used a company bus and a company driver at very little expense, and that in some instances these children are driving over a mile and a half, and then suddenly have this service withdrawn. Could the Minister look into this matter and come up with a sensible solution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Of course, in all fairness to the Minister, I expect him to take it as notice but I'd like to remind him that this question was asked last year and we're still waiting for the answer. I would like the Minister to give us — which was a commitment of last year — the Ottawa's financing formula with regard to programs in his department, that is the area that is still cost-share, in the area where a grant in lieu of cost-share, will that change? If that could be enumerated, and if we could have when it applies, the money received from Ottawa under both formulas, that is the cost-share and the straight grant of the 1977-78 year, 1978-79, that should finish in two weeks or so, and what is anticipated for 1979-80 please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll obtain that information for my honourable friend. I would say, while we're at it that he's aware that the bloc funding formula that was introduced originally by the federal government for consideration on the social services side was not accepted, of course, and that the basic funding still comes under CAP and VRDP.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just to make sure, I'd like the Minister to elaborate. Is the Minister saying that there has been no change, that everything is cost-share then? —(Interjection)— Well, then, whatever the formula, because we were never given this at all. That comes as a surprise to me. Whatever the present formula is, I'd like to have it please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On March 5th I took a question as notice from the Member for Inkster dealing with Gull Harbour Lodge, and Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I would like to advise the member that there are no plans at present, as far as I am advised, under way to divest the public of its financial interests at Gull Harbour Lodge.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. But as a preliminary and a preamble, and for edification of the members, I wanted to indicate that there is a vote currently taking place for the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association. My question to the Minister is, could the Minister advise why the returning office, who is in charge

of the vote, is able to determine, without opening the ballot envelope, he can determine for whom the ballot has been cast, and who has cast the ballot, and for whom?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): No, I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if I could ask the Minister if he would undertake to investigate what I believe to be an un-secret ballot, undemocratic vote. I have the ballot in my hand, and it's a very simple matter to read completely through the envelope to scrutinize the ballot, and the name of the person who sends the ballot in is indicated on the returning envelope. I would ask the Minister to investigate this serious matter, what is taking place here.

And by a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if the public is having to pay for the preliminary organization, tabulating the lists and also, how much is it costing the taxpayer, if anything, to conduct the vote?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is, it would have to be referred to the organization itself. It is in their hands to conduct the vote, as the member is quite aware of. The legislation was enabling legislation for the producers to have their election. The last part of his question, will it cost the taxpayers money to help them with the vote, I'm not sure, it could be that there would be some provincial tax money going to the referendum.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House how much, what is the cost to the taxpayer of Manitoba for this private group to organize themselves, and since this is an organization which personally belongs to the Minister of Agriculture, I would ask him to investigate as to why this is not a secret ballot. I feel reluctant to vote because I can be identified before the ballot is opened.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question that was asked on Friday by the Member for Inkster — who appears to have been busier than an xylophone player two bars behind — and this one dealt with hours of work for Hansard staff. I would like to advise the honourable member that in 1958, with the inauguration of Hansard, the hours of work were established at six hours work for eight hours pay, provided that employees relinquished their scheduled coffee and lunch breaks.

In 1976, Mr. Speaker, management committee of Cabinet, ordered that the hours of work be brought up to six and three-quarters hours by the Legislative Session of 1979, which is this year. But at no time, past or present, have Hansard staff been denied a break. Staff have been advised to take a short break between completion of the transcription of one tape and the start of another, and facilities are provided for their use.

For my honourable friend's benefit, I am going to table the Hansard Employment Guidelines so that he will have an opportunity to understand the conditions under which Hansard staff are operating, and I should like to tell him that the requirements in that office are somewhat different than ordinarily you would find in an office.

He also asked a question with respect to an employee who had been dismissed. All I can tell him, and all I'm going to tell him, is that that employee was dismissed for reasons other than that he indicated in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for the First Minister to have the Department of Labour investigate a group of employees who are required to work six and three-quarter hours continuously, without a legal break during the six and three-quarter hours.

I would also ask the Honourable the House Leader to advise me whether we, as Members of this Legislature who are the employers of that person, are going to permit that person to have a grievance as to whether they were justly or unjustly dismissed?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of breaks. Some of that staff come

to work at 9 o'clock in the evening, and I would advise my honourable friend that there are very few places in this building that breaks can be obtained, although there are facilities in the Hansard room, where the staff are encouraged — as I said earlier — to take a break between the completion of one tape and the beginning of another. At no time — again I repeat — at no time have they been denied that opportunity during the hours that they work, and they understand full-well, when they accept employment, what the circumstances of that employment are.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would once again ask the Minister, and we are the employers, all of us, whether it is satisfactory to have people being asked to sign this question, "I wish to relinquish my legal coffee and lunch breaks to achieve a shorter workday," whether that is satisfactory practice to the Department of Labour, if it is satisfactory practice to the Members of this Legislature, and it's not in my opinion.

I ask the honourable member a second question, will the person who he says was not dismissed for the reasons given, be given an opportunity to present a grievance with regard to her dismissal and if it is determined that she was improperly dismissed, that she will be entitled to reinstatement with loss of pay, which is the right of every employee in the Civil Service? Would he give her that right?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume, and I hesitate to answer that particular question because I think it more properly comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. I don't think that it would be proper for me to answer that, and I will refer it to the Minister of Labour to determine whether or not that is the case. But I again repeat that for the normal 8-hour day, these people only have to work six and one-half, or now six and three-quarters hours, because they do not take the three-quarter hour break that is provided for lunch and two 15-minute coffee breaks, which works up to the total of eight hours. Now, that's a condition that they accept, and again I repeat to my honourable friend, that's a condition that they accept when they accept this kind of employment. And my honourable friend should know, that employment in the Hansard office cannot be related to ordinary employment under normal hours during the day of any other employee. There is a special condition that exists there. My honourable friend — I would like him to tell me where they're going to have a lunch break between the hours of 9 or 3 o'clock in the morning, or whenever it is that they have completed their work.

Again I say they are allowed, indeed encouraged to take breaks between transcripts.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these particular employees are not covered by a collective agreement, are not represented by Manitoba Government Employees' Association, would the Minister see whether the Department of Labour endorses this practice, and would the Minister see to it that this girl, who claims that she was unjustly dismissed, gets an opportunity of having her grievance in the same way that a civic employee would have the right to do?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that we could continue on the rest of the afternoon — my honourable friend asking the question, and I answering it — but I don't intend to continue on. I have already answered my honourable friend, and I don't intend to continue to repeat myself.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question, in view of his non-reply to the Member for Ste. Rose.

Could the Minister, in view of the fact that the public is involved in financing the vote on the Cattle Producers' Association, could the Minister indicate whether he will use the auspices of the Manitoba Marketing Board to investigate the allegations made by the Member for Ste. Rose?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a private agency is being paid for handling this vote, could the Minister answer to the taxpayers of this province why The Manitoba Marketing Board was not used since they are already being funded by the Public Treasury to conduct this vote?

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Since Manitobans now have the dubious distinction of being North America's greatest consumers of the tranquillizer diazepam or valium, would the Minister be prepared to investigate what is clearly a case of over prescribing or drug abuse?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, those practices are continually reviewed both by the Drug Standards and Therapeutics Committee and the Health Services Commission and the Pharmacists' Association. If there are serious concerns of that nature, that the honourable member knows about, I certainly am prepared to refer them to bodies of that kind, but I think that would be the only initiative at this juncture that I could properly take.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that those views have been expressed, and I ask the Minister whether he would be prepared to establish a Central Pharmaceutical Record Depository in an attempt to catalogue both patient and doctor abuse in the use and prescribing of drugs?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend says that those positions have been presented, I would be very interested in having him apprise me of what he knows about that. I would like to know whether they have been presented to the Complaints Committee, for example, of The College of Physicians and Surgeons, and then I would be prepared to look into it further with him.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since this is related to the high cost of drugs, I would ask the Minister whether he has any other program to control drug costs other than raising the basic exemption of Pharmacare which will harm the aged, the ill and the needy?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the increase in the Pharmacare deductible will harm none of those groups referred to by my honourable friend. As he knows, those over Age 65 are excluded from the increase in the deductible.

Approximately one out of ten Manitobans files a Pharmacare claim in a given year, so you're dealing to begin with with 10 percent of the population. A large percentage of that are elderly so you're dealing with something substantially less than 10 percent of the population, persons like my honourable friend and myself who are capable of paying that increased deductible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last Monday I asked the Minister some questions in regard to the serious hardships that a dispute between the local government district of Consol and a local trailer court owner are having on trailer occupants in The Pas. I wonder if the Minister's had a chance to check into that situation as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm awaiting a report on that matter and will respond as quickly as I can.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he could give some direction or some indication to the tenants of that particular trailer court who are not sure whether to pay their rent to the local government district of Consol, to the trailer court owner, or to hold the rent, and people are taking all three of those options I assume with some legal responsibility to themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the final question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not the government's decision on the proposed new jail at The Pas will be given during his Estimates and, if not, when that decision will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to do that, I will try to do that. That isn't to suggest for a moment what that decision will be, but whatever it is I will try to do it and I'll be seeking the assistance of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Government Services, in that task.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways and it's with respect to his responsibilities as Minister responsible for the winter roads. Given that the winter roads are being closed today, which is at minimum a few days earlier than normal practice in previous years, I wonder if the Minister would instruct his department to continue the maintenance on the winter roads' system until such time as all the supplies are delivered to the communities that require this lifeline for their supply, the remote communities that have no other access other than very expensive Air transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice and give the honourable member a fuller answer tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health respecting the West-Bran Work Activity project in Brandon. Inasmuch as this is the second consecutive year in which a cut has been made in this project causing a reduction in both staff and trainees, can the Minister advise the House whether the rationale used is restraint in government spending or whether the Minister believes that it is better to have more people on Welfare than to give them a chance to work?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that perhaps he may want to rephrase his question as it tends to be argumentative.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if you wish — I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if he can give us the rationale for causing people to be out of work due to the cut in funding of the West-Bran Work Activity project in the City of Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the basic criterion for adjudicating the position of Work Activity projects is the level of participant turnover. As my honourable friend well knows, that if you don't have a high participant turnover the Work Activities project turns into a sheltered Workshop. Sheltered Workshops are not cost-shared by the federal government and, in fact, some of those Work Activity projects were taking on the cost of sheltered Workshops. West-Bran, in fact, had one of the better records and is not being reduced in scope to the same degree that some of the others are.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question then. Can the Honourable Minister advise whether the West-Bran Work Activity project will eventually be phased out as is now being feared by some people associated with that particular project?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been no decision to do that now or in the future. There's certainly no intention at this time to take that kind of action. This is a rationalization for the 1979-80 Budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for questions having expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with

the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Mines, Resources and Environment and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order, please. The Estimates of Highways and Transportation. We by-passed Resolution 73, Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects — \$68 million. 6(a) Regular Program \$56 million—pass—the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, the Minister gave us a little bit of a preliminary in the House when he introduced the program for this year in the last year's construction, finished or unfinished, I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of how much is left from last year uncompleted, or if everything is completed. Maybe he could give us a broader over-view in addition to the statement he made in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps just by way of some general comments, the Department of Highways and Transportation has to in order to carry out its designated program, commit considerably in excess of the voted authority. If you recall last year, my voted authority for new construction was some \$75 million in total. To offset the various factors that enter into high highway construction, difficulty in acquiring land in any given year, weather, breakdown by contractors, over the years the Department has found that — and we have authority from Treasury, this is not new, this has been carried on over the past decade — that we in effect commit on a formula of 1.6 in addition to the authorized amount. In other words, we lay out a program of, last year in the area of some \$118 million, recognizing that we have only \$75 million to spend. And that brings on the situation as you see in the program before you with a substantial carry-over program every year.

This program before you consists of some \$49 million of carry-over work, some \$15 million that, in order to even out the tendering process and the work process, we have again traditionally had the capability of pre-tendering, pre-advertising work and tendering. This year that accounted for some \$15 million, and in the new proposed projects to be undertaken in the year 79-80, or 79, some \$50 million, or more accurately \$49,888,000.00. That roughly is the breakdown of the total \$74 million to be spent; roughly speaking, \$49 million of estimated carry-over, \$49 million of new committed programs, and some \$15 million of preadvertising work. In addition to that of course, you have miscellaneous items such as bridges over our provincial road systems, some \$900,000 worth; general engineering work on our provincial trunk highway systems of \$600,000 worth; general engineering on our provincial road systems of \$400,000; the calcium program which is the dust control program — we expect to expend some \$700,000 in that area; Seal-coat Program, that's the program which we return and resurface the highway with a coating of asphalt surface treatment and then rechip; land acquisition is a kind of a standard amount, in this case it's \$600,000; and we have set aside an additional \$600,000 for traffic control and traffic related costs; for an additional total of \$4,400,000.00.

I can readily understand that when you start adding up these figures, they come well above and beyond the authorized limit that you see in the Estimate book, but that is the kind of commitment level that we have to undertake in order to spend the authorized moneys that we are now requesting from the Committee.

We have tried, if I can just conclude, to — in this year's program I recognize that there will be some areas that aren't completely happy with the program. I note the Honourable Member for Virден is busily writing his notes out. On occasions like this there are always two speeches that everybody has — a good one and a bad one — and I'm afraid I'm going to hear some bad ones, I hope that I'll hear some good ones. We have tried to spread the work out keeping several factors in mind, that we attempt to keep the industry reasonably busy in all its facets, that is that there is a reasonable amount of grading work; reasonable amount of earth-moving work; reasonable amount of asphalt paving work; a reasonable amount of concrete paving work involved in the program.

Geographically, we, of course, try to distribute the load as fairly as we can, consistent with the traffic patterns that are developing in different parts of the province. Northern Manitoba again

a very substantial amount of money, road building is expensive in the north. The major emphasis in northern Manitoba will be to carry out the commitment made last year by myself to the improving and the upgrading of Highway No. 391 to full provincial trunk highway status leading to Thompson.

In addition to that, you will note in a program major paving contracts will be let in the area of Easterville on the Easterville road, as well as on the Lynn Lake section, I believe. Now in addition to that, there are of course other individual projects contained, you know, in the program for the north.

As we move into the western part of the province, we carry on with our major commitment to the upgrading of No. 4 Highway to an alternate route to Trans Canada, leading through to Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I am pleased to announce that with that upgrading, we have now found it possible this year and we'll be announcing it more formally on Wednesday at the Yellowhead Route Association meeting here in Winnipeg. This particular Highway Association has worked long and diligently as many members will know for the promotion of the Yellowhead Route, and we are now in a position to change the numbering to be uniform with the other three western provinces. It'll be Route 16 throughout Western Canada and this program has, as it has in the past few years, dedicated several major contracts on that route.

The areas throughout the south and the western central part of Manitoba there's an increasing need, emphasis being placed on the improvement of our secondary roads. I call them secondary roads; in the country we call them our PR roads, Provincial roads; most people refer to them as our gravel roads. The changing traffic patterns, in some instances brought on by rail line abandonment, have singled out particular routes, such as Route No. 250, for attention. In general, what has happened this time in this program, for the first time more money is being spent on our secondary roads, on our PR systems, than on our Provincial Trunk Highways.

In the eastern portion of the province and in the Interlake we've carried on with the major interconnection of 235, I believe it is, through the Narrows. That's a difficult piece of road, an expensive piece of road to build, but we view that to be a major interconnecting route. It also has an enthusiastic Highway Association Group promoting that route as the northern woods and water route.

Carrying on to the eastern portion of Manitoba we carry on with our commitments to the U.S. border through Sprague, with major development work on the major Trunk Highway No. 12 in that region.

In and around the City of Winnipeg and in the more denser traffic conditions, of course the Budget reflects the major inputs on the four laning activities of No. 7, No. 8, No. 59 towards the Grand Beach area and continuing the started improvements on four laning of No. 12 from Steinbach to Trans-Canada.

I should point out one other feature of the program that several projects include paving, or commencement of paving, of roads that lead from this province to Saskatchewan. We are often under some pressure where the other jurisdictions, in this case Saskatchewan, has a paved road leading into our province; we have not. We have attempted to on several instances at border crossings begin that kind of work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I welcome the remarks, the criticisms and the advice of all members of the Committee, that I certainly would be prepared to undertake as good advice in the drafting of next year's program. I'm sure senior staff that is available will benefit from the advice so given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I'd just thank the Minister for his comments. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear in my mind of what has happened last year and what is the intended outlook for this year. I understood him to say that last year we had a carry-over of \$49 million. Under construction, partly completed or completed, I'm not sure just what is meant by carry-over and did I understand that there was \$15 million pre-tendering last year carry-over in addition to the \$49 million program for this year? So that would be \$49 million plus \$15 million or \$15 million in the \$49 million?

MR. ENNS: No, plus.

MR. ADAM: So we're talking about \$64 million. I remember distinctly last year when the Minister advised the Committee that in order to, he was using figures, not necessarily the accurate ones, but he suggested that if we wanted to build \$75 million worth of roads that we'd have to commit \$125 million. And, he has indicated now that last year we had committed \$118 million to do what

we had intended to do last year, which was \$49 million.

MR. ENNS: If I can just interject, Mr. Chairman, that \$118 million is this year's committed figure.

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister have the last year's committed figures?

MR. ENNS: About \$120 million.

MR. ADAM: It's a bit different, it even shows up more than what the Minister indicated last year when he said that if we wanted to build \$75 million worth of roads we'd have to commit \$125 million, and with \$120 million commitment we have managed to do \$49 million.

MR. ENNS: We managed to do \$75 million with the \$120 million commitment last year.

MR. ADAM: Last year. Well, you've given us a figure of \$49 million. What else was there besides that?

MR. ENNS: A new program. You haven't stopped on your arithmetic. Last year you had much the same breakdown, \$49 million, add another \$50 million for a new program, then you add that up. — (Interjection) —

MR. ADAM: Yes, with Northern Affairs program coming into the Highway program this year, then we're spending approximately the same amount roughly, \$73,100,000 as opposed to \$74,329,000 last year. The last year figure does not include Northern Affairs. With Northern Affairs' program in the total Budget this year, Construction Budget, could the Minister advise if Northern Affairs program was included last year; I don't think it was, but perhaps I stand to be corrected. Now, if the Northern Affairs program is in the right hand side of the figures in our Estimate books, how much is the Northern Affairs program, and if it is in there, would that not indicate that we are actually going to do less work that we did last year, with the two programs — the Northern Affairs and the . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I should perhaps correct the member. It is not Northern Affairs money, it's Westland Northland's Canada Agreement, which was shown in the Highway's Budget last year, recoverable from Canada through Northern Affairs.

MR. ADAM: Was there not other road construction apart from the Northland Agreement that from year-to-year has been done by Northern Affairs, that never was part of that agreement?

There was all kinds of construction going on all over the place that I believe was not part of the Northland Agreement. Who does that work now if it isn't the Highway Department?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I advise that you now find that work listed under 8(b) Winter Roads and others, also again recoverable from Canada, the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement which indicates some \$3.5 million under 8(c) and (d) of the Estimates.

I appreciate what the honourable member is referring to, and I think one of the hopeful results of the merging of the Transportation Division of Northern Affairs into Highways and Transportation is that we will bring all highway or road construction under the jurisdiction of one department, and we'll find it a little easier to make comparison as to work level and work activity undertaken in any given year.

MR. ADAM: Well, the work that's done by Northern Affairs is still shown separately in the Estimate books — it's over here under Transportation Services, right?

MR. ENNS: That's right.

MR. ADAM: Acquisition and construction of physical assets. Okay, we get that cleared up anyway.

The Minister mentioned about traffic patterns. Could the Minister advise if we are still pursuing that policy of taking traffic counts in all areas, is that still ongoing?

MR. ENNS: Very much so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Yes, Mr. Chairman. First, I haven't had time to look at the entire program, but I do see some of the things in it that I appreciate, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the first thing I would like to compliment my Minister on is that several weeks ago he put announcement in the weekly papers warning all and sundry of the road restrictions that will be coming in weeks ahead, and I think this is a real good idea. While many of the rural people can't haul grain, they do know it's coming, and it's so easy we have snow and then the next thing the restrictions are on, and so I do compliment him for that.

The other thing, coming in just this afternoon as you may recall, I mentioned drifting last Friday when we adjourned, and I was coming just between Elie and Bernard Siding or Bernard Elevator, I was closely followed by a Lincoln and a smaller car went past both of us, I believe in a 2-door Transam with some people in, and it went spinning around in front of us, but the thought that came to my mind at that second, if it hadn't been the shoulders that had some form of gravel on, he was able to grab himself — get out of our way — and that's what's often been happening. It is drifting out there, the question being, Mr. Chairman, what type of shoulders are we putting on our four-lanes? Are they different than our two-lanes, because I'm one that's always felt that gravel shoulder is much safer even though I realize passing and you touch that gravel — it does give your car a wriggle, — but still on icy conditions you do have something to dig for. As I came three or four miles closer to Winnipeg, it looked as though — I guess the wind had swept most of that top gravel off — it looked like not a hardtop but a very reasonably smooth base that again, had that spin around happened there, it could have been much different than it was, everyone slipped around everyone else and came out of it all right. So the thing is, are we going to continue putting shiny shoulders on our four lanes, because, Mr. Chairman, I don't really think it's necessary. There's a slightly different objective on two lanes, because continually you are going out there, but I still say gravel kept up near that same level is an awful lot safer because then if you do hit a skid, you've just nothing but that ditch to save you. I will stop there, if the Minister was going to reply, or I'll go on, whichever is the case?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy that the Honourable Member for Virden has brought up that particular point. It I suppose underlines a difference of opinion. Some of our urban cousins, particularly when they are travelling under more ideal road conditions as summer tourist trade, they press on the department to pave the shoulders, and certainly from an overall appearance, and perhaps even from a maintenance point of view, we would like to consider that. But in this province, with the number of roads that we still have to pave, we don't place priority on the paving of shoulders, we concur with the member's contention that it also is a safety factor in many months of our driving. The standard 10-foot gravel shoulder is being provided on our four lane highways, in direct answer to the honourable member. We are carrying on paving of shoulders where there is a soil stability problem, or where, as the member will know, for instance Trans Canada West from the point beyond Brandon where we have the single lane, we are doing some shoulder paving there. It facilitates a busy highway, and assists in the passing of vehicles sometimes, but there has been no change in the priorities of our shoulder treatment on our four lane highways as yet.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, then I'd like to continue on. I appreciate the continuation of the bridge construction on 259 just east of Virden. This is a main artery to get across the river to the heavy trucks, and while it will be probably later this summer, and that bridge you can barely get over with an empty truck or with very few bushels and it is certainly nice to see the work continuing this winter, and hopefully that will be completed later this year.

Another point, and I've brought it up many times, is Trans Canada No. 1. That very very troublesome stretch between Alexander roughly and Griswold. Now I go up town and I see somebody that's a cripple on that thing, and I see another farmer who has lost a daughter there, I saw a good supporter of mine, and the Deputy could remind us of the family that was wiped out from Maryfield that were related there, and another one was a burn job — they were months identifying the person, and it's just because there's just two lane, there's a lot of curves, there's ups and downs, you are along side the railroad track, and with the wind in the south it whirls around.

Just to bring the Minister right up to date, Mr. Chairman, a very fine businessman from Lenore, a man who never charged if you couldn't pay for things — he never asked anybody for anything — was killed there last Thursday or Friday. He was buried today. And it just seemed to me we're quite a few miles from that chunk of trouble on No. 1 Highway, but surely, and the other Ministers have taken note of it, Mr. Chairman, but really — and I remember it's on the record how many

deaths per mile on that particular stretch, I believe it was three years ago, I read that into the record. It's hard for us to understand, and I know it's very easy to say, \$1 million a life, but on that particular chunk surely, Mr. Chairman, the Department's got to look quicker at that and rectify it. I'm sure the Minister has been over it many times, yet again, he referred to his urban friends, you don't know about that till a stormy day, as last Thursday and Friday was, as far as we know there were two semi-trailers going east and a smaller car meeting, and possibly what happened the suction of one, or rather, it was drifting or icy and it sucked the car in between the two and there he was, a jack-knife. There was only one death, the lady has two broken legs and the other young person has to remove the spleen.

But that chunk of road, I could just go on and I've got a list of the people that I personally know. Surely, Mr. Minister, if I have to lose some PR roads, or some black topping in lieu — and I might say, Mr. Chairman, this part of No. 1 is not in my constituency, but I just say it, in almost every storm, well, who's going to get it, is it the stranger, and there's many that I don't recall. But the ones that come right to your home as Mr. Terry Carter, who was buried this afternoon, is just one of that long list of local people. So I think I would stop there for the moment anyway. That's the pros and cons I don't know whether I lost or made a vote yet out of this green paper, but I hope I at least have broken even. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to indicate to the Minister my regrets for not being able to be here Thursday and Friday, the weather conditions in this Province negated my being here because of the snowdrifts on the roads in my area. — (Interjection) — No, today as a matter of fact was another good day in the Northern Interlake. I wanted to ask several specific questions in terms of — I think the Minister indicated the amount of money that there was on the carry-over was \$49 million — could he indicate how much work does the Department anticipate will be done on the carry-over program because since there's a sizable amount of the program that is carried over, how much of that is going to be able to be done this coming year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the answer is, as much as possible. One of the reasons why it is carry-over are the three factors. No 1: The practice of the Department to over-commit in any construction year, and we know that some of the programs that we're putting on this year's construction program will form next year's carry-over. Then No 2, and it is a real and I might say an increasing problem. Nobody likes the heavy hand of government taking away their land, expropriating their land. The business of acquisition of land is becoming harder, not easier.

We feel that we are, through the offices of the Land Value Appraisal Commission and the Land Acquisition Board, which I might point out, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Government Services, not the Department of Highways, it is an extremely busy Department trying to acquire land. And the reluctance, I suppose, on the one hand, of the Department to proceed in what might be construed as a kind of a roughshod manner over individual landowners rights, often pushes a program back into a carry-over program or unforeseen engineering difficulties that may crop on a given piece of road. But certainly it is the intention of the Department to carry on, on a priority basis, with the carry-over work to the largest extent possible. I cannot and I don't think any Highways Minister can categorically state that every "i" will be dotted and every "t" will be crossed in any given program that he submits to the members.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicates that land is one of the problem areas, and I would have to concur with him that there are, from time to time, problems in the purchase of land. There have been, and the Minister is aware, several projects that have been carried over that have been on the program as just that, acquisition of right-of-way. Has the Department had problems with the Land Acquisition Branch in purchasing the land, or how is the work detailed out by the Department, and I'll give you a prime example right within the program. PR 417, as an example, has been on the program now for over, I think this is the third year for acquisition of right-of-way as a PR. It is still on the program. I'm assuming that we have not purchased the land as yet. Could the Minister indicate at what stage that would be in, or how does the process carry on in terms of what the government announces vis-a-vis, what it actually does specifically in terms of land acquisition?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just very briefly go through the three major steps that the Department undertakes with respect to the process of upgrading a piece of road, and I must

indicate to the honourable members that they are all three individual decisions made at each Budget-setting time.

The first one being the decision to survey, do the necessary survey and design work required for a particular upgrading of a road or building of a new road. That is precisely what it means; that is we set aside relatively small sums of money, usually \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 to do the survey and design work. It then enables the Department to have a backlog of work on which this work has already been done.

The next step is the physical acquisition of land. And for that step more substantial amounts of money have to be set aside because you are actually acquiring land. It then follows, the next decision, and again it is a separate decision, is will the actual upgrading, that is the grade work, the gravelling, the shoulder work or whatever is called for, be undertaken? And I suppose the third step would be, if that kind of road ever warrants it, final topping with a hard surface treatment of some kind.

So that when you see a program with the notation "Survey and Design" or "Land Acquisition" repeated in a program several years running, that merely indicates that that activity is taking place. You will appreciate that the Design and the Acquisition sections of the Department, have to work well in advance of the Construction section of the Department. And the District Engineers in every district will forward to the Department, prior to program-setting month, roads that they believe need this kind of attention. This, of course, is supplemented by members contribution, by individual residents and/or RMs and other interested organizations. But we attempt to build up, for the department to be able to mount a construction program of this size, we have to have a backlog of this prior work done. That's the explanation that I can give for the manner and way in which these appear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his explanation. I am hoping that in his remarks there is the implicit hope that whatever is on the carry-over program will be systematically handled and done in an order and manner, weather permitting and the like, and the program will be done. That's what I am deducing from his comments and I hope that I am accurate in that deduction.

I have some comments I would like to make specifically with respect to the Minister and the department's consideration in future months and years in my own area as well as the area of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet who was not able to be here during the Estimate process, and I wanted to make some comments. I want to, like the Member for Virden, give the plaudits I presume that are first, I am pleased that the department sees fit to continue with the reconstruction and upgrading of PR 235 to The Narrows. There's no doubt that that road as a major link between the Interlake and Westman region and of course, areas northward, has been very vital and in terms of truck transportation as well as tourist traffic, and it will be certainly well welcomed by all the people in the area that work will continue and this road will ultimately be restored back to a dust-free situation, whatever the capping will be.

I am hopeful the department will be able to, this year, do the work on the old program of completing the work now that PR 326 is completed, that the work on PR 226 from PTH 68 north could be done. There is a very historic curve in the road as well as a bend in the Icelandic River and historically there have been a lot of Icelanders and a lot of other nationalities that have ended up in this river, in this bend of the road. I'm hoping that the department will see fit in completing this project in this construction year, as part of its carry-over program. It has created a lot of problems historically and I'm hoping that they will be able to do it.

The department, in its carry-over program had work for purchase of right-of-way on PR 234, north of Riverton towards the community of Pine Dock. I am hoping that there will be work carried on and ultimately some upgrading will be done on this road to facilitate the people in that northern region, as well as the people travelling to resort communities of Beaver Creek and other areas along Lake Winnipeg.

In my comments, I'm sort of going through the northern interlake, from east to west, not necessarily in direct priority of the project but as a general progression of direction in terms of the roads, that I'm hoping that the Minister ultimately would consider as an Interlaker, and look at the Interlake region in relationship to the rest of the province in terms of the road network that requires to be upgraded.

I'm hoping that the department will consider, in the LGD of Fisher, the work on a main market road, which ultimately should become the extension of PR 233, west and north of Fisher Branch, that would join up with Provincial Road 325. There has been some upgrading done, but there hasn't been upgrading done in the last several years, but of late no major work has been undertaken,

and I hope the department would consider that, as I believe it is a natural extension of PR 233 which would service the community of Fisher Branch and the outlining districts of Fisherton and join up 235, to 325, that road that comes from Ashern.

PR 329 from Riverton through to Fisher Branch is a road that is, as a regional road, as the Minister has indicated that his priorities are in terms of upgrading regional roads, is very widely used and especially the western portions of this road require major upgrading, but the entire road really should be reviewed and upgraded to standards where ultimately, at some point in the future, dust preventative measures can be undertaken in a dust-free surface.

The road that I originally mentioned, PR 417 west of Eriksdale, or west of PTH 6, the road that I made specific mention as being part of the carry-over for right of way purchase, this has been on the books for several years. I am hoping that the department can pressure, if that's where the pressure is required, the Land Acquisition Branch to complete their purchase of right of way on this road, as it is a major link for the residents west of Eriksdale as well as the residents of the Dog Creek Indian Reservation.

I know that there have been discussions as well with the Reserve to upgrade the south of PR 235 into the reserve business section under the previous policy of cost-sharing with the reserves as it would relate to any other community within the province in terms of 50-50 work inside, as an access road from a business section to a main PR or PTH. I'm wondering where those discussions have ended, as there have been no indications whether any construction or any cost-sharing will be undertaken by the department and the band of the Dog Creek Indian Reserve.

There has been much discussion in my area by the community of Ashern and the communities north of Moosehorn and Gypsumville, the farmers that use PR 325 and travel to the auction marts in the Dauphin, Ste. Rose area. The connecting link of 325 has been upgraded, it still requires dust-free surfacing and I would assume that unless there is some change in the design that is required for further upgrading, I'd like the Minister to consider that for future priorities.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated to me and wished to place on the record, several projects for the consideration of the Minister and his department, and that is dealing with Highway 44 from 59 to No. 12 at Beausejour, that the department consider, in their upgrading program and review, and in light of all the commuter traffic in towards the city of Winnipeg, the possibility of twinning Highway 44 at this point, from 59 east to No. 12.

As well, I think he would be pleased to note, because in his remarks he left me, that there have been some pretty rough sections on Highway 11 from 44 to Lac du Bonnet, and this is on the program and I'm sure that he would want to indicate his satisfaction with that road being on the program this year, because it has created some difficulties in that area. The Garven Avenue to Hazelridge, they're rebuilding and dust-free surfacing — I believe that's PR 213 — should be considered in terms of the amount of traffic that travels into that area; as well the road that goes from the north of Garven Road to the Church Grotto at Cook's Creek should be considered along with the reconstruction of Garven Road to Hazelridge, in light of all the traffic and the residential development in that area.

PR 212 north of Highway 44 and back to Highway 59, as well requires rebuilding in that region. The Member for Lac du Bonnet wished that to be placed on the record for the department's consideration. I'm sorry that some of my colleagues are impatient with my remarks. There are two members' concerns that are being mentioned here. I'm as well wondering, at what stage negotiations or discussions have been undertaken between the provincial government and the Jackhead Road through Lake St. George and Red Rose area. There always, perennially, seems to be a pass the buck situation as to who is going to maintain the road and what work is going to be done at whose expense. Could the Minister bring us up-to-date as to what has transpired in the last year and a half with respect to the jurisdiction and/or any future upgrading on this widely used — especially by tourist traffic — and of course the community of Jackhead which requires, I believe an all-weather road because that is the only link that they have with the rest of the province, is through the St. George Lake road and its jurisdiction has been up in the air for quite some time?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I hope the honourable member appreciates that between him and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, he's added about \$50 million to my Highways program. I don't object to it, except that I haven't got the money. I appreciate the member's remarks. I think that on several of the particular items that he is referring to, he is aware that work will be proceeding, specifically 235, 226, we hope that we can carry on work on some of the other roads that he's mentioned. The matters that he specifically raises with respect to the community serviced by 417 and the reserve, the interconnecting stretch, there is a difficulty that has been there for some time in terms of acquisition of right-of-way, it's a little different in that sense. We have difficulty at this moment, under our current policy, in terms of justifying a PR road designation into and onto reserve land. We essentially take the view that the Crown has to own the land that it builds public roadways

on.

The question that he raises with the Jackhead-St. George road, the same status prevails, we're looking for somebody to pick up 50 percent, I suppose. However, that matter is under review and if the criteria of the road can be advanced to look at it to come under a provincial road status, that would change that formula.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Two specific questions with respect to the Minister's remarks. The Minister is prepared, I'd like to ask him, are you prepared to deal with either of the reserves and the land intertwining, either Dog Creek or Jackhead, to construct or prepare to construct, or consider to construct a PR road that is numbered or an interconnecting road, if the right-of-way question is resolved in favour of the province? Is that the position of the province?

MR. ENNS: I would have to indicate that that is the major stumbling block at this time, subject to budgetary questions, we'd resolve the next step, but the block at this time is the question of right-of-way.

MR. URUSKI: And as well, the Minister, with respect to the Lake St. George- Jackhead road, is there any confirmation by the federal government on behalf of the people of Jackhead that they will cost-share at least a portion of that road, or what is the position of the federal government in this case?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that at this time the federal government has taken a negative position with respect to any cost-sharing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, yes, I would like to, first of all say how pleased I am to see that the Minister was able to see fit to commence with the upgrading and gravelling on 242 from Trans-Canada Highway south to 461 and we hope that it is his plan to continue on further south in the near future. As he is quite aware, the condition of that road gets quite deplorable at times, and just the fact that we will be able to make this announcement, I know is going to relieve a lot of pressure on me from the farmers in the south-west of my part of the constituency. Further, it's going to certainly improve the situation when it comes to allowing the farmers to market their product and get it to the proper destination.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to question, if I may, the Minister on his future plans of the previous projects for Manitoba. I notice one here, 1.(a) Railroad crossing west of Portage la Prairie, east of west terminal by-pass. You have, or are in the middle of acquisition of right of way. I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate to me and to my constituents who are concerned ject. what stage he is at with that particular pro

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member is aware that we have entered into some time ago with the city of Portage la Prairie and the RM of Portage in a traffic study cost shared by all three jurisdictions that hopefully will provide us with some of the answers in and about Portage la Prairie. Some of them have been thrust upon us by the event of the substantial industrial and truck traffic that we expect from the new McCain potato plant regrettably positioned in the wrong place from a Highways point of view, but nonetheless, one that the Department and the other jurisdictions mentioned are addressing themselves to. Acquisition of right-of-way . at this point is I suppose more the matter of protecting and giving ourselves every option to such time as when construction can actually proceed.

MR. HYDE: To continue on, if I may, for just a moment to broadly bring it to your attention, very likely you are aware of it, but with the opening of that new shopping mall, Portage Mall, later on this week, they are anticipating a tremendous amount of traffic from the city crossing the railroad crossing at that point. We are faced with the funnelling of traffic into that immediate area with a very narrow road service and I'm wondering if there is any consideration on your part to possibly widening that mile to give us some relief there, sort of a passing lane if we may refer to it as such because I can foresee that we're going to have trouble there with the traffic coming from and to that area.

MR. ENNS: The Department advises that we're well aware of the subject matter whereof he speaks

and that we might well have to look at some separation and widening of the facility at that point. I might point out that for these reasons of course the Planning Division of the Department of Highways is sometimes criticized when these projects in their planning stage are sometimes held up because of the very concerns that the Member for Portage refers. We can foresee the difficulties traffic-wise that can occur when major development takes place in a certain area. We can foresee also the dollar signs attached sometimes to the correction of those problems. I can only assure the Honourable Member that the Department of Highways will do everything it can to assist the growth and development in that fair and wonderful city of Portage la Prairie from which the member hails and represents and will do our utmost to look after their needs.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for these fine words if he's referring to our fair city of Portage la Prairie. I'll just pass that on to the Mayor and Reeve of our fair city. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister some questions about the fair and wonderful town of The Pas and the fair and wonderful constituency of The Pas. I guess my first question is, "How come all the MLAs are so nice to the Minister of Highways?" I can't quite understand that. They're not as nice to all the other Ministers as they are to the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Chairman, I don't wish the Minister to respond because I'm not going to be here this evening. I'm going to have to talk fast as it is to get all my questions in. First of all, Mr. Chairman, on page 23 Highway 327, 28 miles of grade re-shaping base and asphalt and surface treatment. I thank the Minister that that item is included in there. A number of years ago I fought to have that whole section treated at the same time that the Highway was built as part of the highway project.

One concern I have, Mr. Chairman, in relation to a number of roads and a number of highways is the fact that a number of them are not yet designated. This isn't clear to me and maybe the Minister at a future time could answer me on this, as to why for example the highway connecting No. 10 and No. 6 is not designated where it's been newly constructed, why the road to Cormorant is not a designated road. These roads were built through the Department of Highways, but the Cormorant road with The Pas Special Area Agreement funding and the other roads, a number of Northern roads with the Manitoba Northlands funding, and I've never been able to understand why the Department of Highways has been unwilling to designate them. Certainly some of those highways are in better shape than some of the other ones that are designated. They are better roads, better highways than some of the presently designated highways right in my own constituency, I can see that for a case, so it's really unclear to me why that doesn't take place.

The other item that's missing here, Mr. Chairman, that I can't seem to find is any further work on the Moose Lake Road. It is my understanding from discussions with Highways people at The Pas that in fact that road will not be an all-weather road unless there is gravel this year, and that whenever it rains in spring, that it will not be a passable road. I wonder if the Minister could check into that and see if there's been some oversight as they drew up these budgets. Which then makes me ask, Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming that these undesignated highways that are built under the Northlands Agreement show up in here the same way as all the other highways. They're listed as a regular project, or are they listed somewhere else under a separate section of the budget and can we anticipate another \$6 million of construction for this year on another list somewhere? Maybe the Minister could briefly answer that question before I go on.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would be correct to say that you can anticipate another \$6 million in some other department's estimates. It is fair to say though, that you can anticipate some additional moneys that are specifically within the jurisdiction of Northern Affairs, usually of a smaller nature, inter-community work. I believe that there is one specific road that Northern Affairs will be contacting us about of some substance between the Cross Lake . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — MINES, NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 68 in the main Estimates. Resolution No. 88. Mines, Natural Resources and Environment. Clause 8. Fisheries and

Wildlife. We are on Item (a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, last day when we were discussing this section I had indicated that most of the questions that I would be addressing myself to would be asked in this section relating to the overall responsibilities under Fisheries and Wildlife. I have a few more specific questions to ask in this regard.

Following up on the Fisheries Management, I wonder if the Minister has been able to determine since the last day we discussed this whether or not his department is assisting in any way to re-establish the fishery in the Island Lake area and, if so, what type of assistance will his department be giving to the fishermen in that area to make sure that their fishery operates during the open water season?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate what type of consultation process his department is using with respect to the establishment of regulations on Lake Winnipeg. And, I can refer to one specific case in order that he may reply in a specific way. I had requested some two or three weeks ago that his department meet with the fishermen in the Poplar River, Big Black River to determine what their desires are with respect to the spring fishing season to see if the fishery could not be organized in a way in which would fit their needs and desires. I believe one of the concepts they want to discuss is the concept of individual quotas for people in that area.

I wonder if he can assure this side of the House that his department will be following up on that kind of a consultation process and will be meeting with the fishermen in that area to discuss that issue along with other concerns that they have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I've referred that matter to my departmental officials for a follow-up.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister assure the people of the Poplar River, Big Black River area that his officials will be meeting with them, or has he simply asked his department for advice on this matter? Can he assure these people that he has instructed his departmental officials to have such a meeting at the request of the fishermen?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, my departmental officials are arranging to meet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: I thank the Minister for his answer on that. In the general area of fisheries' management I wonder if the Minister can indicate if his department is considering any changes in the way in which the Lake Winnipeg fishery has been managed with respect to the quota system that has been established and also with respect to the licensing system that has been established. Is the Minister considering any changes in that system?

MR. RANSOM: I believe I advised the honourable member last week, Mr. Chairman, that there had been no changes made to this point but that policies, licensing and quota policies, were under active consideration and that I had assured the honourable member that there would be consultation and discussion before any precipitous action was taken.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, by consultation can the Minister assure the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg that he will be meeting with their representatives at the community level to discuss any proposed changes before his department makes any of the changes that they may be considering? And, I ask him this because I know there are some very vocal groups that no doubt have already met with him in his office and may be giving him one story of what the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg want but it may not be what the majority of fishermen on Lake Winnipeg desire. So, Mr. Chairman, can he assure this Legislature that he will be making it possible for all fishermen or a majority of fishermen on Lake Winnipeg to be consulted before any changes are made?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I expect that we will have adequate consultation, communication.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has an answer to the question that I raised on Friday with respect to the expiry dates of the fishing licenses and the overlapping with the spawning period.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I have some information here, Mr. Chairman, which has just been handed to me. I'll have to review it and attempt to respond to the question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the Minister about when I was up north on the weekend. I heard a rumour of the closing of Cedar Lake and I wonder if the Minister could let me know if that is correct. If Cedar Lake has been closed to commercial fishing and if so, what the reason is for that decision.

MR. RANSOM: I'm advised that they have reached the quota there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the way in which I heard this was that there was in fact a delegation containing a person I was trying to get a hold of on the weekend that they'd come to Winnipeg to try and meet with the Minister or with departmental officials in regard to the— I would assume in this case then — the extension of quota. I wonder if such a meeting took place and what answer was given to the fishermen.

MR. RANSOM: Well, there is a meeting, I believe, scheduled for tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, to discuss with the people, that question.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just clarify a little bit further for my information, was the quota the same or are they talking about changing quotas in terms of seasons, or what basically will the fishermen be asking for, if he is aware of that, yet?

MR. RANSOM: Well, my understanding is, Mr. Chairman, that the department was recommending that a 75,000 pound increase in the quota which would allow a short extension of the time involved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not clear now. If the fishermen in the community of Easterville that fish Cedar Lake are asking for an extension of the quota or an increase in the quota and departmental officials are recommending to the Minister that such an increase in the quota be granted. Is that a correct understanding?

MR. RANSOM: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that they have been given the 75,000 pound increase in the quota and that that has been reached also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)—pass; the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could fill me in on the situation of the Saskatchewan River fishermen at The Pas and their concern with the department and certain regulations that have been enforced recently with the department, if he could enlighten me as to what departmental decisions have been made in that regard.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps the honourable member would be just a little bit more specific with his question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan River fishermen did write to the Minister within

recent months and I believe that one of the main concerns was with quota, with net sizes, and with restrictions of certain areas for fishing. I wonder what decisions the department has made on those matters.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'm advised Mr. Chairman, that there's local consultation taking place at this time before any changes or any decisions are made one way or another.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could update me in terms of the figures and it might take a moment for his officials to get that, of the fish taken by the Moose Lake fishermen in Moose Lake, whether the fish population or the fish catch is continuing to decline in that lake and if there's been any changes made in terms of season. And while he's at it, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if he could also include in that a report on the Williams Lake fishery last fall, and if the normal quota was caught in that particular lake by Moose Lake fishermen.

MR. RANSOM: I'd be happy to get that information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could also bring me up to date on the situation of the Grand Rapids fishermen. There were certain line changes made two years ago which allowed the fishermen to fish further out into the lake than they had in the past. I wonder if that situation is working out, whether that has still remained the same, or whether it's been a problem of some disagreement between the southern, or the large white boat fishermen and the Grand Rapids, the local fishermen at Grand Rapids, which use a smaller craft for fishing. And also, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could inform us how the fishery went at the Gull Bay area and whether a sufficient quota was taken in that region to make it worthwhile to keep that fishery open, or whether in fact the fishing wasn't as good as the fishermen anticipated, and whether or not they will be fishing there again.

MR. RANSOM: I'd be happy to get those details and respond at the same time as the other question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the other question that I would like to get some further information on is the problem that was occurring at the mouth of the Dauphin River with the Dauphin River fishermen, and the conflict there between the amount taken by sportsmen, the number of fish being taken by sports fishermen in that region, and the amount of fish being taken by the commercial fishermen in that region. And whether they've been able to extend the area of fishing for Dauphin River, and what is the present situation of the fishermen there. Have some fishermen had to leave the fishery because of the limited quota, or has that area been able to maintain the same number of fishermen as it did in the past?

MR. RANSOM: I'm not immediately familiar with that situation either, Mr. Chairman, but I will get the answers to those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I still have a number of questions in the area of fisheries. I'd like to get an idea from the Minister, for example, what his ideas are with respect to the commercial versus the sport fishery, if there are conflicts in those areas such as occur from time to time, particularly in the northern lakes, where many of the local people wish to have a commercial fishery on a lake and this tends to conflict with existing or proposed lodge owners in the area who wish to maintain the highest quality of sport fishery on the lake. Has he had any attempt made in his department to investigate this, to come up with any policy recommendations on how to deal with this issue when it arises in various locations.

MR. RANSOM: That's a policy question that we are addressing, Mr. Chairman. We haven't arrived at a final approach to it so we haven't been involved in actually working out any solutions to specific problems. But I have made some statements with respect to allocation, saying that in principle, it would be desirable to be able to allocate the stocks of fish to a particular use for a substantial period of time, so that anyone, be it a commercial fisherman or a lodge operator, would be in a position of knowing that when they made an investment, that they could be assured of an amount of stock being allocated to that particular use. That is in theory what I would like to see accomplished. I know in many cases the practicalities of working that out will be difficult, particularly in situations where perhaps there has been an over-allocation of resources that has already taken place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what direction this Minister has taken in regard to the allocation of the fisheries resources in relation to the Minister of Tourism. What seemed to be a possible way of helping to resolve what I would say was a conflict of interests of various groups, that is the commercial fishermen who depend upon the fisheries for their livelihood and have so for many, many years, and the increasing sports fishing and tourist trade in sports fishing.

One way that was talked about with the communities was to increase the number of local people that may have been commercial fishermen, or were commercial fishermen, to involve more local people in the tourist industry, and Mr. Chairman, that has happened in a number of communities where the same people who are in the commercial fishery are also tourist operators or guides, or operating tourist camps of their own, so that they are able to make full use of that local resource for their community. Mr. Chairman, knowing the direction that the previous Minister of Tourism was moving in, and not being aware of the direction of the present Minister of Tourism, where the efforts seem to be to try and bring in, as quickly as possible by whatever means possible, outside developers to develop the tourist industry, especially in northern Manitoba and whether the Minister is pursuing any particular path in trying to make sure that where the community is a community with a number of commercial fishermen, where the fish population is such that it would be a strain to try and provide the full commercial fishing and full sports fishing, whether the Minister is pursuing a path of some way to assist local fishermen, local people in the local community where the resource is situated, to in fact get into the tourist business. Or whether that particular approach has been abandoned by the government and whether they are now pursuing a path to bring in outside people to develop resources that should be developed by the local community.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the important thing, or one of the important things is that the development, the use of the resource, be able to take place. I don't really think it's a question of bringing somebody in from the outside, or having somebody locally do it. I think it's a matter that if there is not the initiative, or whatever is required to see the development take place by local interests, then we must look beyond that and where there are existing interests, then certainly I think it has to be very high, you have to give a very high priority to the protection of the present interests that people have in the resources.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I think this particular Minister, if not some of his colleagues, is probably aware of the situation, or has at least a basic understanding of the situation in a number of the fishing communities, where in fact the initiative is there, because people have been commercial fishing for a long time and making their living from commercial fishing. But the initiative has to be assisted in terms of moving into a new venture. That is, there has to be technical and financial assistance given to people in local communities, if in fact they are going to take advantage of the local resource, in this case the fish resource, to develop tourism. Certainly his colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs has cut any such programs that would assist the local people to take their initiative and use that for their own benefit. Because of that, that increases my concern that the attitude of some of his colleagues of "Development at any cost," especially the attitude of letting outside people come in with fairly large developments may in fact be what is going to take place, and I think it will take place unless the Minister is able to convince his colleagues that there must be some assistance to local people if they are going to use the resources fully, if they are going to not only do commercial fishing but also do the tourist development in their particular community. I would like to get the Minister's direction on that matter - what direction is he going to pursue, because if he doesn't do one, the other is going to happen. So I would like to get the Minister to clarify what direction he intends to move.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Sports.

HON. ROBERT BANMAN(La Verendrye): Thank you Mr. Chairman. I don't know exactly what the Member is referring to when he's talking about outside influence, but let me say that I was one of the few people that got in the car, drove up through the area along 391 through Waboden, through the different areas, with an idea of looking at the different park facilities that we have available for the tourist development, and I did that this past summer.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the problems that we face if we're going to develop some of the sport fishing industry in northern Manitoba is a lack of facilities. And when you sit down and talk to the Council of Lynn Lake you realize that there is a shortage of facilities. People are coming in from the States, and I know there is a certain amount of concern by northerners that

they're coming in totally self-contained. One of the problems we have is that we have not told them that, hey, there is a town like Lynn Lake up there that can look after some of your needs. So what we have started — and I know the new Minister of Tourism as well as the Minister in charge of Northern Affairs will be using some of that Northlands' money to try and develop some sites in conjunction with the local municipalities to develop an area where people can park and have electrical plug-ins, can have some dumping stations, and can get some of the amenities of life which might not have been available to them up there till this time; such things as being able to stop in at Lynn Lake and being able to stock up on groceries, on gasoline, and that type of thing.

So, No. 1, there is a problem we have that we have to make people aware of what we've got up in northern Manitoba. And No. 2 is, number two have to tap the people up there who are anxious to work with it; people in Lynn Lake are very anxious to get something going as far as tourism is concerned. The other thing we have to tell people is that it doesn't cost an arm and a leg to go up there. You can get into some of these areas, some of the local people will fly you into a remote lake, it's a fifteen minute or half-hour hop and they'll be able to get some of the best sports angling in all of North America without having to pay \$1,000, \$2,000.00.

So I just want to tell the members on that side of the House that the government is looking at these different things. We hope to be employing some of the Northlands' money for that, some of the tourism development money, so that an orderly system in conjunction with the people up there and an orderly system of tourist development can happen.

Now I know there's a certain faction up north. . . . When I was up there on several different occasions some people expressed concern that they were not exactly interested in seeing all these people coming from the south and taking advantage of raping the north as far as tourism is concerned. But I think it has to be pointed out that if it's done properly in consultation with the people up there, that the majority . . . I found that the majority of people are interested to see some kind of orderly development, because if they don't have that, they're totally dependent on the two resources, namely the pulp and paper and the mining, and would like to see a town like Lynn Lake, would desperately like to see some more tourists come through there in the summer months.

So I would like to say that there are people on this side of the House such as myself who have travelled through these areas with a car, with an eye on what the tourists are faced with. There is a desperate need for certain facilities. As I mentioned, there wasn't any electrical hook-up from here. I think, when you started up, Grand Rapids was the last place — you could go all the way through to Leaf Rapids and there's not one place where anybody can plug in. I think the secret to seeing these things work properly is to do it with a joint sort of approach with the local Councils, with the local peoples that are involved up there. So I don't think that the Member can get up and say that we're looking at all kinds of outside big interests. If you'll talk to the Councils up there — we've talked to them, we've approached them; we're not trying to bring anybody from the outside in to take that over. It's a matter of sitting down and talking with these people. It's a matter of promoting the north to Manitobans, to tell them that yes, you can go up there, there's some tremendous angling, and as I said before, at a very relatively low cost. And I think that will enhance some of the new opportunities for native people for guiding and involvement in the different segments, in the field of being directly involved with fishing or some of the spinoff industries that will occur.

So it's a matter of public awareness that there is something north. Many Americans aren't aware that there is something north of Winnipeg and it's a matter of educating them and telling them that we do have some of the loveliest facilities as far as canoeing and all kinds of other things north of Winnipeg and developing that untapped resource.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I was slow in getting up; I thought maybe the Minister responsible for Fisheries would like to respond. The Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport who was formerly the Minister of Tourism has given his thoughts on the subject matter I raised. One thing I wasn't quite clear on about his comments was, Mr. Chairman, there are people in the larger communities in Lynn Lake and Thompson that do have the experience, do have the knowledge and can raise the funds to get into the tourist business.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is that somehow the people in the remote communities, the mostly native communities, the Indian-Metis communities will get bypassed unless a special effort is made to assist them to get into the tourist business. So I'm thinking of places like Dauphin River, Norway House, Moose Lake, Easterville, Cormorant, those kind of communities where there is a commercial fishery and where there is a sports fishery.

The Minister who just spoke mentioned the native people guiding. Chairman, I think that there is that option. If outside people come in and develop the tourist industry there are a few jobs available to local people. What I had in mind, Mr. Chairman, is the direction that is being moved in by both

the Provincial and Federal governments previously. That is, to assist the people right in these local communities to develop their own resources, to develop their own businesses. For example, I don't know if the Minister of Tourism had the chance to get into Dauphin River and talk to the native people there running their own tourist camp. We had a chance to get into Norway House and talk with the native people there running their lodge operation, but that kind of development does not just happen. That kind of development has to be encouraged because people have not had the experience yet to move into that particular area. So if we want to get away from just having the native people be guiding, then there has to be a special effort to make sure that they become the owners and managers of tourist development in northern Manitoba, and if there is not a special effort made to assist them to become the owners and managers then it will not take place, Mr. Chairman, it just won't happen.

And what is very discouraging to those of us who are familiar with what's happening in the North, is the fact that programs that have assisted them in the past to get into business and economic development of their own, have been eliminated. And, I wish that the Minister of Amateur Sport and the Minister of Resources would have convinced their colleagues that in fact some of those programs to assist with this type of development should not have been done away with, that both the technical assistance, the advisory assistance and the financial assistance be maintained. I wish they had prevailed upon their colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs, who is more than anxious to cut programs in northern Manitoba to the detriment of the people in northern Manitoba, that they would have prevailed upon him to keep some of these programs in place.

I'm somewhat encouraged by the remarks of the Minister of Amateur Sport and perhaps together with his colleague, the Minister of Resources, if they understand the situation that if they don't make a special effort the people in the local communities will probably be bypassed. It's happened all the time before. So, unless there's some special input they'll probably be bypassed and maybe together they can prevail upon their colleagues to provide that special assistance now, at the time when the tourist industry is still expanding and where a few native people have been able to get into the tourist industry but there are still lots of opportunity, that they don't get bypassed and that opportunity is taken by somebody else leaving the local community out except on some of the jobs working for somebody from outside who is developing the tourist business in their particular community. So, I would hope those two ministers would keep that in mind and prevail upon their colleagues to move in that direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Sports.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the problems we have in the development of any tourist industry in the province is a tremendously short season. It requires a fairly large amount of capital investment and then we've got this awfully short season. The other problem that we've had in the developing of the tourist industry is, I guess when we're dealing with CEDF, you might say, once bitten, twice shy. We took a real bath on the Thunderbird Lodge episode which was a fairly costly venture, not only to the Province of Manitoba, but to the two agencies that were involved on the federal level. So, you have a few of those things happening and people are very reluctant and want to make sure that they go in the right path so that you don't have a repeat performance of that.

I can assure the member that the Communities Economic Development Fund is looking at different proposals when somebody comes in with one involving special ARDA and the CEDF and that particular group, I know the board of directors is looking at different proposals. But, I should point out to the member that we have had a few problem areas which have turned out to be disastrous. The Thunderbird Lodge one, I think the total after we've added up the costs of the Receiver, the court costs and everything, we sold it for something, and I'm quoting off the top of my head for \$132,000 and the total Receiver costs were \$131,000.00. So, for over half a million dollar investment in loans and guarantees, we're looking at a recovery of less than \$1,000.00. So, that does make people who sit on boards, who are responsible to the taxpayer and still want to see investment and development go ahead, it makes them take note and have a good look at the proposals.

So all I want to say is that there are considerations being given all the time, that the government is not, as far as the agency that I'm responsible for, closed to new ideas. But the experiences of the past have made us somewhat, how should I say it, cautious as far as the development is concerned and I know that the people in CEDF will give every hand to some native person or native group that wishes to move ahead on this particular endeavor, every help possible. But, it still comes back that in order for them to be successful, they're going to have to have the clientel and that's the point I was trying to make before; that before they can go ahead and sink \$100,000 into some investment, they are going to have to make sure that they've got the people that will use that resource

so that they can make the payments and, I think, that's where we all in the Legislature have an obligation to make sure that we go ahead and make people aware of the facilities or the province that we live in of the opportunities that are involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his remarks and I could just add that from my point of view as the Minister responsible for the Resource Department that one of the first things that we are going to address is the system of allocating the resources and seeing that whoever develops a particular aspect of the resource, whether it's a lodge developing a sport fishery or whether it's commercial fishermen using part of the fish stocks, that we have a system of allocating the resources and protecting the investments and the interests that those people have in it. That's one of our first concerns and beyond that I think my previous comments with respect to concern for the priorities of local people and of what my colleague, the Minister of Sport, has said, I think gives a reasonable outline of the approach that we'll be taking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm encouraged for the first time in a long time while listening to at least a couple of members of the government benches, I'm encouraged by what they say, Mr. Chairman. I'm not, Mr. Chairman, encouraged by the actions, but the words aren't that bad. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Resources to talk to him specifically is that what has happened in the past — and it's been a very unfortunate situation — when there has been a conflict between the commercial fishing as a resource use and the tourism as a resource use, because there were so few Inian and Metis people, so few people from the local community involved in the tourist industry it usually became an ethnic or racial disagreement with the commercial fishermen being the Indian and Metis people and the tourist operator being a white person, and that's unfortunate the way, historically, when that conflict has come up the way it's broken down. That will probably continue unless some of the steps that I have mentioned and the two ministers have mentioned are taken.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Sport has touched on a real situation in that the development in these communities is not a development that takes place without problems. And, Mr. Chairman, the government and the minister have to be able and willing to take some risk to assist in this kind of development because it is not entirely within the experience of the people in the communities and often if failure takes place it's because of lack of advice and lack of assistance from outside; that is, the giving of the money without giving the technical assistance and advice so it can take place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Sport mentioned one particular lodge development, the Thunderbird Lodge development. And, this has been a problem in a few areas where in fact a native community or a native person attempting to get into business has gone too big and that is not the first time that people have gone too big. But what I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, is the smaller developments within the smaller communities and to assist people who don't know the ropes. He mentioned Thunderbird Lodge and we're talking about someone who knew all the ropes of how to deal with governments and how to get the most out of government. I'm talking about those communities where we have people that have some of the abilities but not yet the experience and knowledg. So they do need help not only to plan so that in effect, as the Minister of Sport said, so that there are people to use the resources, so they know whether it's feasible or not to develop a tourist industry. So the people of Moose Lake know whether it's feasible or not to develop a tourist business at Williams Lake or on Highway No. 6 going north; so the people at Easterville know whether it's feasible or not to establish a tourist industry in the vicinity of Easterville now the new road goes through joining Highway No. 6 and No. 10.

So there is that outside technical assistance and unless that outside technical assistance is given the thing probably will not work. And so, Mr. Chairman, I would urge this minister and the minister who has had to leave that they be willing to take a look at this and that they be willing to take on some of the risks involved. Now, Mr. Chairman, that's always a danger when you're in government and a danger especially for this government whose preferred pattern is to do as little as possible and if that pattern is followed, then we will not see the local people involved in the development. We will not see them involved unless the assistance, technical advice, management, and financial assistance is given to people in local communities and unless the government makes that a definite priority it just will not take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.—pass; (a)—pass; the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of comments with respect to the last issue which was raised and it's with respect to resource allocation. I believe I did request earlier of the minister what his policy was in regard to allocation of resources and in particular what his policy would be in the allocation of resources to communities. We brought it up in regard to wild rice. I asked him if he would continue the policy which was established by the New Democratic Government, and that is of allocating the wild rice resource on a first priority basis to the communities. We did that. He indicated he was continuing that and would continue, I believe, unless there was some overriding reason not to do so and I would certainly request that that policy continue along with the policy of allocating the fishery resource on a first priority basis to the communities.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I make that request is that most of the communities, if not all of the communities in northern Manitoba suffer from a high degree of unemployment. There is very little employment opportunities for the residents of those communities. Most of the young people as they go through the school system have to emigrate from the community into other areas where they can find work. But, Mr. Chairman, there are many people in those communities that have over the years depended on the resource base for their livelihood and continue to want to have a livelihood from that resource base.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to see this government change the policy of allocating resources on a first priority basis to those communities and following a policy which would be designed to attract southern investors to exploit the resources of the North without involving the people in those communities. And, Mr. Chairman, that has been done in the past by governments that forgot about the northern communities, did not take them into consideration as a first priority. Mr. Chairman, there's always that danger that a new minister and a new government with the policy that a general philosophy of government which tends to emphasize the big business interests they will tend to look at the resource base as something to be exploited for the maximum profit to be obtained from that resource and if you look at it on that basis, Mr. Chairman, it may at first glance appear to be more profitable to allow a large investor to go into a northern Manitoba lake and establish a sophisticated tourist lodge which will attract the big buck Americans from Texas and all the southern states where they can come up and spend \$1,000 or \$2,000 a week or whatever it may be. But, Mr. Chairman, the majority of that money that comes into that area will not go into the pockets of the community residents in a situation like that. The majority of that money which is really based on the sale or exploitation of that resource will go into the pockets of that resource owner, that resource owner who is allocated the resource by a policy that would be following the philosophy of the Progressive Conservative Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that you have to have a different philosophy when you're talking about northern communities and northern development. You can't use that kind of philosophy unless there is some way of allocating the profits from that lodge in a fair way to distribute it among the residents of that community so as to allow them to partake of the benefits that accrue to that type of exploitation of the resource. And Mr. Chairman, we were looking at those things while we were in government, but I do not believe that we even got to that point of being able to establish large scale tourist enterprises of that high capital nature, that would allocate the benefits from that resource fairly and equitably to the community residents and those who wanted to work as guides or whatever in the resource.

Mr. Chairman, the other problem that you have when you try to follow that philosophy is that in northern Manitoba, most of the people who are of the working age in a community are of the age, Mr. Chairman, where it's difficult to bring them into new types of work activity. Many of the men who are in the fishing industry, for example, are in their late 40s, 50s, 60s, and Mr. Chairman, they are the nature of man who does not want to be a guide. A commercial fisherman, by his very nature, is much different from a guide. A guide is a person who is working on a servant-type basis to a group of people, taking them out on the lake, being more or less at their beck and call while he is in their service. And Mr. Chairman, a commercial fisherman follows a much different style of life. He gets up in the morning when he feels like getting up in the morning, he goes out on the lake, he's his own boss, he's the epitome of what you would call a free enterprise person.

Mr. Chairman, it's very much like the farmer representatives in this house, I'm sure they can understand that a person who follows that type of occupation would not necessarily want to change to be a guide and to therefore be trained into the high capital intensive industry associated with the tourist lodges.

So Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have a little bit more description from the Minister as to what policy he is going to follow. I can tell him that the New Democratic Party position on this, while we were in government, and I believe it's the same position today, is that the resource should be allocated on a first priority basis to the communities nearest the resource. We did that with the wild rice;

we were attempting to do it with the fisheries; we were attempting to do it with the forestry. And since we're talking about the fishery and the wildlife resource in this section, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make that point with the Minister, that we propose that the fishery resource and the wild rice resource be allocated on a first priority basis to the communities nearest to that resource.

And if he wants a rule of thumb to use for what should be the resource base for the community, what we were using was the registered trapline grounds, which were around a community, as a rough rule of thumb. Mr. Chairman, it usually took in an area, a radius of perhaps ten miles around a community, a more or less round circle near the community. And within that resource base, Mr. Chairman, hopefully there would be sufficient resources, if they were properly harvested, on a sustained yield basis to provide significant employment opportunities for the able-bodied residents of that community.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want the government to change the policy to the extent that they would allocate those resources that are the future livelihood, present and future livelihood, of the people who live in those communities. I would not want them to allocate those resources to outside interests who would exploit those resources for their own profits and not involve the local communities in the harvesting of those resources, and not involve the local community in partaking from the employment opportunities that would be available through the harvesting of those resources.

Mr. Chairman, there are two very distinct philosophies that we're talking about here, and I would want to know what policy and philosophy is guiding the present government in that respect in the allocation of resources that are really the only opportunity many communities have to present and future employment.

MR. RANSOM: I find the honourable member's comments somewhat interesting with respect to transforming the commercial fisherman into the guide who would be at the beck and call of the people that he was guiding, and that perhaps he would not adjust readily to that. I can assure the honourable member, as someone who has had experience in operating a tourist lodge, that there is no one who is more at the beck and call of the clients than the operator, than the owner of that lodge, and I can assure him that anyone who wishes to operate a lodge successfully, financially successfully, is going to have to adjust to that very type of relationship with their clients.

With respect to allocation, Mr. Chairman, I said a day or two ago, that the present policies were still being applied, but they were under active review, and I would not want to leave the impression with the honourable member that that was not the case, because in fact, they are under active review and I can say that I certainly have some reservations at this point with respect to allocation to communities. I have an interest in the local people of a community having some opportunity, having a first opportunity to benefit from the resources, but the mechanism that the honourable member refers to, which is the actual allocation to the community rather than to individual people, is one that I can tell him from a philosophical point of view that I have some serious question about, and that's being looked at carefully.

He referred to our alleged interests in big business, Mr. Chairman. I can assure the honourable member that what we are interested in is the initiatives that private individual people take, and we are interested in individual people being rewarded for those initiatives. It has nothing to do with big business, it has to do with people and the manner in which they are prepared to try and accomplish things for themselves and the rewards that they are then able to reap as a result of that. Resources, in my mind, are no different, Mr. Chairman, than money. You allocate a natural resource that belongs to the province, to the people of the province, it's no different than allocating financial resources, and if one loses track of the profit picture, then I think that it is just as irresponsible to manage the natural resources that way as it is to manage the financial resources of the province that way.

So one must at least know what the picture is, and if it is then necessary to make a subsidy, either in the form of financial resources, or natural resources, at least the managers should be aware of the subsidy that they're making.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member, I believe points out his lack of understanding of what constitutes wealth and what constitutes currency. He equates money with resources, and Mr. Chairman, they're two completely different things. Money is currency and resources are wealth. Mr. Chairman, it is the wealth that lie in the natural resources of northern Manitoba that we're talking about right now, and it is the wealth that is contained in those resources, particularly the ones that are of a renewable resource nature, where one can realize a sustained yield value from those resources year after year, without ever damaging the storehouse of resources that are available there. And if it's a fishery resource or a wild fur resource, Mr. Chairman, I would

like to have that resource allocated to those who live in the area where the resources are located, particularly, Mr. Chairman when we have people who are living in those areas that are now depending on those resources for a livelihood, and who will require those resources for the livelihood of the people who are living in those communities now and who will be living in those communities in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I'm very concerned when I hear the Minister talking about protecting investments, because I think of his possibly adopting the policy which would be taking a resource in northern Manitoba and offering it to some big businessman who would put up a few hundred thousand dollars in cold cash, in currency, in return the government would allocate him this resource, which Mr. Chairman' is actually giving him the wealth that is contained within that resource over a period of years that the person would be operating and harvesting the resource.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to see the government giving away the resources of northern Manitoba to people who are not living in northern Manitoba, when there is a high degree of unemployment existing at the present time in remote communities. I would want to see the government of Manitoba take an interventionist role, seek out and find groups, individuals, whatever, in those communities, to develop those resources; help them, give them the technical advice, and the financial assistance to develop those resources and produce an income from those resources for the benefit of the people who live in those communities. But not give away our resources to the so-called highest bidder, who comes in and says, look, I'm Daddy Big Bucks here, I will go and I will put a lodge in on a lake in northern Manitoba and this is the kind of money that I can generate from that lake every year.

Mr. Chairman, if an individual who comes in from outside of the northern area can do that kind of thing, there is no reason that somebody couldn't be assisted from the north to do the same thing, or a similar thing, but Mr. Chairman, with a different view. The view being, in the case of assisting somebody in the north to do it, would be to have the maximum benefit from the wealth produced from the harvesting of that resource to stay in the north, and not be exported out of the province. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the government go further than that and review the leasing policies and the way in which resources are transferred from one owner to another, where there are lodges operating, for example in northern Manitoba today that are long-established lodges, that have been developed by Manitobans, whether they're southerners or northerners. They've been developed, they're operating, they're very valuable potential for the future for a business enterprise in those communities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the provincial government have the final say on who that resource is transferred to when that present owner decides to transfer his resource to another owner of the facility, for utilizing resource, whether it's a lodge or a fish station or whatever, I would like to see the government give priority, if not exclusivity to transferring that resource to somebody who is in that area. And Mr. Chairman, to provide that individual or that group with the financial assistance and the technical assistance to be able to accomplish that, not to just sit back as a government and let it go to the highest bidder.

Mr. Chairman, the result of following the latter policy is to have our resources lost forever or for a significant number of years to people who don't even live in Manitoba. I know of one large lake in northern Manitoba, which is in my constituency at the present time, where there was a native family operating the lodge, and Mr. Chairman they were operating on the basis of a lease on that lake. They had leased the land from the government, they had built up a very well run profitable lodge on Molson Lake, and Mr. Chairman, I believe that they have sold that lodge now to a group of Americans. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if that lake can support any more lodges, but if it doesn't, it means that that resource is now in foreign hands and presumably, Mr. Chairman, there may be a few people from the nearby community of Norway House who will get some employment benefit out of working the Lodge, but where are the profits going to go? They will not stay in the community of Norway House. They will more than likely end up not even staying in the Province of Manitoba, but they will probably be going out of the province altogether, and Mr. Chairman, you have a situation where the resource is in the hands of foreigners and because of the way the Lodge would be operating with the type of promotion that they would be doing, even the enjoyment of the resource would be in the hands of foreigners. Mr. Chairman, I would rather see us put Manitobans first, and in the case of the Northern Resources and their near proximity to Northern communities, I would like to see us give a first priority to those people in the area and give them the assistance and the financial capability to develop the resources for their use for the overall benefit of the community they are from and, Mr. Chairman, with a view to making that resource available as far as possible for the enjoyment of the resource to all Manitobans.

I know that it's a very expensive proposition when you're talking about having fly-in Lodges and fly-in fishing. There are very few Manitobans who can afford such a luxury, but Mr. Chairman, it's certainly adding insult to injury to Manitobans when the resource that they can't afford to even

go to is in the hands of foreign interests, the profits from the harvesting of the resource are going out of the country. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister would very seriously review any proposed changes to the existing policy with respect to Resource allocation and I would put him on guard that he would be certainly open to attack from this side, from people who live in northern Manitoba, if he implements a policy of making Northern Resources available to outside interests without taking into account the needs and desires of people who live in northern Manitoba to develop those resources for the benefit of the people who live there.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I fully expect to be attacked by the honourable members opposite for changing the policies that their government instituted. I don't think that should come as any particular surprise, but the honourable member reacts rather automatically, I guess, to a phrase like protect the investment. Somehow that's a bad thing to do, to talk about protecting somebody's investment, but I can assure the honourable member that whether or not it's a non-resident or whether it's a local person who makes an investment in an enterprise, then they would desire to have that investment protected and that is what I'm referring to. He automatically interprets that as meaning some sort of protection for big business, Mr. Chairman. I'm talking about protecting investments of anyone who makes it, be he small, be he local, or be he outside of the area or even outside of the province.

I guess that this is probably an area that is somewhat similar to the mining situation in that it does reflect a very basic difference in the approach that the honourable members opposite took in government and the approach that we take because it reflects the faith that they have in bureaucracies and Central Planning and in things that governments can do for people, as opposed to what we believe that individual people can do for themselves. Now, they somehow believe that government intervention, as he said, is going to be able to pull a whole community, or a whole group of people up to some level that they would desire to be at. Mr. Chairman, I maintain and we maintain that that is not done by government, that government can only create the circumstances within which individual people must be able to do things for themselves, and if the people are not prepared or are not suited to or don't want to run a Lodge, then no number of bureaucrats and no amount of government planning is going to be able to convince those people that they can do it, or be able to force them to do it successfully. If there are individual people who are inclined to do that sort of thing, then more power to them, and it will be our policy to create circumstances where those people can do things, and we will be prepared to provide the technical assistance, advice and so forth that's necessary. People who have not been involved in that sort of thing and don't have a business background, obviously they require assistance to do it, but it must be in response to what individual people want to do. It cannot be done by government intervening, and I think that that is going to prove to be a very basic difference in the philosophies of the two governments just as our approach to mining differs, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister confirms my suspicion that he takes a very narrow view of what governments can or cannot do, and Mr. Chairman, just the Lodge I mentioned in passing, the Lodge at Molson Lake which was developed by two Indian men from Norway House was developed with the assistance of government people and government funding. Mr. Chairman, they made a successful enterprise out of it, and if you're looking at assisting people, Mr. Chairman, sometimes you have to go out and beat the bushes to try to find people who are interested in doing this and not just sitting back, as this government, I believe, with its present philosophy would tend to do, is sit back and wait for people to come to them. Mr. Chairman, in some of these communities you have to go out and use an activist role in government and try to explain what is possible, and use the instrumentality of government to assist people to do what is possible, and Mr. Chairman, even if it's in the case of training native people for teachers in our northern schools, some of the native people never even realized they had the ability to be able to be trained for teachers. Mr. Chairman, we brought in policies that went out and beat the bushes and found people that had the capability to be trained as teachers and we provided the means by which they could take special courses to be trained and now many of them are taking their place in northern education in the northern schools, Mr. Chairman.

It's the same with the development of industries, or the development of our resources. We have to go out and assist people to help them to assess their own capabilities and to help them to achieve their capabilities, to achieve their potentialities and, Mr. Chairman, that kind of thing can only be done with an activist government. I do not believe it will be done or can be done by the kind of government we have across the way that believes that all they have to do is sit back and let people come to them because, Mr. Chairman, the people who will come to them will be the people with means. It will be the people with money. It will be the people who can hire consultants and hire the professional people to sell their projects to this government and, Mr. Chairman, those will be

the people who will be obtaining the wealth of our Northern Resources. That is the fear that I have. I would rather have the government going out and finding people in the north who will develop the wealth we have available in our north, and not just sitting back and waiting for the people with means to come to them so that this government can protect their investment rather than protect our wealth which is in Northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I would have some more questions on this area when we come back to it this evening, I believe we're going into Private Members' Hour at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, and in accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return to the Chair at 8:00 this evening.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Private Members' Hour I'd like to make an announcement that the Honourable Member for Roblin will be chairing the Committee in Room 254 at 8:00 o'clock.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Hour, the first item of business is Resolutions, the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — PARENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that the following Resolution be presented for debate in this House:

WHEREAS the United Nations has proclaimed 1979 as the Year of the Child and we in Manitoba are dedicated to pursuing equality of opportunity for all our children;

AND WHEREAS a substantial number of our children are parented by persons with limited life skills and finances;

AND WHEREAS many studies on Child Abuse cite poverty as the most serious threat to the well-being of families;

AND WHEREAS children and families in certain regions of our province are disadvantaged by reason of their domicile;

AND WHEREAS those infants who suffer the effects of neglect and/or abuse in such circumstances are often undetected until they have suffered extreme physical, intellectual, and emotional privation and abuse;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House do instruct the government to formulate and implement a comprehensive program designed to assure that parents get necessary medical care, instruction respecting parenting skills, adequate nutrition and supervision, assistance and surveillance both before and after the birth of their children.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before I accept the honourable member's Resolution, I point out to the honourable member that I have sought advice and consultation on whether or not this Resolution is acceptable, and it is my belief that under our rules and specifically Rule 58 and also Rule 54 in our Rules, I believe the Resolution in its present form is unacceptable and therefore I would make a suggestion to the member that perhaps he would like to withdraw it and rephrase it. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, generally on such a ruling it would seem to me that it would be of some value if you asked whether there are representations to be made by either side of the House with regard to the Resolution before you make a final ruling so we are not then in a position of arguing a ruling after it has been made.

Secondly, you indicated that you did seek consultation and advice and I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that if you are seeking consultation and advice you would also do so from the contending parties in the House. I wonder if you could indicate to the members on the basis of which Rule you are considering finding the Resolution to be out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: I was going to raise the same Point of Order.

Before you reply to the Honourable Member for Inkster, I wonder if I might be given an opportunity to indicate to you, Sir, on what basis that I find that the Resolution is out of order, and in my view it is out of order on two accounts, and you have indicated both of them: (1) On Rule 54, in that the Resolution, although it involves the expenditure of money, is not constructed in the abstract. And that's a pretty standard practice in this House, and I recall from time to time honourable members, who are now sitting on that side of the House, used to rise in heated indignation pointing out to us that the resolution is out of order because it was not couched in the abstract.

Secondly, Sir, there is a reference to that very subject matter contained in the Throne Speech to date and if you will look on page 5, the reference is simply that the United Nations has declared 1979 as the International Year of the Child and is endorsing and recognizing its principles and objectives. My government will be giving special consideration to the needs and welfare of children. That, in my opinion, Sir, pretty well embraces the content of the resolution. So, for those two reasons, I believe that the resolution is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, without arguing the substance of the question as to whether or not this resolution involves the expenditure of government money or whether in fact the instructions from the House to the government could be dealt with within the existing estimates themselves, because it doesn't refer to any particular expenditure, to formulate and implement a comprehensive program, the design to assure that parents get necessary medical care which is part of the existing medical care program, instructions respecting parental skills, all of which are provided for, Mr. Speaker, under the child guidance grants, etc. that are submitted to various agencies throughout the province, adequate nutrition and supervision, assistance and surveillance both before and after the birth of their children. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that all of those things are available within the estimates of the department and that what the member is seeking is the creation of a comprehensive program, that is a package under which this is done in an organized fashion, but without debating the substance of that, and it is sometimes useless to debate moot points, would the member permit the resolution to proceed by consent of the House if it contained the words that my honourable friend says are necessary, that the House advised the government to consider the advisability of formulating and implementing a comprehensive program which would then take care of the more substantial of the two objections?

With regard to the objection that the resolution anticipates government legislation, Mr. Speaker, I think that the mere mention of the fact that it is the Year of the Child should not preclude a general debate which doesn't in any way, Mr. Speaker, impinge upon government policy or government responsibility and if my honourable friend is able to give us notice that some of these things are going to be dealt with by direct legislation, then we would rule them out, but would the Honourable House Leader not consider that a kind of general debate introduced by a private member will not impinge upon anything that the government announced that it's going to do. If it is, then I'm sure that the Member for Wellington will proceed to deal with the question, either by removing the offending passages from the resolution, which I think would be rather unnecessary, but would the minister not agree that this does not impinge on any specific program and really gives the honourable member an opportunity of presenting to the House a suggestion for general things that are necessary with regard to the field of children and neglected children? And I concede, Mr. Chairman, without conceding the point, I will concede for practicality that the words "consider the advisability of formulating and implementing a comprehensive program" should be inserted and if the House gives its unanimous consent, then the member can proceed to discuss the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think I understand what the Government Leader of the House is saying and what the Leader of the Opposition is saying. I was wondering if the member would be willing to withdraw his resolution now and reword it and resubmit it later. Would that meet with the . . . The Honourable Government House Leader?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it still does not deal with the second, and I think more substantive point that I've raised: That it conflicts with the provision that is made in the speech from the Throne. It's been a pretty well established rule in this Chamber that resolutions are not introduced or not acceptable if it contains reference to a letter that the government has indicated it's going to be

dealing with by virtue of a passage in the speech from the Throne. And, I'll again draw your attention to that particular passage. My honourable friend drew attention to the mention of the Year of the Child but he neglected to mention the substantive portion of that particular sentence which says, "recognizing its principles and objectives my government will be giving special consideration to the needs and welfare of children." Now, that is a statement in the Speech from the Throne which to me indicates that measures are going to be taken to deal with the very subject matter that is contained in my honourable friend's resolution. If my honourable friend wants to withdraw the resolution and try and think of something else that is not contained in the Speech from the Throne, he's welcome to do so but the resolution as it stands and the subject matter thereof are not acceptable according to our rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on point of order.

MR. GREEN: On the same point, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, whenever a challenge is made because it anticipates government legislation, the government has been ready to indicate that legislation with respect to some of these points are going to be dealt with. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it used to be a practise, although I don't know whether it can be done now, that we left the resolution on the Order Paper and not introduced it pending the introduction of whatever legislation was going to be dealt with and then stayed clear of that particular measure in order to be able to deal with the resolution. If the honourable member is suggesting that that can occur what I can recall personally doing is indicating that there is going to be a bill on such and such a question. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that because the Throne Speech mentions children, we cannot present a resolution with regard to the problems arising from juvenile delinquency.

The rule with regard to anticipation is not intended to foreclose dealing with the subject matter. It's intended to prevent the opposition from introducing material which the government has every intention of legislating with respect to. And, I think, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend is going too far by suggesting that the government can mention by one word that it's going to do something in a particular area and then foreclose a private member from introducing a resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not my view of the rule against anticipation and I would at best ask your honour to take the matter under advisement to see whether a single reference to a particular area rules out any discussion whatsoever on the general area because that is not, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to my honourable friend, substantiated by the rule against anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite prepared to take the matter under advisement. Also, I would like to have some indication from the honourable member if he has any indication of changing some of the wording in the resolution.

MR. GREEN: May I ask my honourable friend whether he would agree with the first half of it. In other words that we can resolve the question of government spending by agreeing that the words would be changed, that we would change the words that the House instruct the government to consider the advisability of formulating and implementing a comprehensive program. Can that be done by consent? And then we're dealing with the one objection only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: It's quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend wants to withdraw the resolution and reword it, to couch it in the abstract, that then will be acceptable. There's no question about that but again I repeat that there is a much wider implication that I have drawn to your attention and I have no intention of repeating myself on that, that if my honourable friend is going to withdraw the resolution and reword it, that I would suggest that he takes that into consideration as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have not agreed that that amendment is necessary. I have offered a way out in which we can all agree. If my honourable friend will not give unanimous consent to the correction we're going to ask you to rule this resolution as to whether it does in fact involve the expenditure of government funds in the way in which it is placed, and secondly whether it anticipates government legislation. We will ask you to rule on both those points. I was hoping that the members of the opposition would not make it necessary to rule on the first point. It being necessary, we ask you to make a ruling on both points.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm prepared to take the matter under advisement.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

MR. SPEAKER: We'll proceed with the next order. Resolution No. 2. The resolution of the Honourable Member for Transcona and the amendment of the Honourable Government House Leader. This resolution was under discussion just at closing time. It is now open. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a few comments into the debate on this resolution regarding the question of citizen access to government information and, Mr. Speaker, I certainly find it a most interesting resolution and one that concerns a lot of people, not only in Manitoba, but I daresay all across Canada today as governments get larger and larger and more and more of our citizens want to have more details of whats going on and how their tax dollars are being spent.

I listened with some interest to the comments of the Honourable Member for Inkster the other day and I don't know whether I misunderstood him or not, but I checked back with Hansard very briefly a moment ago, and he leaves me with the impression from his comments whereby he said that the government doesn't set up legislative committees and there's absolutely no provision in parliament for government to set up a legislative committee. . . I checked back through some of the debates, I find that the former Minister of Agriculture on the 24th of June, 1970, brought in a resolution regarding the use of farm machinery and . . . — (Interjection) — Yes, he was the Minister of Agriculture. Right. I was maybe under the false impression that the Honourable Member for Inkster said that governments don't set up legislative committees, if I read him correctly, I think it was from page 468 of Hansard. But there are several occasions where governments did bring in resolutions. The former First Minister brought in the resolution for the purpose of regarding the school

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member . . . system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster, may I point out to him that interjections can only occur with the consent of the member who is speaking. Does the Honourable Member for Roblin wish to give consent? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: May I advise you that the Member for Roblin always permits me to question him and that's why I assumed that he would do so this time. He has never told me, as other members have that they don't wish me . . . Would the honourable member not agree that in each case the committee was set up by a resolution being presented by a member of the Legislative Assembly and adopted by the Assembly, that no government has ever set up a committee?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I'm sure it was approved by Cabinet when it arrived on the floor of the House but just for the clarification maybe I misinterpreted the honourable member's words correctly on the bottom of page 468. He says, "I was going to be a little tough on my honourable friend. I would say that the government does not set up Legislative Committees and there's absolutely no provision in Parliament for the government to set up Legislative Committees." But regardless, we shall not carry the debate much further. It's maybe a misunderstanding on my part.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is an ideal society when all information that's generated by governments at the Municipal and the Urban and the Provincial and Federal level, all Corporations, all Societies and all the individuals should have access to the workings and the things that were said in those various meetings if it affects their everyday lives.

I think it's also assumed, Mr. Speaker, that nobody would abuse the rights of others because of this accessibility which, in most cases, has been held in trust, and of course the problem is that we don't live today in an ideal society. That is where it's going to make it difficult for us to further develop this Resolution and the Committee that will come out of the workings of it because if we're going to get where we want to go and where the citizens of Manitoba and Canada want us to go, we must start from where we're at today to improve it. I guess, Mr. Speaker, there's more and more evidence the public at large certainly are seeking, as I said earlier, more access to that information, but when we start generalizing about how we're going to get that information there are a lot of things that have to be considered and dealt with before we decide the vehicle that we're going to use, and I'm referring to the system, the British Parliamentary System which we have lived under for well over a hundred years and has worked real well and has stood the test of time up to this particular point in our history.

We talk about in this Resolution that we must assume and have a full understanding of what Ministerial responsibility means and what it stands for and have it spelled out loud and clear. What is Ministerial responsibility? We must have a full and a clear definition of what the words "freedom of information" mean. What does that mean to you, to me, to the man in the street, to the politician, to the person that's sitting on Municipal Council and others? Should there be disclosure of all the documentation that comes into the hands of government, and what kind of a disclosure should be allowed? Should there be exemptions for certain people under certain conditions and under certain times or under certain Committees that are established? If we and this jurisdiction, which is the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, decide in our wisdom when this Resolution is finalized on the full freedom of legislation, of all the legislation that's dealt with by this Legislature, then should we set up a Committee of the House or a Committee that's selected by government to decide on the parameters or how far we're going to go in dealing with all the matters that are being dealt with by government in this province?

And, Mr. Speaker, if it's to be meaningful, should there be a time limit set on it, a limitation? Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the members of the House and we have several vehicles at our disposal today. The Parliamentary scrutiny is a well-known vehicle that's been with us under the British Parliamentary System since Day One. We have the Auditor's reports to deal with in this Legislature. Should we have an Information Commissioner set up to go into the records and the figures of and dig it all out for the people? Should we have a Judicial Committee of the House, the members of the House, to decide should this information be handed out or should it not be handed out? Should we set up an Information Commissioner, may I say, with judicial powers to serve the needs of our citizens?

Mr. Speaker, the more that you look at it and the deeper you go into the subject matter, it seems to me that any conclusions that are made will have to be made up with a lot of things in mind; such as, the security of the State; the information which would allow somebody to gain personal advantage or to cause somebody else to lose some of his rights, or how far should we go regarding the invasion of privacy of an individual under such a Committee or such Legislation? How far should we go in dealing with legal information which comes up from time to time in the House which is pleaded judicial and the Courts may be already dealing with the subject matter at the same time, information that I'm sure the Ministers deal with from time to time that's classed — maybe it's frivolous — information that's presently available, information that's included in the Statutes that we have in the province today, information that's received in confidence from outside governments; such as from the federal government, the senior government of Canada, or from our neighbors to the south, or from the Mother of Parliament, information that's left to ministerial discretion — should that become public information?

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all want an informed electorate that tends to, as I said earlier, it seems to prevail across Canada today where people want more and more information. And we have, as I started earlier to explain, several ways under our present system where a lot of information can be gathered. As I said, the Public Accounts Committee, we have the system of the Auditor, we have the Ombudsman, we have the Workers' Compensation Board, we have the Human Rights Commission, we have the Clean Environment Commission' we have the Question Period in the Legislature every day, which is one of the most simple methods of eliciting information that I know of. We go through the Estimates of all the various departments with the Ministers, the Law Amendments Committee where we deal with the legislation that comes before the Committee of the House where a man in the street can come and make his views known, and if he can't get information he can certainly get to a member that's on that Committee and raise questions, and we have all the other various Committees of the House. We have the Grievance Motion if somebody's being unduly treated, there's a vehicle, and certainly there's several other ways whereby information can be gathered today.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, the task is not going to be an easy one. I can example: We talk about Ministerial accountability and Ministerial responsibility. Let's just take an example. The CBC today — what Minister in his right mind could be accountable or responsible, or held responsible, for a Corporation of that magnitude, and all the decisions and the decision process that's going on within the inner workings of the CBC, and at the same time have a Minister held responsible for that. There are other large Crown Corporations as well where Ministerial responsibility and Ministerial accountability comes to the forefront and yet somebody has got to be responsible because somebody wants to gain information from a Corporation of that magnitude. Who is going to be responsible for it?

I also, Mr. Speaker, have been looking through some of the experiences they've had in some of the jurisdictions. Sweden, where I daresay they have the most open information system in the world, but if you delve into the workings of government in Sweden today you'll find out that the civil servants have learned real quick to devoid the paper route, the route by letters and

Instead of records going into black and white, or being inked on paper, the civil servants there today use the Telephone System so that there would be no records left from what they have said or what they have done.

The United States, of course — our friends in the States — there's apparently, as I understand it, a sort of a new industry has grown up in the United States on showing people. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . ways and means of gaining freedom from government and, of course, the leak system has certainly surfaced to some great extent across the border, and we can only look back at the great example of what a leak started there, it was the Watergate story and certainly that is another method of gaining information.

But I'll say very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Amendment by the Honourable Minister here is one that's very deserving, and the Resolution is one that deserves the attention of the House and one that we should look at very seriously because I'm satisfied and the many people that I have been speaking to, that the man in the street is looking for more information today, and we may have to hedge on this all out, full disclosure of everything that happens — full information. It would be nice to say, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to be free and we're going to be open with every possible document and every possible piece of communication that transfers back and forth amongst the various departments of government, and if that is so, then I think that I would have some doubts that maybe our system would break down if we became that free and open with information.

I daresay there would also be chaos amongst the civil servants of the province because the public servants, the civil servants of any province or any government are entitled to their own anonymity because there's lots of cases where the civil servants make a decision that the government doesn't accept. There's also cases where the civil servants would not want their names to be dragged in the pages of our newspapers because of a certain decision or a certain judgment that they made.

So I hope that we — I express caution, I think we should take a serious and dedicated look at the future and let's not destroy a system that has stood the test of time reasonably well, but I think the Resolution is a deserving one and I like the Amendment as proposed by the Minister and I think it's progress for Manitoba if we support it.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't actually going to participate in this aspect of the Private Members' Hour today, but given that I'd come prepared to speak about something, given that I've been inhibited in my attempts to speak on what I wanted to, I will as an alternative, speak relative to this particular Resolution.

It's one, Mr. Speaker, as you will recollect, it was dear to my heart last year. I had the privilege of seconding the Private Members' Bill introduced by the Member for Fort Rouge at that time, and at that time I gave my reasons for doing so and specified that it was my intention to be supportive of any initiatives that were taken in that respect, albeit even from other Parties in this House. Again, I commend my friend, the Honourable Member for Transcona, for bringing this matter to bear once more, giving the members of the Assembly an opportunity to fully debate and discuss this matter at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I might, by way of prefacing my remarks, indicate that one of the reasons I was motivated to speak in this respect today was because I, as an MLA, just a very short time ago, a few days ago, had the opportunity to try and gain information from a department of your government. At that time I was deterred in my efforts by what I should say were well-meaning civil servants, and I should add that they were entirely civil in their manner towards me. At that time I was trying to get information relative to the number of youths resident at the Agassiz Centre, Portage la Prairie, and also information relative to the number of spaces for occupancy currently available at that institution, and I spoke to several people including the Acting Director of the institution and an individual who introduced himself as being a senior member of the Corrections Division of the Department of Health and Social Services.

At that time I was advised that such information was privy only to the Honourable Minister responsible for the department, that I was not, although — and this was done very respectfully — that I was not the Minister and I had recourse to other means if I wished to obtain such information; namely, I could contact the Minister directly, and at that time he would indicate whether or not he was willing to divulge the information, or I could ask a question in the Assembly, during the

Question Period, or in the alternative I could file an Order for Return. As you will remember, it was your opinion that the matter was properly the subject of an Order for Return, but since I had given notice, the Honourable Minister reciprocated by way of providing the information to me at the time.

But it certainly underscores, Mr. Speaker, the need even within our own ranks, not just with respect to members of the public at large, but within our own ranks, the need for some guidelines. The need for some mechanism by which Civil Servants in their intercourse, in the conduct of their affairs with members of the public — including MLAs, I might say somewhat sarcastically — can determine what sort of information, what classes of information should be divulged to the public sector.

I, having had an experience in the Civil Service, having been a person who worked — and not always civilly, as I was reminded even by some members of this House, some years ago — but having had the experience of having worked in such an environment, I can tell you and assure you that it is most difficult, very difficult indeed for those persons to maintain the conduct of their affairs, to dispatch their duties without some sort of guideline in this respect. Quite frankly, they tend to be overly protective, and I guess justifiably because they don't know what is classified information. They have no concept of what the government of the day may find embarrassing; what the government of the day may not wish to divulge; and as a result sometimes they do foolish things like telling a MLA that he can't obtain, he can't become privy to information that is obviously not the sort of information that should be privileged. It's absolutely ludicrous.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have those sorts of situations arising and I suggest that the Member for Transcona has tried to bridge that gap, he's tried to do something to make life more tolerable, not only for members of the public but also for members of the Civil Service.

Another case which has come to my attention in the past while, and certainly since our last debate this time last year, was the rather infamous case of Mr. Gray, the Federal M.P., and the Bell Canada contract that was so arduously debated in this Assembly. Mr. Gray finally got the contract, you might remember, Mr. Speaker, if I can presume to refresh your memory, that there was considerable debate as to what was in the contract, what the terms and conditions of that contract were, whether they might be deemed to be discriminatory or biased as against any particular racial or ethnic or sex group, and we had prolonged agonized debates on that subject, relative to our Crown corporation, The Manitoba Telephone System.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gray finally got — after goodness knows how many months and years of labour — he finally got a copy of the Bell Canada contract with Saudi Arabia. How did he do it, Mr. Speaker? And the story probably is a testimony to the vigor and initiative of that particular Federal member — he went to Washington. He went to the City of Washington in the District of Columbia, and he approached one of the Federal Consumer Watchdog Organizations in the United States, indicated his plight, told the Chairperson of this organization that he had for many months been trying to obtain this information through his colleagues in the Government of Canada — because we should remember that he's a government member and not an opposition member, he's supposed to be privy during the course of caucus to all sorts of information that would not be available to members of the public at large, or for that matter to opposition members. But this member went to Washington — took the initiative of travelling all the way to Washington — in order to ask a person who is not affiliated, not associated with government at all, if he might try to obtain the information.

Well, lo and behold, less than 48 hours later Mr. Gray was back in Ottawa and he was able, in the House of Commons, to present the Minister responsible for that area of endeavour with the contract; and how did he do it, Mr. Speaker? It was no secret, the gentleman he approached utilized the provisions of the national or the The Federal Information Act in the United States, and simply by going to a designated office and paying what I believe is a rather nominal fee and registering his request for a specific item of information that was in the public domain, he was able to obtain it; he was able to give it to Mr. Gray, who could in turn pass it on to his colleague in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, nothing that I know of underscores the need or the importance, the significance, of this sort of initiative more than that incident, because it really does indicate that secrecy doesn't just stop, in present terms, doesn't just stop at the doorstep of members of this Assembly or for that matter Members of the House of Commons, our Federal Assembly, it stops in fact at a much more inhibited level. So I think there should be provision for something of the nature of that which has been called for by the Member for Transcona.

Mr. Speaker, when we're considering methods to establish what's accessible, we should also be remembering that it's important to recollect that we're doing service to the public, I suppose in two different ways. First of all, we're enhancing their basic democratic right to know, their right to know what their public officials, what those whom they entrust with responsibility relative to public

affairs are doing, in what manner they're disposing of the responsibilities entrusted to them.

But more important, we're giving them the opportunity to exercise their freedom of speech. We're not only giving them the right to know, we're giving them the right to discuss public affairs — matters of immediate import, topical events. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I really rally to preserve and to fight for. That is what concerns me more than anything else.

There is, Mr. Speaker, and this is perhaps a subjective opinion but it's borne out in the recent experience of even political persons such as ourselves — and I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that you might be a political person, we know that your office would not allow you to maintain such a capacity or presence — but I'm suggesting that other members of other assemblies in this country have very recently come into conflict relative really to freedom of information. And this has been a matter of import because it has been taken before the Courts, and there have been judgments made that have very seriously inhibited and limited the rights of people in this country, not only to be informed but to know and to discuss. The freedom of speech in this country has recently, in my opinion, been inhibited, and we must discuss that. It's a duty incumbent upon us to do that.

Mr. Speaker, without any further ado, I'm referring to the fencing of the public's right to speak out, and particularly with respect to publications. Publications such as The Saskatoon Star Phoenix newspapers. You'll recollect that not too long ago there was a letter to the editor published relative to the conduct of an alderman of the city of Saskatoon; an alderman and a fellow lawyer, Morris Chernowski; it was deemed by the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench to be a libelous utterance, this was the letter to the editor. But what makes it so significant, Mr. Speaker, was that it wasn't the person who uttered the libel directly that was found liable. The liability for that particular matter was not put at the doorstep of the primary defendant, it was put at the doorstep of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, who were told by the Courts that they couldn't publish that sort of information. They were told that that was defamatory, and that they should have sanitized; they shouldn't have allowed that sort of publication to be made in their newspaper. And this frightens me, Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening trend in public affairs in Canada, that the Courts, and I know that members opposite are quite concerned about this because I have heard the First Minister make remarks relative to this when he discussed the last First Ministers Conference and The Bill of Rights that was proposed.

I think we should all be concerned that the Courts are perhaps taking too large a role in the affairs of our democracy in the sense that they are limiting and inhibiting what is in the public domain. They are not allowing a free interchange of ideas, and there's no better example than the Saskatoon Star Phoenix-Chernowski case. So the Star Phoenix is put in the position that now their editors must sit down and must weed out all those letters that are not printed by them, which might be deemed by a Court — and I say "might be", because nobody really knows — might be deemed to be libelous of a person in the political domain or of events in the public domain.

Even more frightening recently, I suppose, is the decision in British Columbia relative to the cartoon that was published by a Victoria newspaper depicting one of the government's Ministers, a Mr. Vander Zalm, in what was deemed by the Court, what was interpreted by the Court to be again in a libelous manner. Again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we're departing into a very frightening sort of existence when we contemplate that now the Courts are making decisions as to what the media can print. Where does it end?

So, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that we not only want freedom of information, we not only as members of a public assembly want the public to be aware of what transpires in their forum, but we also want to give them the right to discuss those events in an open, free and uninhibited, unfettered manner, and I suggest it's the responsibility of members of this Assembly to consider ways and means not only to enhance the public's opportunity to obtain information, but also to disinhibit the discussion of the information that is made public. And I suggest that one way we can do it is not only contemplate what has been called for by way of the Private Member's Resolution for Transcona, but also start to contemplate ways and means by which we can protect the news media in our province, in order that they not be put in these embarrassing circumstances, in order that they not be called upon to exercise not only discretion but really to exercise a form of censorship in what they may publish through their media.

I might cite, Mr. Speaker, and I think it should be put on the record, that the Ontario Press Council — and I commend them for this, and they're a body which I'm informed act as a sort of media watch dog in that province — has recently approached the Ontario Attorney-General, Mr. McMurtry, and has proposed amendments to their province's Libel and Slander Act. As I understand these amendments, they would at least protect the Letters to the Editor column in order that the publishers and editors of newspapers in that province could publish with assurance anything that was submitted to them, and this, Mr. Speaker, makes good sense, because it makes no sense to persecute those who bring the message. There's the old expression about "Killing the Messenger"

when one doesn't approve of the news he bears. Well I can think of no more apt example in Canada than what has happened in these two particular cases in the Courts. I think we have to take, as public representatives, a vigilant and activist approach to this problem; I think that we have to thresh it out; and we have to take measures — and obviously I address this particularly to members on the government side — we have to take measures as soon as possible in order to secure the individuals freedom, not only of information, but of speech in this country.

So I would commend to you, Mr. Minister, that when this debate continues, and when members opposite rise, they should give consideration to their positions in this regard. They should state, for the record, where their sentiments lie, whether they want a truly freer state of affairs, or whether in fact they only want a slightly freer state of affairs in our province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I personally believe in the freest possible access to information. I think it's basic to our democracy. I think it's basic to our personal freedoms. I realize that in today's world, the power of information is very important, and I wouldn't want to see that power of information a monopoly held by large private bureaucracies and by the government, just as I'm sure that there aren't any members in this House who would at this point challenge the secret ballot or other parts of our democratic process. I think that the freest possible access to information is basic to our democracy just as the secret ballot is basic and things of that sort.

I've listened now for two years to the Member for Fort Rouge. This is a particularly important discussion to me personally, and I think I have listened to all the debates on this matter very closely. I realize and I accept that the Member for Fort Rouge has a very deep commitment to providing a freer access of information to members of this Legislature, to all citizens and I can understand his personal disappointment because he's been unable to convince the majority, or even a sizable minority of the members of this House that the particular approach that he wants to use to provide more information, that that approach is a proper approach.

Last week when he was speaking on the Member for Transcona's resolution, I think the frustration and disappointment sort of came out in his speech, and I think one of the sentences that he used was to describe the present resolution and to suggest that it really wasn't necessary, might be a waste of time, he said, "We're simply going to study the question one more time." And to him, the way he spoke at that time, it seemed like that was a total condemnation.

I personally believe we're going to be studying this question as long as I'm alive. I hope so. I hope as long as there's an active, free democracy in our society, we're always going to be looking for ways to provide freer, better information, and make our system more open. I don't think that studying necessarily means that you can't take action if action is necessary. Maybe I'm less cynical than some members of this House, people who have been here for a longer time than I have. But I think we have to be continually looking for ways to adjust what is a very old institution, the British parliamentary system, to adjust it to the modern world.

I personally think that there is an inertia in government, or any large bureaucracy, and that inertia continually pushes towards more secrecy. Governments, large bureaucracies, want to protect themselves. Information is power, they don't want power to be used against them, it's only natural, so they protect the information. And they don't supply all the information that we could, or probably should. —(Interjection)— That's right, open government, I believe in it. But I'm also very much aware of the arguments that have been put forward by the Member for Inkster and the Member for Morris, and I accept at least some of their arguments to the effect that it is possible, in the name of open government, to pass laws which will result in even more closed government. I'm not at all positive or sure about my position on this matter. I think it will become evident as I try to express myself.

Another problem that was brought up by the Member for Fort Rouge, another condemnation of the resolution supplied by the Member for Transcona, was that he said, this will simply become, if the committee is struck, he suggested, it will simply become one more opportunity for the regular partisan give and take. I've been in this House long enough that I've already got to see how things work. I've realized that a lot of what goes on here is posturing, a lot of it is within the partisan —(Interjection)— oh, I don't propose to resign. Indeed, I enjoy some of it. But I don't think it's necessary that this sort of a resolution and this sort of a committee become a partisan thing. It's always possible, but I don't think it's absolutely necessary, and I think, to his credit, the Member for Transcona, when he first introduced this resolution, I think almost out of character he was totally non-partisan. There was very little government baiting, very little abuse of the government, I think he genuinely wanted a non-partisan debate and I think it's possible that we can have a non-partisan

committee that won't be looking for just one more form in which to embarrass the government continually, but that will be looking honestly and sincerely for ways in which we could improve the flow of information that goes out to citizens and members of other political parties.

I must admit that the debate that followed, the speakers who followed the Member for Transcona, at least the ones that followed directly after him, didn't give me much hope because they were some pretty partisan speeches. But I think even with some practice, people like the Member for Inkster and the Member for Burrows and the Member for St. Johns and other members on this side of the House, whose names I can't recall, I think even with some practice they could take a less partisan approach to this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I've already stated that I believe that we should have the freest possible access to information. However, I'm not sure what methods we should use to attain that information, but I am willing to see a committee of this sort established, and I am willing to see a committee of this sort investigate what methods we should use. I'm not totally sure, I'm not convinced that the Member for Fort Rouge is wrong in his request for a freedom of information bill. I've also listened to the Member for Morris, the Member for Inkster, and they have some pretty powerful arguments, arguments that at this point tend to convince me that there's no need for a Freedom of Information Bill. But I'm not convinced that our system is perfect. I'm not convinced there are not alterations we could make to our system right here that would not allow for more information to be released to individuals and to members of political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the government will do with this particular resolution. I haven't discussed it with the Cabinet and with the members of the front benches. I do, at this point, accept the Government House Leader's argument that it's not practical to hold the committee during this Session, and that if you can't hold the committee during this Session, that means you've got to hold it between Sessions, if you hold it between Sessions, it means that it's got to be an expenditure of money, therefore the government should call the committee. I know that members opposite, at least some of them, don't buy that argument. I do. It's to be expected that I would be more sympathetic to that argument than they. However, I'm not sure what the government will do once this resolution is passed in its amended form, but I am very sure what I personally will do. And what I personally will do is that I am going to see the Premier and I'm going to see members of the Cabinet, and members of my own Caucus, and I'm going to urge them to accept the suggestion we received from the Member for Transcona, to accept the fact that our system's not perfect, to hold the committee between Sessions, and maybe this committee should be an ongoing committee. Maybe it should meet frequently. Maybe it should meet on an ongoing basis and we should continually call witnesses and hear briefs from individuals, and we should continually look for ways to improve our system. Because if we get to the point where we're going to accept the fact that you can't release information to citizens, then our democratic system won't work, and the only alternative to turfing out governments that are intent on following an approach that's not the will of the people will be revolution. And nobody wants that.

I'm a big enough capitalist to realize that capitalism and productivity don't prosper in a situation where you don't have order. To have order you have to have a system of government that's accepted as fair by all. To have that sort of a system of government, you have to have as much information going freely and openly to the citizens as is possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Could we call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, before I leave the Chair I would like to announce that the Committee of Supply meeting in the Chamber here at 8:00 p.m. will be under the chairmanship of the Member for Rhineland until the Deputy Speaker returns from an official engagement that he has at that hour.

I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume in Committee at 8:00 p.m.