

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 3, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 30 students of the Manitoba School Science Program. These students are under the direction of Miss Debbie Dylor and Miss Cheryl Sitar. These are my guests.

We also have 38 students Grade 6 standing of the Elm Creek Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Mullaney. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

And we have 30 Senior Grade students of the McLaughlin School of South Dakota under the direction of Mr. Roruig. Also my guests.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Manitoba Committee on Children's Dental Health Care Volume I and the Technical Appendixes thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Tabling of Reports or Ministerial Statements? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if he can confirm that his department is now in the process of investigating allegations and charges of misappropriation of money in connection with the Northern Manpower Program being conducted at Southern Indian Lake, or other programs of his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, certain rumors were circulating in Northern Manitoba in regard to the activities of one employee of the Department of Northern Manpower Corps. Those rumors were checked by the officials of the Department of Northern Affairs and they were unable to substantiate them. In order to protect the Department against the kind of accusations that have been coming from the Opposition I talked with the Attorney-General and his Deputy Minister who said that there was no grounds for them to do any investigation but that we should attempt to get any material that we could in writing. There seemed to be only one source of the rumor. We asked that person if they would put something in writing; that person they had no allegations to make in writing and therefore the matter is in our opinion closed.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to confirm that there have been tenders let by his department in connection with the work being undertaken - that there has been work at least let without the normal proper tendering procedures being followed?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of occasions in Northern Manitoba where the full procedure isn't gone through and I think that this could apply in the case of South Indian Lake, especially in terms of getting goods in before the winter road season ended this year. And we are not aware of any irregularities in the tendering process.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can confirm that his department has rented equipment which has been used by his officials or under contract that have not had the proper time clocks placed for recording of the actual rental time used by the machines.

MR. McBRYDE: Another separate case, Mr. Speaker. Allegations have been made in that regard, we're asking those allegations to be put in writing.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder whether he can confirm that the member, Mr. Lou Oatway who is the representative of the Executive Council in Thompson, has met, can confirm the meeting with the contractors who have been

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) doing work for the Department of Northern Affairs dealing with allegations and dealing with the problems of tendering, the lack of control on leasing equipment, and generally the problems of misappropriation of funds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I will ascertain whether such a meeting took place and whether it was useful in terms of obtaining information of a tangible and specific kind. I don't know what the reference was to misallocation of funds, or misappropriation of funds; it is again an example of the kind of wild and irresponsible and loose use of terms which does never seem to have any substance behind it. But in any case I will inquire to see whether the individual referred to has had such a meeting, whether any useful information has been obtained.

MR. SPIVAK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then if the First Minister would also indicate who was present, if such a meeting was held, who were the people present?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I'm going to inquire as to whether a meeting took place I would also want to know who was present.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. Would he explain to the House why a major portion of the old Grace Hospital has been demolished or is in the process of being demolished; and when was the decision made to demolish it and on whose recommendation was it made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the decision was made on the recommendation of the Public Works Department. It was made months ago I gather, last fall, and was to wait until the spring season.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister explain to the House what justification there was for demolishing the building inasmuch as it was found to be sound, at a time when there's an acute shortage of beds?

MR. SPEAKER: The question with the added words is making it argumentative. If the honourable member wishes a question would he make it direct with no appendments.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The question would be, how did the report that the Minister received justify the destruction of the building when previous reports had indicated its soundness?

MR. SPEAKER: Again, the honourable member is adding an opinion to it. The first half is correct. If the Minister wishes to answer I'll allow it, otherwise I'll have to rule it out.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister has reported to the House previously . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question period is for brief questions to the point. The rules are there. The fact that the honourable member may wish to debate what may have occurred previously cannot be utilized during the question period. The Honourable Member.

MR. ASPER: The question then is, in the light of the shortage of nursing home beds, which the Minister has indicated, was there any justification for the destruction of the building?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if there was no justification it would not be in the process of being torn down. It was done on the advice of the Public Works Department who I'm sure have the engineering capacity far more than I have, and I suspect far more than the Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister indicate what alternative use he now plans for, (a) the portion of the land that is now going to be vacant as a result of tearing down the building and, (b) that portion of the building which is to remain.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that will be examined and considered and a decision, when it's made, will be made known to the public and to the House.

MR. ASPER: Yes, I have a final supplementary. In view of the fact that it is now some seven years since the building has not been used, could the Minister indicate when we'll be told what use this valuable asset will be put to?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it's being used right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. In view of the announcement this morning of the strike vote taken by

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) the employees of Brandon General Hospital and the vote in favour of striking if their wage demands are not met, I wonder if the Minister is prepared to offer the special services of his department in order to avoid the possibility of a strike and take some action similar to that which he took in connection with the Winnipeg Health Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I think, Mr. Speaker, I have by my action within the Department of Labour answered the honourable member's question. Certainly we will continue to do whatever we can in any instance to prevent strikes.

MR. MCGILL: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the employees at Brandon General Hospital have I understand wage parity with those at the Winnipeg Health Centre, will the settlement of the strike at that institution necessarily . . . or could we anticipate that that will also provide the basis for a settlement at the Brandon General Hospital?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question precisely but I think the record of the Department of Labour is pretty good in assisting in resolving industrial disputes. This is a matter of negotiation between the unions involved and two different management. It could conceivably be that a settlement, and we're very hopeful of a settlement insofar as the Winnipeg Complex is concerned, it could well be that the basis of that settlement will be made applicable in the City of Brandon and its health facilities, but I can't definitively make any guarantee that that will be so.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. Can the Honourable Minister report to the House on the experimental removal of low priced wines in Northern Manitoba. Has he got a report from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): I'm not in a position to report further on that matter at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister at the present time in consultation with the Manitoba Liquor Commission to consider removing a wine named "Mateus" from the counter at the present time?

MR. PAWLEY: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker, but I have my own personal concerns which I'll be dealing with.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the Minister is at the present time in consultation with the Manitoba Liquor Commission in respect to that wine that I just named?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was kind enough to distribute copies of his program for flood-fighting and I wonder if he would include just a couple more details to that program for the benefit of members who do get a lot of inquiries. First of all, the location of the office of the flood-fighting plan and secondly, their telephone number. I wonder also if the Minister would undertake to ask Mr. Bole if he would distribute to the agricultural representatives scattered throughout the province in those areas that have been flooded, copies of that plan, the details and the application forms which people could readily obtain in order to assist them in compensating for their flood damage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Right, Mr. Speaker. This document will be attached to a letter which will be going out to all municipal offices of all municipalities that are in the watersheds that were designated as being the flooded areas. And of course it may well be, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some municipalities that are in watersheds which may not be on the particular list, but as is pointed out the Department of Mines and Resources Water Control Division will be adding to that list, or modifying that list as required in the future. Certainly the information as to location of office and telephone number will be included. I thank the honourable member for making reference to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question either to the First Minister or Minister of Mines and Resources in relation to the flood question. In the near

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) vicinity of the flood gate, the question has been raised as to whether or not the water levels are higher as a result of the flood gates than they would have been without any flood control works at all. Is there any technical information that is available and can be supplied that would indicate that the flood in 1974, this year, without control gates would have been as high or higher than it was under control conditions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, that question was dealt with previously. All our scientific information, which I admit I have no way of convincing the people in the area is correct, indicates that the flood levels south of the floodway inlet are no higher than they would be under normal conditions, that is if the floodway was not there. I told the people, Mr. Speaker, when it last came up in 1970 that if they could prove that our engineers were incorrect in this they would have a right to sue the province for creating flood conditions which would not normally have existed, I indicated that I would sympathize with them if they could make that proof. But they would have to show that our engineering advice and the engineering advice which was taken by the Conservative administration when they set up the floodway was incorrect, because that's the basis upon which it operates.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I had a question from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose relative to the number of tons or thousand pounds of chloride that were used on city streets and consequently found its way into the Red River this winter. Mr. Kyle, Commissioner of Works and Operations - this is the answer - that's of the City of Winnipeg, informed me that a mixture of calcium chloride and sodium chloride amounting to between 4,000 and 5,000 tons was used on the city streets during the 1973-74 winter. This covers 12,000 miles of city streets.

Mr. Speaker, in further answer to what the Member for Riel asked me. My recollection, and I'm only going by memory, is that I sent the delegation that appeared to me a copy of our engineering advice in this connection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if the government are intending to compensate farmers who have been unable to deliver hogs for two weeks now and who are incurring extra costs in keeping them and will get reduced returns as a result of overweight animals brought onto the market?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, again that is something that the province is not prepared to consider, in that the decisions affecting those producers are decisions made by their elected board in light of the heavy offerings of hogs for sale at the present time. It is, as I understand it, considered to be an advantage to the producers to operate the market in such a way as to maximize their returns on the numbers of hogs sold in any given day, and that to allow indiscriminate deliveries, as I understand it, would further reduce the price levels in the Winnipeg market; and therefore it is considered to be in the best interests of the hog producers that if there is an oversupply in any given day that those deliveries be spread out over a period of days. But again I want to tell the Member for Morris that this is a decision of their own elected board and they have the powers to make those decisions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister say that maximizing profits to the producers can be achieved by forcing them to feed more than they would normally have to feed and getting lower returns as a result of overweight hogs?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is not a new technique. Having been very much involved in marketing organizations for a good number of years myself, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the Member for Morris that sometimes withdrawal or withholding of a small percentage of product, available product from the market, results in a much better return on the larger percentage which more than compensates any inconvenience or losses on the small percentage not delivered.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister would provide evidence of those great returns that the hog producers are getting as a result of this beautiful experiment in supply management.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Morris alludes to a supply-management

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) situation, which is not correct. There is no restriction on production, and that is by the way perhaps one of the reasons why we have somewhat of a problem at a given point in time. We have an oversupply at the present time right across North America which has resulted in some depression of prices. Let me assure my honourable friend, however, that the adjustments that have been made in the marketing process have at least kept our price in line with the Ontario prices, which is something that has not happened for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, thank you. My question is on orderly marketing to the same Minister. Has the Manitoba Egg Marketing Board requested the Federal Government to restrict the importing of eggs from the United States, and if that's the case when was the request made and by whose authority?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe there were numerous requests made of the Government of Canada for some control of imports of American eggs which are considered to be a surplus commodity in the United States and which are considered to be dumped in this country at distress prices. On those assumptions it was a matter of presentation of the Government of Canada, part of the national egg marketing agency, that something should be done to prevent the indiscriminate dumping of eggs in Canada, yes.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister indicate what share of the Manitoba egg market is enjoyed by imported U.S. eggs?

MR. USKIW: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to give the honourable member that kind of information. I would presume the question would be better put relative to Canada as a whole since we have a national egg marketing system.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can put the question another way. In the light of the Egg Marketing Board's reluctance to see U.S. eggs come into Canada, in light of his answer, could he indicate what action or what result in consumer prices for eggs will be obtained. How much will the price of eggs go up by keeping U.S. eggs out?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is asking for an opinion. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already rephrased it once. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is: Has his department studied and does it have information indicating what impact its actions will have in the rising price of eggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we of course have not made studies of that kind of thing because the practice, Mr. Speaker, is not a new one. That practice has been enjoyed by the manufacturing industry in this country for I presume all of the history of this country. So the fact that the egg producers are asking that they be protected in the same way is not something that should be considered as a new concept in international trade.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister in his role as Minister for Urban Affairs. Will the Minister advise this House what prompted him to reopen the boundaries commission on the ward and the community committee concept report of its findings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be surprised if the honourable member is implying that there ought not to have been some procedure followed so as to enable the commission to receive presentations and views of community groups and community committee chairmen, councillors and the like. So that's really what's involved in this exercise and the Boundaries Commission I believe regards it as a useful exercise to carry out to receive the views and presentations of groups and interested persons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. It relates to the Air Canada overhaul base and there were certain questions asked yesterday in his absence. The Minister of Industry and Commerce indicated that a statement would be forthcoming from

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) him shortly or a policy position statement, I wonder if he could indicate when that statement would take place and whether it will be his intention to bring together the Air Policy Committee, and further whether he is dealing with the question of Air Canada providing an air base facility here for overhaul or is dealing with Air Canada contracting out to CAE.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two parts at least to the question. Certainly we expect to be in a position to indicate the time and place of any proposed meeting that would involve the Air Policy Committee and possibly meeting of the Air Policy Committee with senior persons in Ottawa. That we expect to be in a position to ascertain and announce within a matter of days after I have received a reply from the Prime Minister's office with respect to communication that is being prepared now. I might add that it is approximately three weeks ago that I was in discussion with the Prime Minister and with other Federal Ministers and it's about at this point in time that follow-up inquiry is appropriate. This will take place in the course of the next few days. Subsequent to that we shall know with certainty as to time and place of any meeting involving the Air Policy Committee.

Insofar as the second part of the question is concerned, it's my very distinct impression that any Boeing aircraft overhaul involving Air Canada acquired Boeing aircraft would involve an Air Canada overhaul facility and not a contracted out arrangement because that would involve I would think litigation under the collective agreement.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister a question. It relates to the answer just given to me by the Minister of Agriculture in which he indicated that it was part of government policy to keep the price of eggs high in Manitoba at the expense of keeping out foreign produced eggs. Is that a policy of the Government of Manitoba, to accept. . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The Leader of the Liberal Party has imputed some position on the part of government on this question and I don't recall stating any government position on that question. I outlined the situation as it was today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member ask a question instead of stating something and then asking someone to verify it?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If the Agriculture Minister wishes to change his answer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I repeat, the honourable member creates his own problems by expressing his opinions about what someone else says and then wanting someone to reply to that. One cannot express opinions in the question period. That's part of the rules that this House has adopted and if the honourable member will adhere to that we'll have no problems.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I ask you to consider what was said in the first instance that created the point of order raised by the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I asked a question - Mr. Speaker, I ask you to listen to my point of privilege, because you have ordered that one cannot express opinions, and I agree with you. But I ask you to consider, that I asked the Minister a question, he said words to the effect that it was not unnatural, it was not unusual for the price of goods in Canada, eggs in this case, to be maintained by keeping out, and he used the word "dumping", cheap U.S. produced goods, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: Now having said that, - Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me indicate to the honourable member that one of the other rules of this House is one does not debate points of order with the Speaker on the rulings that have been issued. The honourable member may wish to have an explanation. My office door is always open, he can always come and see me. That's the normal way to do it. I will not accept the argument that he is creating on this floor of the House at this particular time. His interpretation of what he may have heard may be perfectly right and then it may be totally wrong. But one does not preface a question with an opinion and then ask someone else to verify it.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Would he make a statement indicating the Government of Manitoba's policy with regard to the support of consumer prices, whether it's eggs, television sets or what have you, in regard to supporting those prices by maintaining or restraining the importation of goods from other countries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, you have just finished, Sir, making a kind offer to the Leader of the Liberal Party to have him in your office to explain to him the basics of House procedure, and for me to answer the honourable member's question I would extend an invitation to him to visit with me at my office so I can explain to him the basics, elementary points of agricultural products marketing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister confirm that the fluid milk producers now holding a quota under the new system implemented May 1st will lose their cash investment and will not receive any remuneration for their quotas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't quite follow the honourable gentleman. The decisions that have been made with respect to a price increase for the milk producers in no way should be interpreted as having some effect on the value of quotas. The only thing that affects the value of quotas is the restriction on production and right now we want more production so there is no restriction. And that of course has to answer the question most fully, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm that the bacteria count for shippers shipping fluid milk has now been raised from 50,000 to 100,000?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that particular aspect has not changed one iota. The 100,000 count has been there for some number of years now and it remains.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just before we proceed to the debating period I would like to indicate that I believe there is unanimous consent for an adjustment of hours starting on Monday; that the suggestion procedure - and if there is someone who believes I have interpreted wrongly can advise me - is that we would start the afternoon session of every day at 1:30, that we would conclude at 5:30; that we would then resume the evening session at 7:30 and conclude at 10:00 o'clock. So the only change in hours is from 1:30 to 2:30 and from 7:30 to 8:00 o'clock.

Now the next phase of the change is that at 1:30 when we came into the House we would go through the routine proceedings up to but not including Oral Questions. We would then go into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of departmental estimates up until 3:00 o'clock. At 3:00 o'clock Committee would rise, the Speaker would resume his position in the Chair, we would proceed from Oral Questions in the ordinary way, that is we would go to Oral Questions, any other material and we could then move into Committee of the Whole House if we have completed bills or other proceedings. In other words, the fact that we had previously been in Committee would not preclude us from going back into Committee following the resumption of normal business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that to be an acceptable procedure from all parties in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable House Leader will confirm that Wednesday we would start at 1:30 as well.

MR. GREEN: Every day the afternoon session - and Friday we would start at 1:30 as well. The afternoon session. But on Friday we would not start with the departmental estimates, we would merely continue the normal proceedings. But on every other day we would start departmental estimates from 1:30 to 3:00; 3:00 o'clock the question period followed by the normal order of procedure.

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

MR. GREEN: No change on Wednesday night, no change on Saturday night - Friday or Saturday.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of what the House Leader has just indicated is that this arrangement is to last until the conclusion of the estimates and no longer, subject to further House decision? Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. GREEN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have unanimous consent for that and if we do I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we start on Monday by coming into the House at 1:30 and then following that procedure. And if of course there are any unforeseen developments then the House Leaders will get together and discuss it with their respective caucuses and we can deal with them.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that on Tuesday next I would like to have a meeting of the Municipal Affairs Committee. There is one bill in particular relative to Thompson that is desired and I would ask the Clerk to advise any other persons who may wish to make representations on any of the other bills--Are there any other bills before Municipal Affairs?--that any other persons wishing to make representations relative to bills before Municipal Affairs Committee should be advised of the meeting on Tuesday. If we are aware that there - well, Mr. Speaker, I then ask and sometimes have received the co-operation of the media to somehow indicate that Municipal Affairs Committee is going to be meeting at 10:00 o'clock, that there are certain bills to be considered and if the Clerk has any knowledge of any persons wishing to make representation he should get in touch with them. If any of the members have any knowledge of people wishing to make representation respecting any of the bills would they please get in touch with them--(Interjection)--Well there are bills before Municipal Affairs Committee, the Clerk will indicate which those are.

Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 46 firstly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have it left stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 43 and the others, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virден.

BILL NO. 43

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virден): Mr. Speaker, there is many problems shown on the original bill dated 1971 and this amendment to the Act, or this new addition to the Act has got some good points in it and it's got some problems in it. And the nut and bolts of it is that a good operator who looks after his equipment, has good relations with his dealer or dealers has had no problem and is having no problem, but he indeed has to pay for the poor operator or the more careless operator. And I think my experience - while I'm a very limited farmer I've always had good understanding from many dealers, and I think the example about a year ago, the Honourable Member from Arthur and I went down to a place that I had done business through, another dealer here in Winnipeg and I'll mention the company, Robinson Alamo Distributors on Waverley Street, the Manager there, Mr. Neufeld, he was very co-operative. He understood my problems while I was out of warranty and it was rectified. And earlier this week, on Wednesday, I went to that same company in company of the Honourable Member from Swan River. I expressed a particular piece of equipment that I'd got through their distributorship and he renewed the workings of that particular machine. Coming out of there the Honourable Member from Swan River said, well how does this happen Morris. And I said well this is public relations, and I said to the member you cannot legislate good public relations with dealer, with customer in any field and certainly in the farm machinery field.

Now one of the additions in this new Act is the hour meter. I suspect it was with good intentions but anyone who knows equipment knows very easily what makes an hour meter work, it's the pressure from oil mostly and the electrical system and all one has to do is undo the tiniest little wire and your hour meter is not worked, that in conjunction with the oil pressure your meter will not run. So I don't know that it has cleared up an awful lot but it has added to putting hour meters on such things as combines many of them haven't got today. Maybe one day they will have on. So I don't know that that is an awful addition.

The other area is this troublesome penal bond. The big dealers have had no problems. The smaller dealers have had a real crunch and many of those small dealers have been in business, I can think of my own local one that's been 50 some years in the business, is having a problem and on page 7 it says, but the board may in its absolute discretion waive the requirement of the bond, and I wonder who is going to get waived and who is going to pay. I would

BILL 43

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) suggest as the bond goes in conjunction with the license or the license will not be issued until a bond or until a bond's been waived, and would not, Mr. Speaker, the proper approach be, charge a little more for the license and set a fund aside to bond all companies or all agents or dealers as the description is. Not to bail them out, Mr. Speaker, simply to make them equal, because one dealer that's doing a \$3 million sales will get his bond for \$100, another dealer that has been as I said 40 or 50 years may have a real struggle and indeed may be at this hour be refused. This hardly seems fair and that addition of the discretion of the board maybe it would waive it in those cases. But I think one blanket price would be fairer than the one who talks better. Again maybe its public relations with these companies. The big dealers seem to have no problem.

And the entire warranty system today and years gone by, and I can think of the days when the Honourable Minister of Agriculture was over here, and it's one of the few times maybe I really agreed to him when we talked about the machine testing program in Saskatchewan. I remember prior to his years here I had approached the then Minister of Agriculture and I think the price of that hour was something like \$45,000 to join their program but since then it's been scrapped and I really thought that was a pretty positive way because many dealers would take that book and what that testing station showed they sold their machinery accordingly.

The problem here in Manitoba, especially to people on the west side of the province, it is very much simpler for me to go to Moosomin where I'm much surer of getting delivery. I don't have that four and a half percent, machine agents today for the most part have certainly a one-year, and I've never seen a machine that was faulty that the second or third year they would not honour. So what we're really paying of this full warranty as suggested in the Act is four and a half percent and if one is doing a 40, 50 or 30 thousand dollar business in a year that's a sizable sum. And really and truly if there's a way of me wiggling out of that I have no intentions of paying for my more careless neighbour. I think there's room here, and all the Minister really has to do is make this optional. If I want that full three year right down the line I should pay for it; but if I do not desire let me go back to the one, and most companies inside of a motor is two years, everything, included labour and the lesser components are a shorter term.

Another area, I see in this new act that they're now leaving out the tires, batteries, belts, hydraulic components, electrical parts and diesel pumps. So if I have a fault after my year I've got to go and find if it's the Bosche company of the United States or if it's the Goodyear Tire Company, I've got to negotiate what my warranty is. And really should it not stay with that dealership and let him, if he's got 50 machines out and a percentage of them are showing too much weight for a tire if that be the case or a faulty tire or a cord break that he would have more power to do this. This is something the dealers wouldn't mind doing is looking after this because when you look at it, when you take all those parts off and you have your two year warranty on your motor really on most equipment what else is there to be warranted. I thought when this bill first came out in '71 that it was the intention of the department to really try to get at the head office and most of our equipment, a lot of it at least is made in the United States. I can think of a dealer in the Honourable Member from Minnedosa's constituency had a seed drill manufactured by Kirschmann's, a distributor manufacturer in the States. That drill came in, this is a seeding drill and one gear went wrong on it. Well that was not usable the latter part of last seeding operation and it's still sitting there and he cannot get that part, the owner of that will not be able to use that drill and those are the kind of things that an Act should be put the teeth in, that we can get to the head office but not penalize the small dealer and the guy - the small dealer and big dealer. It's the best bonanza and I'm sure if I was a dealer there's enough holes there to make just a fabulous little fee here. But he has got to pass it on to the customer, the farmer. And that's the problem.

I just say, Mr. Speaker, if a farmer does not want it I don't think he should be compelled to it, and add that feature in and you'll soon sort out the good operators and the poor operators, and the poor operator is getting a real buy at four and a half percent; the good operator is paying a hell of a penalty for being a good operator. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief on this bill. There's just one part of the bill that is a little confusing to me. I believe that in this bill it says that it used to be that a dealer who sold equipment, any new equipment to anybody

BILL 43

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) would not be able to take a chattel on anything else in his home. I believe this legislation says that it now applies to used equipment as well. Mr. Speaker, it confuses me a little, that if the government members vote for a statement that says that they cannot take a chattel on anything else when they sell a piece of farm equipment to a farmer, I wonder how the members can vote on the fact that if a person doesn't pay his Autopac insurance on time that they take his license. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief on this. It'll take me about 30 seconds unless I go over all of what the Member for Virden said, and he's perfectly right, he's perfectly right. So I won't go over that. No. I just say that the bill is a bill actually to protect the shyster dealers, and there are some, like shyster lawyers or shyster doctors. And there are shyster farmers. And all the bill provides for is for those people, the government to get in between them. So I say that I agree with the Member for Virden and I intend to vote against the bill. It should be thrown out. It's a shyster bill. It's designed for the shysters. Okay.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 44

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to Bill 44 please let me say at the outset, Sir, that I want to begin with apologies and with thanks. I want to apologize to the House for having taken several days to reach the point at which I wanted to make my initial comments on this legislation and to thank members and the Ministers for allowing me and my party the time to give it the consideration at this stage that we wish to give it.

I recognize that the legislation was introduced for second reading some days ago and that there have been some members of the Chamber, I think the Minister among them, who have been relatively anxious to hear from this side on the bill. I know that he appreciates however that many members of the public, certainly many members of the industrial community, many members of the general labour community are deeply concerned about what is in this legislation. Have wanted time to look at it, have wanted time to study it, have wanted time to refer to various members of the House in various parties and compare observations, and I trust therefore that the Minister is fully appreciative that the time I requested at this stage of the study of this legislation was justified and justifiable. The public as I have said and the labour community in general obviously for excellent reason have a very deep and widespread interest in the bill and they no doubt in substantial degree and number be making representations when the bill goes to committee stage on a number of the provisions contained in it.

I would also like to just take a moment to commend the Minister and members of his department, departmental officials, for the work that they have obviously put into the preparation of the legislation and for the intent implicit therein to improve the status and the condition of injured workers in the Province of Manitoba. That, Sir, is an objective with which my colleagues and I are fully in accord and fully in agreement. That is an objective which we support and which we commend to the support of all members of the House. I wouldn't want the debate to proceed without some recognition of the fact that officials of the Minister's department and the Minister himself have I believe approached the legislation, approached these amendments from that perspective. The necessity is with us for upgrading of pensions and pension benefits paid to injured workers, paid to the wives and dependents of injured workers and paid to the widows and surviving dependents of workers who have been killed on the job in industrial activities in this province. That necessity seems always to be with us, Mr. Speaker, so any move in the direction of improving those benefits, upgrading those pensions and taking into further recognition those needs is a laudable move and one I think that in principle will always find our support. Certainly, Sir, it has my support.

There have been improvements introduced in the life of this - not the life of this legislature but the life of this government which have prompted some criticism in the past, to the effect that they have not been good enough. I know that in 1972 when the Minister introduced

BILL 44

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) amendments to the Act calling for improved benefits I was one who while congratulating the Minister on the improvement offered at that time particularly with respect to widows' pensions commented that I hoped those improvements could go further and that I felt perhaps they did not quite achieve the objectives at that time that we all desired. That I think is indigenous to this kind of a situation and this kind of legislation. I think no matter what one does in the area of improving pensions of this kind there is always going to be a feeling on the part, probably of all of us in this Chamber, that it would be nice if even a little bit more could be done. If the improvements could be a little bit better. But the government of the day, the government of any day, has to work within the framework of a realistic budget and I know the Minister did the best he could within that framework, so I am not going to suggest in this debate as I did in the debate in June of 1972, that perhaps the improvements didn't go far enough. I think that they go some distance, I think the Minister has done well in bringing them along that distance, I recognize that, knowing his feeling for the labour community generally that he would like to take them a lot further if it were practical and viable and reasonable to do so. But the point is the Minister himself has said both in the 1972 debate and in the present debate, Workmen's Compensation is not a welfare program, was never designed or intended to be a welfare program and should not be approached from that perspective anyway. It is after all an insurance program and part of the argument about improvements in benefits and pensions I think stems from the fact that many persons perhaps misunderstand that basic concept. Many persons perhaps fail to differentiate between the Workmen's Compensation program and what it's intended to do and be and social legislation enacted by this or any other government. I want to come back to that point about the philosophy of the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workmen's Compensation program in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say that I agree in principle with many of the things intended in the bill. As I've said, I certainly agree with that part of the bill that has to do with improved and upgraded pensions and pension benefits for the disabled and their dependents. Those tangible improvements, that aspect of the bill, those parts of the legislation before us are good. I'm not so sure, Sir, that I subscribe to the philosophy underlying some areas of the legislation's thrust. I think that on that level the Minister and I will part company and find ourselves on opposite sides of the debate. For it seems to me that the Minister has to some extent overlooked or ignored his own professed interpretation of Workmen's Compensation in some of the measures proposed in the amendments before us.

The measures that I refer to, Sir, are those having to do with the cost and the bearing of the cost of the new benefits being announced. The measure I refer to, Sir, are those which place the onus in total insofar as I can see for the carrying of that cost on employers. In 1972 in the debate surrounding the amendments introduced to the Act at that time, the Minister pointed out very carefully and very emphatically that he did not feel that employers should have to carry the full load and the full burden of the costs of the upgraded pensions that were being introduced at that time. At that time, Sir, there was a program that called for an investment of some 4 or 5 million dollars to support the upgrading. And the Minister on that occasion pointed out that the province out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund would carry the onus for \$1 million of that cost. He said, and I quote from his speech on that occasion, Sir, on Page 2775 of Hansard for June 8, 1972: "Another provision contained within the Act, Mr. Speaker, is a provision that from the Consolidated Revenues of the Province of Manitoba a contribution, if you want to call it that - we'll call it that - to the Reserve Fund of the Workmen's Compensation Act to the degree of \$1 million will be paid. It is intended, it is intended that by the issuing of non-interest bearing bonds payable over twelve years from the Consolidated Revenues of the province annually, an amount approximating \$84,000 will be paid into the Reserve Fund of the Workmen's Compensation Board. By this, Mr. Speaker, we recognize a point raised by industry on a number of occasions that the whole of the cost of past pensions or past accidents should not be charged to industries operating today. Government in its consideration felt that it would be reasonably fair to accept at least part of costs of the provision in respect to past pensions to injured workmen, their widows and the children, to the degree of a million dollars. It is our estimate that it will cost in total between four and five millions of dollars to provide for the increased benefits suggested under the amendments I now present to this Assembly for its consideration."

That was the Minister speaking on June 8, 1972, Mr. Speaker, and subsequent to that he

BILL 44

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) reiterated and reaffirmed in question and answer exchanges and in debate on the legislation that he subscribed to the principle that industry and that employers should not have to carry the full burden of paying for past accidents and upgrading past pensions and pension benefits.

Now, Sir, two years later in May of 1974, the Minister introduces a measure which is as I've suggested in many of its aspects is overdue and highly desirable, but a measure which calls for the upgrading of pensions, the paying of past accident benefits that will cost something in the neighbourhood - by the Minister's own estimate - of \$10 million. The last time it was \$5 million, this time it's \$10 million. With the inflation factor and with the desire of the Minister to make the kinds of improvements we've talked about that's acceptable. But now, Sir, he says that we're going to introduce a program here or we're asking this House to pass a program that will require the outlay of an additional \$10 million to pay for past pensions and past accidents and we're asking employers to carry the whole load. I hope I'm not misinterpreting the Minister on that point but I certainly infer from his comments up to this point that he doesn't envision involving government, that he doesn't envision a sharing of responsibility, that he doesn't envision any contribution from the Consolidated Revenue Fund into that program.

Sir, on Thursday evening, April 18th of this year, the Minister was speaking in introduction of Bill 44, the bill before us, for second reading in this House and he said at that time, and I quote, Sir: "Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the cost of the changes I have described to increase widows and childrens allowances in past cases and disability pensions in past cases will amount to approximately \$10 million. The Act provides that the Board may spread this cost to employers over a period of up to seven years. Costs in respect of new cases will of course be higher than those which are being incurred at the current benefit and pension levels and these costs also will be assessed on employers."

Further on in the exchange that evening the Honourable Member for Swan River asked the Minister whether that cost of \$10 million would be shared to some degree by the province, whether it was the intention of the province to put some money into that program as it did in the previous program. And the Minister replied to that question on that occasion a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "No, Mr. Speaker, the \$10 million that I referred to is the cost of upgrading past pensions and that will be amortized over at least a seven-year period. It will not be a thrust on assessments say for instance for '74 or '75. It is my understanding from the board that the impact on employers will not really be felt for say about 18 months. Mr. Speaker, in reply to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River at this time, the answer to his last question is no, it will be an assessment against industry."

So there's the difference in the two positions, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it represents a complete reversal in philosophy and a complete juxtaposition on the Minister's part from that perspective he took in considering similar improvements in the Workmen's Compensation field two years ago. And I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that it imposes a heavy, and I think an unjustified burden on employers to ask them, to demand of them that they carry the whole load of those improvements. I do not think it is unreasonable or illogical or unfair to ask this Minister and his colleagues in this government to share the cost of that highly desirable program, at least in a minority way, with the employers who will be bearing the brunt of it.

I don't think that the Minister will have an easy time in justifying that position, if that indeed is his position and if it continues to be his position, either to members of this side of the House or to members of the business and industrial community in Manitoba at large. He may not be concerned about that and he may feel that he can fight the thing through and he may have made up his mind that he's going to fight the thing through, and that's fair enough, that's fair politics. But I suggest, Sir, that it's going to be a fight necessarily. If he thinks he's going to get it through in that form I think he's going to be in for a fight because it is not going to be easy to justify imposing that kind of a burden exclusively on employers. I don't think that it's justified in morality whether or not it can be supported in economic terms. The economic burden is obviously substantial but I could appreciate that a government that wished to operate programs in other areas on other priorities could come to the conclusion in its convoluted reasoning that this kind of program in this kind of area should be entirely up to industry and the private sector. I don't agree with that but I believe that economic argument could be made and probably could carry. But I suggest to the Minister that in terms of ethics, in terms of morality there is no support, no foundation for that kind of an approach. I don't know why he

BILL 44

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) feels that government should have no responsibility to share part of this load and that private employers or public employers, that employers in general and industry in general should have to do it all.

He has said as I suggested in the remarks that he made in this House a couple of weeks ago that I quoted earlier, that the program will be amortized over at least a seven year period and will not involve a thrust on assessments against employers say for instance in 1974 or 1975. He has said that it's his understanding from the board that the full impact on employers will not really be felt for about 18 months. But that's small comfort or consolation, Mr. Speaker. Woe betide the employers 18 months from now who suddenly get hit with that additional burden to carry. So I think that the Minister and the government should be reassessing their position on that aspect of the legislation and should be prepared to consider modifying the program to permit a substantial sharing of the cost by government if they wish to be fair and to retain the goodwill of those who will be appearing before committee to make representations on this point.

Mr. Speaker, there are many parts of the bill that I can't go into in detail obviously at this stage of debate but which will prompt suggestions and I believe suggested amendments from us later on because they represent inconsistencies in approaches to employers and leave loopholes and anomalies where benefits for injured workers are concerned. I want to talk for a moment or two about the injured worker and his position with respect to the board, with respect to this legislation and with respect to the Minister. I know the Minister is fully cognizant of the organization that is known as the Injured Workers Association. He doubtless has had representations from them, I don't know to what degree he has sat down at any time in the past and listened point by point and piece by piece to the cases they make on behalf of their membership, but I know that he's had representations from them. They have talked to many of us individually and collectively on many sides of this House and they, Sir, the members of that Association, feel that they have many legitimate grievances and I believe that it is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour if he has not sat down and listened to them and tried to help them work out their problems, I believe it is the responsibility of any Minister of Labour to do that. Surely the Ministry encompasses the whole spectrum of job activity in the Province of Manitoba. Surely it's not an exclusive kind of a domain over which he presides. To be truly faithful to the responsibilities of his office he has to examine all aspects of the working condition in the Province of Manitoba and representatives from all parts of that community. And if he's not listening to the grievances of injured workers, really conscientiously and really in a meaningful way, then he is being derelict in that duty and that responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

He may say to me that he is listening to them and if he is that's fine. I would hope that they will get some response from him if that's the case. I would hope if he's listening to them that he is looking into some of the questions they have raised. I don't know, I'm not prepared to estimate at this juncture to what extent their grievances are entirely valid, but I think the condition of a person's lodging a grievance is a valid condition and it deserves investigation. If it proves that the grievance is unfounded then obviously the government has no further responsibility, but surely the existence in the individual's mind that he or she has a grievance and the attempt to take that grievance to a higher authority for a hearing is a valid condition and a valid situation and should not be summarily ignored. The injured workers, members of that particular association, feel very strongly that the Workmen's Compensation Board is in need of some substantial overhaul. They have some suggestions to make in that area. I, in my knowledge of the field have said, and say again, that I believe the Workmen's Compensation Board is doing a good and a thorough and a conscientious job, and I believe that the officials in the Minister's Department who have primary responsibility in that area are doing likewise. That does not say, Sir, that those men and women, any more than any of us, are doing a perfect job. That isn't to suggest that everything is ideal. They can be doing a conscientious job and there still can be areas of oversight, areas of grievance that cry out for time and inspection and remedy. And the Injured Workers' Association does feel conscientiously that there is something to be desired in terms of the make-up and the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and I would hope that the Minister is looking conscientiously into that grievance.

The association to which I have referred feels also, Mr. Speaker, very strongly, that the emotional side of disability, the emotional effects of industrial accident and injury, is badly overlooked in the legislation that's on our statute books at the present time, and in the day to day work of the board itself. They feel that most of the parameters for measuring impact and

BILL 44

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) effect are entirely physical and that the psychological and emotional injury is not properly taken into consideration and consequence. That it seems to me, Sir, is another area deserving of the strict and conscientious investigation of the Minister. He perhaps can come into this Chamber and say that that aspect of injury is fully considered and is assiduously attended to by the board and by my department officials, and here is an example and there is an example. I would hope he can do this because I believe that the people who raise this grievance are entitled to a responsible reply on that point.

I would say in that connection, Sir, that I think none of us need have any doubts about the responsibility of the Injured Workers' Association itself as a body. Obviously there would be many subjects on which they and the Minister would be in very vigorous disagreement but the association presented a brief on the Workmen's Compensation Act to the Minister some months ago and I have in my hands a copy of a list of the responses that are delivered to the association with respect to that brief, and I would suggest, Sir, that it's an impressive testimonial to the integrity of the association itself. There are many organizations, many corporations, many societies, many agencies whose names are included in this list of responses, and there are many officers of such bodies whose names are also listed here who signed the responses.

The comments in their responses all are complimentary and favourable to the position that the Injured Workers' Association has taken, to the position that the association's brief put before the Minister. And the persons signify those comments, signing those responses, represent a cross-section of our community and for the most part are highly successful and responsible citizens. So that if any of us needs a testimonial to the responsibility and the integrity of the association I suggest it's contained in this document, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Minister has also received one of these. If he hasn't, he is welcome to have a look at mine.

On those grounds I simply repeat that this is not a fly-by-night group of agitators who are harrasing the Minister and his department; this is a responsible body of people representing men and women who have in their, and many other persons' view, a legitimate series of grievances to raise on the subject of Workmen's Compensation, and the whole subject deserves the attention of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has talked about an advisory committee under The Workmen's Compensation Act which will review pensions and compensation on a continuous basis, and will make recommendations to the Minister and the Cabinet. I don't know whether that committee is functioning at the present time or not, the Minister can tell us that, but it's my information that at least up to this point there is no representative from the Injured Workers' Association on that committee and I--(Interjection)--Well the Minister tells me at this point there is no committee.--(Interjection)--I thank the Minister for that information. I would hope that when the committee is being set up that he would consider representation from the Injured Workers' Association because that is a perspective that I think recommends itself to the department.

There are a number of individual sections and provisions in the bill as I've suggested, Mr. Speaker, which I feel we will want to examine very carefully in Committee and perhaps to amend, and I can't go into detail on them at this stage of the debate I realize, but let me just say that in general the overriding effect that one seems to get from some of the legislation is that the benefits introduced by the Minister have now brought compensation up to the point where it's a little bit better than welfare. I think there have been comments in the media generally that this is a good thing, that compensation benefits to injured workers or fatally injured workers' families should be higher than welfare. Well many of us object to the philosophical suggestion implicit in that kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker. We don't believe that compensation for injured workers should be equated with welfare in any sense, whether it's better than welfare, or a little lower than welfare, is entirely irrelevant and in fact it's insulting to the concept of Workmen's Compensation. We're not talking here, we're not dealing here with persons who are on welfare. We're talking with people who have gone out and made a contribution to the community, who have made a contribution to the economy, who are not interested in being on welfare. They are people who are interested in working, men and women who are interested in getting up and going in on shift at 8:00 a. m., or 4:00 p. m., or midnight, or into offices and factories at 9:00 o'clock in the morning, and working and producing something for their families, for themselves and for our society. And therefore I find it repugnant that any mention, even in an oblique way, of welfare should be brought into discussions of Workmen's Compensation. The two forms of payment, the two programs are in no way analogous. We're talking here about

BILL 44

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) an insurance program, not a welfare program.

And on that point, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether in order to reinforce the concept of insurance, and to further get away from the unfortunate connotation of welfare, the Minister might consider perhaps making it possible for working people in the province to contribute in some small way to the Workmen's Compensation program. If some contribution, even of a very small nature, were made by the individual working man and working woman, would that not, Sir, perhaps develop and help to generate a sense of pride and satisfaction in us, the working people of Manitoba ourselves, in that program, and would it not help to generate in us an appreciation of that program as an insurance program that we are building for ourselves. We're not as workers looking for handouts from the government, we're looking for protection, and if it's necessary to develop some kind of mechanism of that kind to emphasize that this is an insurance program and not a welfare program, then I wish the Minister would consider building in that kind of a mechanism. I don't think there would be many working people who would object very strenuously, Sir, to the private and individual, private and individual act of making a small contribution to the program, because I think many working people, many of us here, many of us across the province, are repelled and angered by the general connotation of Workmen's Compensation that seems to have been allowed to develop. And I can't emphasize that point too strongly, that we don't want this viewed by anybody, media, members of the Legislature, employers, employees, men, women, children, across the country as a welfare program. It is not, and it must not be viewed that way.

Mr. Speaker, there are improvements to the Act that we think should have been made that have not been made in these amendments, and once again I remind you, Sir, that we will be suggesting some of them in Committee. One of them has to do with the access of injured workers to the medical reports made on them, by and through the Board. Under the present legislation there seems to be an extreme difficulty facing the workers, or the injured worker and his dependents when it comes to trying to get hold of the medical reports on their condition with which the Board is working. We would like to have seen that kind of provision introduced in this legislation where it became possible and easy for an injured worker and his dependents to obtain from the board those medical reports. There is nothing in the bill that introduces that kind of a provision.

There is the whole question of pre-existing conditions or so-called underlying conditions, and the desirability, in fact the need, Sir, of a further and deeper recognition of the legitimacy of that kind of a condition. Most of the legislation deals with the obvious, but there is that whole grey unknown, unexplored area of pre-existing conditions, physical, emotional, psychological, which had great impact and effect on the recovery of a working person from an accident or an injury, and those pre-existing conditions are more important than that in their effect. They have great impact and effect on the injury itself. They in many cases are the cause of the injury, a working person suffering from some kind of condition that debilitates him or her to the extent that an accident occurs. And the legislation does not properly recognize that state of health or take it into account in the area of compensation.

So these are things, Sir, that we feel are missing from the bill and we want to talk about when we get into the Committee stage. But let me just say in conclusion - and I know I'm down to my last couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker - that essentially we would like the Minister to reconcile the conflict in philosophy which seems apparent now in his presentation this year as compared to his stance two years ago. We implore the Minister to be a Minister of all labour, the employee and the employer. Not just a half Minister. We ask him not to be just a Minister to those who are in the work force but be a Minister to the whole community of labour, and that means both sides, all sides of the working function, the working activity. He can't just take into account in his legislation and in his considerations the position of the employee, he must take into account the position of the employer, and that's the forgotten ingredient in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for--Stand? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the 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.

. continued on next page

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

MR. McKELLAR: . . . and it deals with the new regulations that were passed April 30th and take effect the 1st of May, dealing with the milk producers of Manitoba and the supply of milk, both industrial and fluid, that will be consumed and manufactured in the Province of Manitoba. I had a meeting with some of the milk producers from Brandon on the weekend, last weekend, and they did express their concern. They were fluid milk producers for many many years, and they expressed their concern to me at some of the regulations that were passed and taking effect the first of May.

Now one of the problems I find out, that we can't get those regulations, and I guess even though they were passed the first of May we can't get them for at least two weeks, by the time the Queen's Printer prints these, gets them printed, and we're flying in the dark when I debate right now. But there isn't. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the member should know that every Order-in-Council that is passed is available to members opposite, I believe, within a day of the passing of the order or on the same day, so he should not suggest that he is not able to get his information.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I inquired from the Milk Control Board and they tell me it wasn't passed by the Cabinet. --(Interjection)-- This is a different thing, these regulations were adopted by the Manitoba Milk Control Board of which Dr. Baldur Kristjanson is the chairman, and this is one of the problems that we have. If it had of been passed, and this is what I thought it was, it would have been a simple matter to go and search that out and get those regulations. Now this makes it very tough to debate because I don't know what all the facts are other than hearsay.

But one of the problems as I see it is that while it mightn't mean that much, and I heard the Minister answer a question from the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, where he said there was a shortage of milk at the present time, and one of the reasons for eliminating the quota system, we'll have a bigger supply of milk in the future. Well I happen to be a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those who operated a family dairy from 1930 to 1945 and I know what it cost to feed cows in the wintertime. I'm quite aware of what it cost to feed them, and especially a winter like this. The farmers have been feeding their cattle now on the seventh month at the present time, seven months, and I would say that they will have to feed them till the month of June if the weather remains as cold as it is. I realize that most of the dairy men feed their cattle practically 12 months of the year because of the fact they have to have a feed of very high quality to keep their milk production up.

But on the 1st of May, Mr. Speaker, the quota system is being removed, for better ^{or}for worse—just the same as the marriage ceremony, I guess, for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer, and that's the way the farmers will be. They don't know, will it be for better or or for worse, or richer or poorer? One of the things they do know in the past that when they had a quota system they had to keep their supply of milk up the year around, 12 months of the year. If it meant going out to buy a thousand dollar cow in the middle of December or the middle of January to keep that production up during those winter months, they had to do that. Now I realize that by eliminating the quota system you're maybe going to get more milk but you're not going to get it 12 months of the year because it isn't necessary for the fluid milk producers to produce milk the year round as it was in the past. There is nothing in their contracts, I'm told, and even though I haven't got the contracts or regulations, there's nothing in the contracts that say they have to keep their production of milk up every month during the whole 12 months. Now, Mr. Speaker, what's this going to mean for the consumers of the Province of Manitoba - and I wish the Minister of Consumer Affairs was in here because he's been concerned over the prices, the increased prices of everything, the commodities that we have to buy as consumers. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to be difficult, maybe not this coming year because most of the farmers in that dairy business have their cows bred and they're coming in, it's going to take at least two years before the effects of this policy will be known to everyone in the Province of Manitoba. And they will be known, Mr. Speaker, because if I was a dairyman I would produce as much milk as I could from May till November, and then I would ease up on the feeding during the winter months when it costs a lot more to feed cattle in the winter than it does in the summer, and I'm sure this is what will happen. These will be the effects but they won't be known for two years, they won't be known for two years.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Now I sympathize with some of the industrials, and what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, the new board has been formed, a board that's not been elected by the producers but it's a board that will have control over, and it's called the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board made up of producers, both industrial and fluid milk producers. Mr. Edie, I understand is the chairman at the present time. This board at the present time has no authority and the other Milk Control Board is still issuing the regulations, and carrying out until a permanent board is elected. Now I think what should have happened, and I realize that these regulations are both--I mean the subsidy comes from the Federal Government for both industrial and fluid milk, and provincial, 100,000 a month, Mr. Speaker. 100,000 a month coming from the Minister of Finance's office down there to subsidize the price of milk to the consumers in the Province of Manitoba.

So we have regulations coming up where a temporary board is actually administering it, through the Milk Control Board which has been set up for many many years. I don't know whether this is the right - I would have liked to have seen the producers board elected and given six months, given six months to get their regulations set up and their educational program, because it's going to take an educational program to advise and instruct all of the producers in the Province of Manitoba before they would become known. So what's happened today, at the present time since the 1st of May, which was on Wednesday, the producers of the Province of Manitoba are not aware of their responsibilities, not aware of their responsibilities, and they don't know actually where they're going. I'm referring mostly to the fluid milk producers because they are the ones that are most affected. The industrial milk producers are not affected to the same extent and I understand, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--they're not affected; they don't know yet whether they're going to qualify, a lot of them don't know. Because I wasn't aware of a plate loop count of 100,000 and I guess this is a bacteria count, I understand. But I understand also that 70 percent of the industrial milk producers in the Province of Manitoba will qualify as fluid milk producers.

Now the problem as I see it, and as I know the dairy business, that many of these industrial milk producers even though they might qualify on this bacteria count, many of their operations are not as elaborate and maybe not - I don't know, I shouldn't say they're not qualified to produce fluid milk, but they're not as elaborate. Some are and some aren't; some are and some aren't. So the problem will be, the problem will be to straighten this all out. And I think they should have six months lead time, I honestly think they should have had six months lead time.

Now one of the problems as an Opposition member that I realize the government members have had this information for many many months, but I never heard the Minister of Agriculture give a lecture, instruction, or give a statement in the House here on this particular problem. I didn't hear him give a statement. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to certain things he can tell us all the whole storey. When it's the things that affect all the consumers in the Province of Manitoba, all the consumers, and all the milk producers, then I think he had a responsibility I think he had a responsibility to both the producers and the consumers, to instruct us as members of the Legislature and inform us of the change in policy. He can laugh all he wants but I tell you I won't be the one that will be laughed at. He'll be the one that will be laughed at in the long run, so this is the way as I see it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what negotiations went on with the Federal Government. I was told a year ago, less than a year ago, that when the subsidy went on to the federal that had to stay there for 12 months. I'm also told now that this extra subsidy can take place providing you bring in one board to operate all the producers, both industrial and this is the way, and it had to come in the 1st of May. So I want to know whose responsibility the bringing in of this new program on the 1st of May. Was it your responsibility, was it the Federal Government's responsibility, or was it the responsibility of this newly appointed Milk Producers Board, or whose responsibility this was? And I realize that maybe the Minister doesn't want to answer me on a grievance motion, but if you want to answer me tomorrow on the question period, and the statements of the Minister, or whenever he wants to do it, but I think he owes a statement to the Legislature, he owes a statement to the consumers of the Province of Manitoba, he owes a statement to the producers of Manitoba, to tell us what the facts are and how he sees this new operation and new board functioning.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

I want to also know when the producers are going to be elected on this new board. Is that going to be six months, a year, or is this going to be like the Hog Commission where it takes about two years to get elected, and then you can only have the right ones, you can only have the right man elected. I want to know whether all these men are going to have to be NDPs to qualify as board members on this producers board? Or can they all be Conservatives, or can they all be Liberals, or do you want a mixture of both, or are you going to let the people decide, the producers themselves?

Mr. Speaker, I just want to put one letter on the record here and it comes from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. W. P. Janssen, and it's answering the Brandon Fluid Milk Producers and a letter they wrote to him. I think it pretty well states here his thoughts on the quota system. Before I read this letter I want to say that I don't know enough about the quota system on the fluid milk, and I was always told that the board issued quotas to fluid milk producers, that that wasn't actually an asset, but the fact of life was that unless you bought a quota from another producer you couldn't get a quota, you couldn't get established in business. So what's happened? Many many producers paid large sums of money for quotas which now they find out on the first day of May is no longer, does no longer mean anything. And this new dairy in the constituency of Brandon East, and I don't see the Member for Brandon East. . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the honourable member has suggested that the new price changes and the organizational changes in the Milk Marketing Board, or the system of marketing in Manitoba, had something to do with quotas, and really we have not dealt with quotas whatever. All we have done is make adjustments in the price of milk and in the way it's distributed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me indicate that the Honourable Minister didn't have a matter of privilege. He may have had an explanation. I would appreciate if the interruptions wouldn't occur. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I knew he didn't have a question of privilege because I didn't make a statement that would make an accusation against him. I knew he would say the point of order--all he was trying to do is interrupt or try to hear himself make a statement. But anyway he got his statement on there.

But I want to tell you what the facts are, Mr. Speaker. The facts are that you could never get in business in the fluid--you couldn't sell fluid milk unless you had a quota. It was an actual fact. The only ones that issued quotas were the Milk Control Board under Dr. Kristjanson, the present chairman and other chairmen before him. I know that, and I also know that if you wanted to get one you had to buy another man's contract, like another man's quota.--(Interjection)--Yes.

MR. USKIW: . . . not aware that for two years now the Milk Control Board has been issuing free quotas?

MR. McKELLAR: Well if that's the case, why did a group of Brandon people pay \$97,000 for a quota within the last 12 months, and they live in Brandon East. Did not the Member for Brandon East inform them of this information? Why did they pay \$97,000 for quotas?--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, that's not right. If it's right, why was this done? It was done simply because they couldn't get into the dairy business, couldn't get into the dairy business unless they had a quota, and the only way they could get quotas was to buy other quotas from other farmers. They did that, the Westmen Dairy, an operation southeast of Brandon in the constituency of Brandon East, the constituency I formerly represented. And I know all these men. They're all farmers that went together, and they got a dairy herd of about 350 cows, and I tell you they're not operating at 100,000 this plate loop count, they're operating in the neighborhood of 5,000, because they're efficient, a very efficient operation. They say they're going to have to--their 5,000 count will make it possible for other ones of higher counts to keep below the 100,000. This is what actually it will mean.

But that's not the point. The quota system has been done away with the 1st of May. It's done away with, and I want to read you this letter now from W. P. Janssen, Deputy Minister. --(Interjection)--Well I haven't got a reply. I got a reply but it isn't the one that was sent. . . I should read the letter; I've got the letter here. I tell you, I'll read--what it is, it's more or less a statement of fact with the names there, and it was sent by wire because at that time there

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd). . . was no mail service. "At a general meeting of the Brandon Fluid Milk Producers held Tuesday, April 16th, the following statements were adopted:

"No. 1 - We must continue to recognize quotas because,

(a) to maintain a constant milk supply;

(b) with quotas the market would be short of milk during the periods of the year when production is normally low;

(c) we have been compelled to work with quotas for the past 35 years but even when at times it's become difficult and expensive;

(d) many quotas were purchased at high prices during the past few years, and elimination of quotas will be a hardship on several producers. Or is there a move to compensate farmers who can no longer value their quotas as an asset.

"No. 2. We recommend that the plate loop count for fluid milk be lowered to 50,000, and originally maintained for class 1 milk."

Mr. Chairman, I want to interrupt the statement by saying that the plate loop count previous up to 1972 was 50,000, even though the Minister said it was many years since it was that.

"No. 3. We recommend that class 1 milk be priced at a \$11.00 per cwt. and class 2 milk at \$8.50 per cwt." Now, class 2 milk means industrial milk.

It's signed by about 25 or 30 farmers here in the Brandon milk producers area.

I want to read now the answer on the 23rd of April, 1974 to the Brandon Fluid Milk Producers, c/o Mr. Blake Donohoe, Brandon, Manitoba. "Dear Sirs: The Honourable Mr. Uski has asked me to reply to your telegram.

"No. 1. I cannot understand your statement that we must continue to recognize milk quotas in order to maintain a constant milk supply. Quotas are generally used to restrict production and fluid milk quotas assumed of value because only a restricted amount of quota was available. If removal of quotas would result in a drop of milk production, does that mean that producers were paying for something that they would rather not do? I must assume that producers paid high prices for quotas because they thought that the price of milk justified it, although there is no provision in the legislation to legitimize the sale and purchase of quotas by producers.

"No. 2. I see no particular reason to change the plate loop count for fluid quality milk!"

"No. 3 - The price for fluid milk is subject to the agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments respecting the consumer milk subsidy and cannot be raised to the level you suggest. The Milk Marketing Board has before it a recommendation that would raise the price of top quality milk to approximately nine dollars and a half per hundred. Signed: W. B. Jenssen, Deputy Minister."

According to Mr. Jenssen--well the next letter was only - I can't read it because--(Interjection)--I know but they've changed it in formation a bit, and I can't read it. I didn't get the exact letter that was mailed the other day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, one of the problems as I see it is the farmer, as a former milk producer that we are going to have troubles, but we're not going to have trouble before two years because of the fact the dairymen have their cows bred at different times of the year so their milk production will keep up for the 12 months. These men have a big investment, an investment I would say most of them over \$100,000. And I think that we should look at this before it actually should have been brought in, and that's why I say we should have had six months lead time, not one day or two days. This is about all that most of the people have had, because I understand this new Board which has only been appointed by the Minister, was only appointed two weeks ago, two weeks ago, yet they're making the regulations at the present time for all the production of milk, both fluid and industrial use in the Province of Manitoba. This took effect the first of May.

As I mentioned before we can't get these regulations for two weeks because they won't be printed at the Queen's Printer. And I would like to ask the Minister if he's got a copy of these regulations, would he be good enough to make copies for all 57 members of the Legislature, so at least we can talk and know what we're talking about when the people ask us questions in the country. If he's got a copy of those regulations, could he have them go to the library and have 57 copies made for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else I have to say other than I think that he should, he should inform us if there will be any further information because, as I mentioned before, the problems won't start for two years, they won't start for two years, and after that. That's

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd). . . when our problems are going to start. If I was a milk producer, fluid milk producer, I'd produce like crazy from April til November and then I would let the other five months carry on. I wouldn't feed the cattle, or the cows so heavily in order to save money, because you can produce a lot more milk when the grass is green than you can when the snow is on the ground, and I don't have to tell anybody in this Chamber that. That's a fact, it's a fact of life.

A MEMBER: You have to tell that to the Minister.

MR. McKELLAR: It's a fact of life.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Minister has treated the milk producers, even though he says he's helped the industrial milk producers. He might have helped some of them, I know he's helped some of them. I know he hasn't helped all of them. The end result will have to be proven. The end result will have to be proven. So I will just sit down by saying that I hope the Minister gives us information. He mentioned that we didn't debate this, we didn't debate it. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you, you heard every word he said through your mike down in your office - you weren't in here it was the Chairman - but any question we did ask, all he'd either do is blame Lang in Ottawa for something or blame the Conservative caucus for something they did. He never answered any questions. This is the problem with the Minister. This is one of the problems. He just won't. . .

MR. USKIW: I should like to draw the attention of the member to the fact that the departmental estimates were not debated beyond my salary.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Well I'll tell you what we'll do then, I'll tell you. We'll have the greatest debate on concurrence that he ever saw in his life. If he wants to debate we'll hit you with everything we've got. But the trouble is he doesn't know how to debate estimates. He doesn't know how to debate estimates. All he does is talk in circles, you know, and if you haven't got a story to tell, Mr. Speaker, one of the things you do is blame somebody else for something else that happened some time ago. That's not good enough. That's not the kind of leadership we want in the Department of Agriculture. We need something better than that, and the milk producers are looking for something better than that; the consumers are looking for something better than that; and the members of the Opposition are looking for something better than that, and that's what I want to close by saying that to the First Minister: let's get somebody in their government that can run the Department of Agriculture. Let's get a Minister. Let's get somebody that will accept responsibility, not hide behind the wall, the great red wall. That's not the way to do. We want somebody that's going to give leadership and I tell you we need it now in the third day of May in 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is to go into Committee of Supply.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Highways, Resolution 64(a)--pass - the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did put some remarks into the record and I don't believe the Minister was in his chair when I spoke on his estimates and asked if he had a policy, or the government had some plans for the future of what's going to happen with these areas where the railways are going to be abandoned. Are we going to take over those old roadbeds? Are we going to try to follow the P. . . plan that was brought up at the Conference of Western Premiers in Calgary, or has the government got any suggestions along these lines, because this coming year, 1975, there's going to be many of these lines that are going to be abandoned. So naturally if we're going to keep the economic base in these rural areas as stable as they have been in the past I think we've got to take a look at the transportation routes, and what in fact Manitoba is going to do.

The other one was the petition which I got from the budget people, and I have a copy if the Minister hasn't got it. I could send it over now. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, my staff may have, not the petition, but the question dealing with the road that the petition was referring to.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd). . . They might have the question. I don't have that piece of paper with me and if the honourable member would care to sort of indicate what road that the petition refers to and the honourable member, we'll try to see if we can answer it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Apparently - here I'll send the petition - the department and the government are surfacing the road from 83 up to the Shellmouth Dam and these are a bunch of people in the Dropmore community that have been isolated for years due to the--and they ask if it would be possible to extend it another two miles or something.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, no, I must admit - I don't think I've seen the petition and I would suggest to the honourable member that I'll review this matter with the staff and. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 64 and 65 were read and passed). Resolution 66 - the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Before we pass Resolution No. 66 I wonder if I might just inquire of the Minister if there's going to be any acceleration of the program to provide surfaced roads to communities that may be located off trunk highways, provincial trunk highways? I am thinking now in particular of Highway 424 leading into the Community of Springstein. Now Springstein has been a small community that is now growing in size because of the fact that a lot of people are moving out of the city and preferring to live in these small communities, yet the connecting road from that community to Highway No. 2. has remained in very bad condition. For some time now they have been asking that they get the kind of access, paved access to that community, that other communities are getting. I think there is a justified reason why something should be done to assist these people in this community because of the fact that the community is now getting larger. The traffic over that road is considerably increased over what it was a few years ago. I wonder if the Minister could give some indication, or some assurance, that within the near future consideration would be given to assisting the people in the Springstein district.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his comments and the suggestions brought in. I would say of course that any communities that do not have the proper access road which are eligible for access roads, certainly we will look at in the near future. I don't think that I can give the assurance to the honourable member that we will do it this year, but I certainly will have noted it down and some time in the future we'll certainly look into it and possibly do the very thing the member is talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 66 (a) pass - the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Minister of Highways would expect me to bring up a brand new subject in the House, that is provincial roads. If I'm correct, Mr. Chairman, does it come under this item? Well I notice (a) is Maintenance programs so maybe I should pass until it comes to No. (a).--(Interjection)--Or do you wish to have it now?

Well, Mr. Chairman, from time to time I have brought up before maintenance of provincial roads. In the past four years nothing has been done about maintenance of provincial roads, which the municipalities have indicated to the Honourable Minister that he has neglected, that he has deliberately taken away the one and a half times a week more or less maintenance of provincial roads, and the Minister shakes his head, but this is a fact. The president of the municipalities, rural municipalities made a statement at Rivers last June that the provincial roads - and he wasn't sure about the western area, but he happened to be the reeve of the largest municipality in the Province of Manitoba, and he made the statement there that the PR roads were not fit to drive a half ton truck over. And this is a fact right across the municipalities of the Province of Manitoba where the money has been taken away from the tax base in southern Manitoba and used to bulldoze out bush up in the north.--(Interjection)--No. It's a fact.--(Interjection)--Well I'm just quoting what the municipalities have been saying. And the Minister - H'mm?--(Interjection)--Oh I've got a PR road right through between - 12 miles from where my farms connect or my lands connect. And I dodge them. In the southwest area where we are trucking oil from Waskada, from Tilston, from Lyleton, from Pierson up into the Cromer pumping station, they are using the municipal roads with heavy trucks right past my farm. They're dodging the PR roads because PR roads aren't fit to drive over. This

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. WATT cont'd). . . is a fact. If the Minister would go out and drive over in the western part of the province, and drive over the provincial roads and see the type of maintenance that's going on there, and he has admitted to me, he has admitted to me that it's not the Minister's responsibility, it's a computer that is saying where the maintenance should go, and when.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I was not here to hear his opening remarks because it really wasn't fit to get over the provincial roads from my farm to get in here in time.--(Interjection)--That is correct. But I just want to draw to his attention that there has been - in the southwest area there hasn't been one damn thing done as far as construction or maintenance of the provincial roads in the past four years. No.--(Interjection)--He says no, no. But I happen to live there, and I happen to drive over or dodge the roads, which all the heavy traffic is doing at the present time. Right now.--(Interjection)--The Minister says no. He said to me in the last Session that he was getting on fine; that he had no problem with the rural municipalities. But there is a resolution on the books from the last convention of the municipalities condemning the Minister for the fact that he has not kept up the maintenance of the provincial roads that was promised and set up by the Conservative Government. At that time the Minister of Highways was Walter Weir, and he made the promise to every, and he travelled over the whole province, and he made the promise to every council that the roads would be maintained, graded at least one and a half times per week, more or less depending on the weather. And now my understanding is that a computer decides this. It's got nothing to do with weather, nothing to do with the Minister.

I don't want to make a long speech on this but I want to make it clear that in southwest Manitoba nothing has been done and really nothing is promised. Nothing is promised in this year's program for any reconstruction or consideration of additional grading of provincial roads. If the Minister can get up and deny that, let him bring his Estimates forward, his road program, and prove to me that I am not correct in what I'm saying now.

MR. BURTNIK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we ought to waste time in repeating things. It's too bad if the honourable member was not in his Chair when I made my introductory remarks, or some of the explanations that I have made, yesterday and the day before, so I would suggest to the honourable member that he can check it out in Hansard. I have given the amounts, increased amounts that have been spent on maintenance of our PR roads from year to year and that will be - it's all in the record and I'm sure that the honourable member can read it for himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister that there is no question about it that there's been a hell of a lot more money spent, but where? Is it increased personnel? Is it involved in the 1400 more cars that the government have now than we had in 1969? Is it involved in the 5,000 more personnel that now have increased from 8,000 to 13,000? Or is it on the highways? Or is it on the Provincial Roads? We haven't seen it in the provincial roads, and we haven't seen it in the highways. But we have seen it around this building where you can't get a parking place anymore. Twelve months a year you can't find a parking place to bring your car in here because of increased personnel. You talk about decentralization. What about the building that's going up across . . .--(Interjection)--We understood that decentralization was going to take place in the Province of Manitoba. What has happened out in Arthur constituency? Can you tell me anybody out there that has been any additional personnel? No I doubt if you can.

Oh, somebody has sent me a note. It says "There hasn't been one damn cent spent in Radisson." Maybe that came from the Minister, I'm not sure. Well I just I have to bring this up, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that there has been no expenditure and that's one of the basic tax areas of the Province of Manitoba in the southwest area. It's because of the fact that the First Minister made the statement that if we didn't go NDP out there we could expect to get clobbered. And it's evident now. It's evident now. One thing I have to say, that I must say, that he's honest about it. When he made the statement that we would get clobbered in the southwest Manitoba. . .

A MEMBER: By hail.

MR. WATT: . . . by him, which he didn't. He got clobbered. That we are now getting it.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

A MEMBER: We're getting clobbered now.

MR. WATT: We're getting clobbered now. So if the Honourable Minister would just get up and tell me why there is practically nothing in the road program in southwest Manitoba, except that there was a bit of oil poured on in places in June of 1973, in the election, but nothing in the program now. I'd like to hear from him.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Member for Arthur is serious, or he's trying to have a little fun, or what? But I can--(Interjection)--

MR. WATT: I'm not trying to have any fun.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well I'm not so sure.

MR. WATT: 16,000 people that live in my constituency do not think it's fun.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. It's not a matter of privilege.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I have stated on numerous occasions in the question period, and also in my remarks of the last few days, that we have tried to keep as fair a program as possible spread all around the province, based on priorities and needs; not based on politics. What the honourable member is saying that nothing has been done in his constituency that is absolutely false. I will not accept that because, as I said, it is untrue; it is completely false. Again on the question of PRs I gave a statement yesterday or last night, I believe, quoting the figures on PRs the amount of money that have been spent on the maintenance of PRs throughout the province. But one thing that the honourable member - maybe I should repeat this - does not take into account the fact that some years ago when the government took over the PRs that the weights were lower, at 44,000 and then they were increased to 48, now they're at 74, and therefore the maintenance of course at that time was not needed to the same extent as it is now, and I agree that that is true. And I also said, and I'll repeat for the honourable member's information, that although we have as he says worked with the computer, but I've always said to the district engineers, and I've said this in the House, and I can assure the honourable member that the districts have complied with this to the best of their ability, to not rely completely on the computer but to use their common sense, and this is being done.

I also would like to point out, too, that at times when they do have - and this is very seldom I might say - that we do have a complaint about a certain road which happens, depending on the weather conditions, and what have you, that there is a problem and some of course will phone or write and tell you just how terrible it is, we've gone out and we've taken the local councillor with us, and we've found out that it wasn't really all as bad as was pointed out to us. So we are constantly on top of this, and as I said I've got all these things on record, and the honourable member certainly can read it in Hansard tomorrow perhaps.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Honourable Minister actually then denying the resolution that was passed by the rural municipalities at their convention last year, which indicated, and I'm sorry I haven't got it here in my desk, right now, but I could read it. He knows it. In regard to provincial roads that they have been downgraded. Is he denying they were correct in that statement?

MR. BURTNIAK: I am not denying that they were correct or incorrect except the honourable member knows darn well, and I am not knocking the municipalities here at all for their resolution, I think that they've tried to get as much as they possibly can, of course. I think that the honourable member, myself, and everybody in this House, and all over, would like to get as much money as he possibly can, knowing full well it doesn't come out of their pockets it comes out of the province. So of course they're going to send in resolutions and make comments and say, well give us more, give us more, all the time. Well the honourable member shakes his head but he knows darn well that this is correct. But it wasn't based on the fact that there was a downgrading of the maintenance of our provincial roads. They wanted to have more grading than perhaps even necessary. We found out at the time that their roads have been bladed perhaps at times in certain areas which did not require any blading for the next few days and the graders have gone on there. And this I think is a waste of time but I think where the road is, and it is necessary to blade a certain road of course it has to be bladed whether the computer says so or not, and that's what I say that the engineers in the districts have been using their common sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the department has some responsibilities at the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border to construct a divided highway in connection with the

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . combined tourist facility at that point. Now I don't see that in the highway construction program, and I wonder if the Minister would tell us how much divided highway is being constructed on the Manitoba side of the border, how much on the Saskatchewan side, because I believe your department is also going to do the part on the other side of the border. Is that right? Anyway I'd like to hear just what the plans are for this area and this combined facility of the Province of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

And would the Minister also, if he has not already done so at some time in his responses, give us some idea of the research and costing that the department has done in respect to the additional maintenance costs resulting from the use of studded tires in the province. Have we had enough experience in the Province of Manitoba now to say that the use of studded tires is expensive, is relatively inexpensive, or what? I presume that we've had a year or two experience and the Minister would be able to make some comment in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: On the first question, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Brandon West in regard to the tourist reception centre on the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, the reason I believe that you don't see these figures here because I believe you'll find this under the Department of Tourism. Whatever construction as far as the road is concerned, it will be done by the Highways Department but the funds were provided by the Department of Tourism in that respect.

On the other question as far as studded tires are concerned, I must say that we've had a couple of years or more of experience in this respect, and we can't really say because of, perhaps because of the fact that our traffic is not all as heavy as in some other areas. We have been told by the City of Winnipeg, who apparently do keep, or try to keep some record of this, and they find that there are certain areas, particularly where you stop and start, at your stop signs and the likes, that there is a certain amount of deterioration on our streets there. But they haven't, not to my knowledge, have not come up with any kind of a figure as to what they might think the cost would be per year. So that's all I can answer in that respect, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, then I take it that the Department of Highways in Manitoba has done no research on their own in an attempt to evaluate the cost to the province of the permitting the use of studded tires on the highway. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the department must have had some statistical basis for arriving at a decision to use studs, to permit the use of studs on the highways, and to have arrived at that decision, on the basis of some statistical evidence that the cost was not excessive. Can I take then from the Minister's responses that he has done no research whatever in this connection?

MR. BURTNIAK: No, this is not entirely true. We are told by those who are doing this research that it would take at the minimum 2,000 vehicles per day on a given street or road before they could really find out just what damage, if any, is being done. As I said we don't have that many, if any, roads that carry that kind of a load as far as vehicles are concerned, so therefore we haven't been able to find anything that will really tell us that it is becoming costly and we perhaps should do away with them, or whatever. But as I say in the city this is where they can - they're working on this now, and they have been for some time, and this is what they come up with when I say, especially where you have lights, stops and starts, they are able to determine it because the density of traffic is much higher on your city streets than on our roads. But I would think that just from the information that I have from the department that the damage is minimal and I think that based on our conditions, winter driving conditions, and what have you, I believe that this is probably something that we wouldn't want to do away with for the sake of safety, if anything else. I don't think the costs are going to be that great, or very minimal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 66 was read and passed) Resolution 67 (a) - passed; The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister would care to explain this rather substantial increase in this particular branch. The figures here from the previous year indicate that it's increased from \$3,855,000 to \$7,390,000. I checked back to the 1970 figures and I find out that at that time it was \$1,866,000, which to me represents a pretty substantial increase in the Motor Vehicle Branch, and I wonder if that can be explained.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I agree that this shows a substantial increase. If the

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd). . .honourable member would care I can give some explanation as to the amount that is listed on the right-hand column for this year as compared to the left-hand column last year. I might point out that - I'd just like to read to the honourable member the reasons. I have them here. The major reason for the increase in the Motor Vehicle Branch estimates is due to the decision taken last year to transfer the processing of registration and insurance renewal applications from Motor Vehicle Branch to MPIC. Now the Estimates for MVB for that program were deleted and not at the time be calculated. That's last year. What payment would have to be made by MVB to the MPIC for the processing of registration applications, maintaining the vehicle registration file for enforcement purposes and statistical data. So therefore I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that although it doesn't show here, that since we did not know just what the cost would be last year, but we have a pretty good idea what they will be this year, so that's why we have them listed in here with the potential increase. But the actual increase is not as great as it may indicate here, because there was a special warrant passed which does not indicate that amount on this other column which would increase that figure of three million, eight. I believe the amount of the special warrant was something around two, two and a half million dollars, so that will bring this figure over six million rather than three, eight, five, so therefore it would be something in the neighbourhood of about a million or a little better than a million difference between the figure on the right-hand side and the figure on the left-hand side.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, the explanation is somewhat of a rationalization but it still does not explain why this substantial increase must take place over a four-year period, since I indicated in 1970 estimates it was under two million dollars, it was a million eight hundred and sixty-six, and now it's over seven million. What is involved in these increased costs that makes it necessary for this particular branch to have costs that appear to me to be a little bit exorbitant.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister responsible for MPIC is here and I think he could probably give a clearer indication or explanation on this than I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two reasons for the difference in the increased estimates in the MVB estimates as far as the administrative costs are concerned. First of all, formerly agents were paid a commission of 65 cents per transaction and these were adjusted now to \$1.20 per transaction. Additionally the agents made their commission deductions off the transaction that they did in their offices. What happens now since the agents are paid on a commission basis all the money is forwarded in and gathered at the central source and then the commissions are sent back to them, are deducted on their total accounts. And as a result extra moneys are shown on the estimates because the total moneys are sent back and then they are recouped as further commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 67 (a) to (c) was read and passed) Resolution (d) (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister regarding the Licencing Suspension Board that if a person had their licence suspended or taken away because he didn't pay his Autopac, what decision would the Licencing Suspension Board make when he asked to receive his licence back? Would they decide whether he was a bad driver or not a bad driver because he hadn't paid his Autopac?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister responsible for MPIC could answer that one, but I have been informed that apparently there have been no such appeals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 67 - the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairmam, shall we call it 12:30 at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. The hour being 12:30 I'm leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 o'clock.