

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 38 students of Grade 4 standing from the Ramah Hebrew School, under the direction of Mrs. Ashton. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

We have 28 students of Grade 6 standing from Columbus School, under the direction of Mrs. Breckman and Mr. Burch. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

We have 45 students of Grade 3 standing from Margaret Park School, under the direction of Mrs. Boychuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee on Municipal Affairs met on Tuesday, June 27, 1978 and considered Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Brandon Charter. And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Economic Development met on Thursday, June 15, and on Tuesday, June 27, 1978, to consider the Annual Reports of the Manitoba Development Corporation and Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited for the year ended March 31, 1977.

Your Committee examined the financial statements of the following corporations in which the Manitoba Development Corporation holds equity investments:

William Clare (Manitoba) Limited — for the fiscal years ended December 31, 1976 and December 31, 1977.

Flyer Industries Limited — for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1977.

Morden Fine Foods Limited — for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1977.

Tantalum Mining Corporation of Canada Limited — for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1977.

Mr. S.J. Parsons, Chairman of the Board and General Manager of the Manitoba Development Corporation and Mr. C. Malcolm Wright, Vice-President of Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited presented general statements respecting the affairs of their companies. Having received all

requested by members of the Committee, the annual reports of both companies were received as presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the

First Report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations met on Tuesday, June 27, 1978, and appointed Mr. McKenzie as Chairman. Your Committee agreed that the quorum for all future meetings of the Committee consist of 6 members.

Mr. Art Coulter appeared on behalf of the Manitoba Federation of Labour with respect to Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act.

Your Committee has considered

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act,

And agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending December 31, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Moose Lake Loggers Limited Ltd. Annual Report, year ending March 1977. I would also like to table Channel Area Loggers Annual Report 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance will recall some few weeks ago now that I asked him if he would take under consideration the advisability of making representations to the Government of Canada to protest the rather special arrangements that seemed to be underway with that province with respect to the sales tax treatment in Canada. I wonder if the Minister could indicate today with respect to the rather special treatment indeed, relative to the income tax application in Quebec by the Government of Canada, whether the Minister of Finance has already or intends to formulate any representation to Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, we don't intend to make any formal representation to Ottawa on this matter. I expect that it will be a topic of conversation although I don't know that

there is any significant amount of the agenda devoted to it when the Finance Ministers meet in Winnipeg the end of next week. But as far as Manitoba's position is concerned in it all, we indicated to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa prior to his announcement of the proposed program to Quebec that we could not be expected to endorse the program due to the fact that it was different from and was not an option that was open to the other provinces. Beyond that it is pretty much a constitutional question and we do not intend from a Finance point of view to do anything formally at this point in time.

MR. SCHREYER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's approximately two weeks since the First Minister tabled a letter he had written at that point in time to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. O'Neill, with respect to the Garrison Diversion. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether he has received a reply to either or both of those letters.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, there has been no reply as such although there have been some communications between my staff and the staff of the Department of External Affairs vis-a-vis the letter. I'll certainly know tomorrow if there has been any reply and we'll answer him categorically. To the best of my information at the present time, there's been no written reply received from either of the gentlemen to whom the letter was sent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: To the First Minister. I believe that the First Minister gave us to understand about a week ago that within a matter of some days that it might be possible to indicate to the House an estimate, approximate estimate, of the damages sustained in the tornado storm the other week and also indicate what type of formula response the province might be in a position to make with respect to those who suffered damage other than an insurable type.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first portion of my honourable friend's question, it is not possible at this stage to give anything other than a guess as to what the damage figure would be. Mr. Elswood Bole has been asked by the Minister, by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in charge of Emergency Measures, to assess the damage in a similar way in which he assessed the damage from the wind storm last year, and when that figure is available then we will be in a position to know whether or not the federal disaster funds click into this situation, how many people were insured or uninsured, and then to make a decision based upon that. I would only correct my honourable friend to this extent, the second portion of his question is that no decision has been made with respect to any compensation whatsoever, on any formula whatsoever. We first have to know what the damage was, how much of that damage was covered by insurance and after that a determination can be made. That information should be in hand, I would expect, within the next month at the latest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In the legislation that was distributed yesterday dealing with amendments to The Rent Stabilization Act, the protection afforded tenants that were leaving their apartments only began after September 30th. I wonder if the Minister can indicate what protection is available to those tenants which are not being given renewal of leases as of the end of this month, in terms of the three month grace period, or even more importantly, those tenants which are being given eviction notices presently? Do they have the right to appeal those notices considering that it may be a way to simply avoid the rent control period and to apply for decontrol?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Fort Rouge, the question is rather characteristic of the kind that he presents and involves a number of points. I think, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to take the question as notice and we might deal with it appropriately on second reading of the bill which has just been distributed.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister would reply before debate so that the debate could be considered upon what the full range of protections are so we don't have to go fishing on those during that debate. I would ask then a further question of the Minister. Has the Rent Review Board itself reconstituted itself and rearranged itself as he indicated it would during his Estimates debate? In other words, has the Rentalsman now become the vice-chairman of the board? Has the board itself been reconstituted? Has there been any further changes in the staffing arrangements for the Rent Review Board?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, those proposed changes to the Rent Stabilization Board are in the process of being implemented. They will be in place in time to deal with the matters which we anticipate will be coming up in respect to the new legislation. But we did give notice to the House that changes were contemplated and those changes are in the process of being made.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The supplementary would be to the Minister. If changes are being contemplated or, as he said, being implemented, could he indicate whether there would be a new chairman and vice-chairman in place by the end of this month so that the process of the Rent Review Board could be initiated in that very critical three-month period before the decontrol measures come into effect and so that tenants have a right to make their applications and get the proper information and the response that is necessary to gain the proper protection?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, when the changes are made, they will be announced and our planning is that they will be in place in time for them to deal with any problems which may develop. In the meantime, the board is still functioning and any problems which occur at this time or within the next few weeks will certainly receive the usual treatment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is the Minister of Labour considering legislation which would require an employer to have a vote amongst his shareholders for any proposal by the union that he proposes to reject?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: No, Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Labour consider repealing the law that Mr. Aitken who is now bellyaching and can't handle a strike without court support, which Mr. Aitken says that he is going to go to court for, to require the union to have its internal processes reviewed by the court, which the Minister says she won't do with respect to employers.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, this government has no intention of intervening at this time.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister make it clear that the same laws that, as far as she is concerned, the same laws with regard to the internal affairs of corporations will apply to the internal affairs of trade unions?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that my department is here to see that each side is served in a fair manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

MR. GREEN: A third supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A third supplementary, all right.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that Hansard will show that it's the same count as was given to the Member for Fort Rouge and I'm sure that as the Minister of Labour would want to treat employer and employee equally, you would want to treat members of the House equally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister whether she considers it appropriate that the Builders Exchange

has available to it, when it gets into difficulties and can't handle itself, has available to it the laws of the province to deal with the internal affairs of trade unions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, we haven't done any intervening in any shape or form and we certainly intend to see that there is fair play on both sides and including fair play in the House for the Member for

MR. GREEN: Thank you very much. Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. During the Minister's Estimates he indicated that he had under review the present practice of releasing patients from the mental institutions in the province to various nursing homes within the province, thus creating additional pressures insofar as the waiting lists for those nursing homes are concerned. I would ask the Minister whether he has completed his review and whether he is able to report to the Assembly the results of his review?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the review was undertaken in particular with reference to a specific situation in Selkirk, at the Selkirk Nursing Home, and I believe the Tudor Nursing Home, that involved the employment on a day-work basis of three patients from the Selkirk Mental Health Centre who were being held at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. That review was undertaken at my request by the Mental Health Review Board and the report that I received from the Board sufficed to assure me that those patients were meeting the requirements of service at those nursing homes and were complying with all the parameters of their confinement at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre. The review has not gone beyond that point and no other cases of that kind have been brought to my attention in the interim.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a supplementary.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer but he didn't really answer the question due to the fact that I was asking pertaining to patients released to become residents of the personal care homes rather than patients released to undertake staff duties. I was referring to those released becoming residents within the nursing homes themselves to the extent of some 40 to 50 percent of the capacity of the nursing homes. The Minister had indicated that he was undertaking a review of that policy and I believe he was awaiting a report from the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Has the Minister received the report, has he completed his review and is he in a position to report to the Legislature?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinction in the two cases that the honourable member is making. With respect to that review, I can't say that I have completed the review but I have received a report from the Health Services Commission which would indicate that the present practice is acceptable to the Health Services Commission. The report that I have received would indicate that there are, on a ratio and guideline basis, sufficient personal care beds to meet the needs of the Selkirk community and surrounding communities, but I am not entirely satisfied that that is the case. I appreciate the point that the honourable member is making and I am looking into it further.

The suggestion that came from members opposite that the existing Mental Health Centre might have an area that could be converted to personal care bed use has been explored. It has not proved to be practical. I haven't had an optimistic report back on that. Apparently, renovation would cost a great deal and it doesn't appear viable, but I am continuing to look into this subject. All I can say to the honourable member is I have had an opinion from the Health Services Commission. It is not an opinion that I necessarily endorse. I think it's probably not an opinion that the Honourable Member for Selkirk would endorse.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the Minister refers to the costs and practicality of renovating existing facilities, if within that study and review on his part if he would consider the

costs that would be implied within the construction of brand new personal care facilities, whether or not that cost would not exceed the cost of attempting to renovate some existing facilities in order to provide greater room and facility for those that are awaiting attention in the personal care homes.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I will certainly consider that, Mr. Speaker. I might say that the position the Commission takes is that on the guidelines that were established under the previous administration for personal care beds per 1,000 of the population over age 70, Selkirk and environs are regarded as a well-served region of the province, if not in fact "over-bedded".

I don't necessarily subscribe to that, but I am simply putting to the Honourable Member for Selkirk the position that has been advanced to me; I am looking further into it.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Isn't the position of the Manitoba Health Services Commission that there is a sufficient number of personal care beds in the area? That is dealing with the population of the surrounding area. Now, could the Minister agree that the problem is —(Interjection)— Will you shut-up a minute? I am asking a question. Mr. Speaker, if your assistant can leave me alone for a minute, I will place the question.

Doesn't the Minister feel that the situation is that the people that have been in Selkirk Mental Hospital, from all areas of the province, then do not leave the area? They are admitted; there is nothing wrong in admitting them to the personal care home, but they are admitted to these personal care homes and then take the place of some of the people from the area. I think that's the problem.

MR. SHERMAN: There is no disagreement on that point, Mr. Speaker, that certainly is the problem. I think that Selkirk is in a special category, a unique category, when it comes to personal care beds precisely because of that fact that persons from all over Manitoba, who are processed through the Mental Health Centre, wind up occupying Selkirk personal care beds. And I am not satisfied that the community and the surrounding area are fairly treated under the existing guidelines. So I reiterate that I have had a report from the Health Services Commission, but I want to assure my honourable friend that I am not satisfied with the conclusions up to this point. I am looking further into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I direct my question to the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker. Has the Honourable Minister received any information from the HBMS regarding the shut-down of the Fume Plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for having given notice of this question. I am advised that the Fume Plant has reduced from a seven-day schedule of operation to a five-day schedule because of some technical metallurgical difficulties, that this has resulted in about 30 people being reclassified. There have been no layoffs and it is expected that within three months the people will have regained their original classification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. As the Minister knows it is the departmental policy to require a certificate of safety inspection for all trailers and mobile homes that are brought into the Province of Manitoba for sale. It is the requirement that such safety seals be placed on this equipment before sold at retail outlets. Can the Honourable Minister confirm, Mr. Speaker, whether all sales that occur outside of the City of Winnipeg cannot take place until an inspector comes from the City of Winnipeg to whatever community is involved where such trailer sales may take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, there have been some problems with that particular area and we are investigating the Act under the Mobile Homes, and there will be some changes made.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for her reply. I wonder if she could take under advisement, or

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

under consideration, the possibility of improving the efficiency of the process as it relates to cities and towns outside of Winnipeg, including the City of Brandon, where, I am advised, dealers now sometimes wait many days before they can complete a sale. Even when the sale is made they cannot make the sale because there is no inspector available to put the certificate of safety on the vehicle.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the Member for Brandon East that is one of the reasons we are going into the Act, because we know there are problems to that effect and we hope that it will solve the problems that we are currently in.

MR. EVANS: Well, just one final supplementary. Immediately I am advised that staff will be going on summer vacation, and there is a possibility of no one being available for inspections for a week or two for the community of Brandon and that area, as I understand. Can the Minister look into this matter to make sure that there are people on hand to do this inspection, so that there will be no inhibition on the sale of trailers in that area?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to assure the Member for Brandon East that we will see that there will be people available so that they won't have that hardship.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

-t04**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is in a position to table the letters that he promised he was going to table, in order to facilitate the debate on Bill 25. We hopefully can move on with the debate if we just had some co-operation from the Minister in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a ruling made by yourself last week and I would like the member to refer back to Hansard to that ruling.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister is confused. I am not referring to the stack of paper that he had when he introduced the bill; I am referring to the fact that he had introduced, as subject matter, letters from various organization in support of the legislation on introduction for second reading and we had asked him to table that and he said that he would. It's not the huge stack of papers that I am referring to that he had on his desk, it's the other letters.

MR. DOWNEY: It was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that you had made a ruling on it. However, I did read from two letters and would be prepared to table those for the member.

MR. USKIW: Well, could the Minister then confirm that two letters are the sum total of letters in support of that legislation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated letters of support from other organizations — I read from two — referred to a resolution that I had in my possession and referred to other letters that I had from other organizations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, with a fourth supplementary.

MR. USKIW: No, I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Industry.

MR. SPEAKER: A new question.

MR. USKIW: For the Minister of Industry and Commerce, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: . . . and that is, can the Minister advise us as to the number of jobs lost to the Province of Manitoba due to the relocation of Massey Ferguson's operation to Saskatchewan?

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my department has been in touch

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

with this particular company to see what the exact effect would be. I understand that they are moving their parts location depot to Regina to centralize the whole operation as many other equipment dealers have done and I would report back to the member to see exactly how many people were involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Resources. In light of the significant discoveries of new oil deposits or additional oil deposits in northern North Dakota, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines if he can confirm reports to the effect that the Province of Manitoba is uncertain as to whether to continue with certain joint venture exploration drilling with Shell Oil to Precambrian basement or at least to Devonian formation in southwestern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is referring to an agreement that was in the process of negotiation a year ago, then that agreement was not concluded.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that bespeaks a supplementary question. I'll ask the Minister then if he can indicate today or whether he will take as notice the following question: Does the Crown in the right of the Province of Manitoba intend to attempt to formulate an agreement with Shell Oil or any other major oil company with respect to the possibility of a joint exploration drilling venture in southwestern Manitoba to deeper formation than any of the present currently producing oil wells?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we are not now in the process of any direct discussions with Shell Oil. We expect to be announcing policies shortly that will be designed to encourage the development of oil resources which we certainly trust the province has in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister assure the House that the quality of health care in Northern Manitoba is not presently suffering because of the lack of laboratory services for both doctors and hospitals North of the 53rd?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that that kind of service is not suffering. I recognize there are opinions expressed from time to time in this area and I take those expressions of opinion seriously and I investigate them. I will investigate the current opinion which I presume is at the root of the honourable member's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines. In view of the information we received this morning that the public of Manitoba in conjunction with Granges Exploration have a mine which is valuable by today's standards and which justifies all of the monies, in his opinion, which Manitoba has spent in exploration in connection with its exploration program. Does the Minister, will the Minister —(Interjection)— Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, the professional gave the opinion that that mine justifies every penny that has been spent in exploration and I ask the Minister . . .

MR. LYON: You mean that mine or the whole program?

MR. GREEN: . . . is he intending . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster may continue.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member apparently doesn't have the understanding that the mine at Thompson justifies everything that Inco spent in exploration. I ask the Minister whether he intends to dispossess the public of the Province of Manitoba of their interest

in that mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: First of all, Mr. Speaker, in his statement, the Honourable Member for Inkster may have at least originally left the indication that I had said that the expenditures were justifiable. He then added later that it was the gentleman reporting for Manitoba Mineral that made that statement. And with respect to our interest in the property, Mr. Speaker, the provincial interest has been transferred to Manitoba Mineral Resources along with our interest in a number of other properties, the Manitoba Mineral Resources has been funded to the extent of \$2.5 million for the coming year to handle the interest in those agreements and to this date, we do not have a recommendation from Manitoba Mineral Resources with respect to the find that the honourable member refers to.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, could I then be pleasantly assured or pleasantly surprised in the assurance that the government has not directed, as they did direct the Manitoba Development Corporation not to improve our investment in Tantalum, that the government has not directed Manitoba Mineral Resources to dispossess the people of the Province of Manitoba of their interest in that mine.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the only direction that we have given to Manitoba Mineral Resources is to protect the interest that the people have in that particular property.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines — and the Minister of Industry may have some ministerial responsibilities with respect to the Tantalum Mining operation — can the appropriate Minister inform the House as to whether or not it is correct, the report is correct, that the last offer that the Province of Manitoba received for its interest in Tantalum Mine was in the order of twice as much as the province has invested in that operation since the time it became involved in order to stabilize the employment of 70 people.

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the offer that was received was for \$3.2 million, if my memory serves me right. The investment in 1972 of the acquisition of those shares was \$1.5 million, however, the Leader of the Opposition will also realize that over the years there has been interest accruing so we're looking at six or seven year interest which means that our investment right now is roughly between about \$2.5 million.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the numbers that the Minister has reported but then using his very own numbers, may I ask the Minister if, in addition to that however, there is also a reported profit for the last operating year of some half a million dollars from that operation?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there was a reported profit of half a million dollars for the whole 100 percent, and not just on the 25 percent of our shares, that was on the whole 100 percent of the operations. So with regard to that, yes. There have however, been no dividends paid out to date, and whether or not there will be only time will tell, depending on the strength of the operation and what happens to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, then, could the Minister indicate, at least in a general way, as to why it was, based on his own figures of a \$1.5 million initial investment, value of money calculated over a period of six years, or thereabouts, bringing the total investment in the order of \$2.5 million, and having received an offer — according to the Minister himself — of some \$3.2 million, can the Minister indicate as to principally why the province did not see fit to accept that offer? I'm not suggesting they should have, but I'd like to know what their reason was for not doing so.

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time we felt that it would be advantageous to the people of

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

Manitoba to hang onto that particular commodity, and I mentioned that in my opening statement. I know the members opposite like to paint us into the particular corner of getting rid of anything just for the sake of getting rid of it, but, Mr. Speaker, we are divesting ourselves of the companies that are causing problems to the people of Manitoba, and are a drain on the purse.

This particular company, we did not feel at this time, was a drain on the taxpayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with a third supplementary.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very accommodating. I can wait until tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines. Can the Minister confirm that senior level management at Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited has indicated that there will be reduced exploration in Manitoba by that company this year because of the unco-operative attitude of his government in regard to 50-50 cost-sharing of joint company and government exploration projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: I'm afraid I cannot confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order please. Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day. I have perused the Order for Return of the Honourable Member for St. George, and I have reviewed the ruling of Speaker Forbes and looked in Beauchesne, Bourinot and May, and I have come to the conclusion that the Order for Return is not a proper order in its present form. It's out of order.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I would respectfully appeal your ruling.

MOTION on the Speaker's Ruling presente and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.\$

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day I should like to remind honourable members that the Committee on Economic Development will continue its examination of the reports of the various companies that are before it on Thursday at 10 o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of the Attorney-General.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We have a quorum. We are on Page 14 on Item 5. Law Courts, Resolution 23. 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is one that I raised some time ago and I suppose in a sense gave notice of to the Honourable Minister, and respecting the document

prepared and tabled by the Provincial Judges Association in late September of last year. It was entitled a Statement of Concern and was signed by the then President, Judge R.L. Kopstein, and sent to. . .

HON. GERALD J. MERCIER (Osborne): I wonder Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CORRIN: Could I finish my question, Mr. Chairman? Unless it is a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, it is a point of order. Would it not come under 5.(f) and (g)?

MR. CORRIN: Well, we are now dealing with administration of the courts and I believe that since this particular submission addresses itself in a very general way to the administration of all the courts really, it would be properly dealt with here as opposed to under an individual salary. I mean if we did defer, we would just spend a very few moments together anyway.

MR. MERCIER: . . . I'm sorry. Go ahead, go ahead.

MR. CORRIN: In any event I note that subsequent to my giving the Minister notice of my question in the House respecting this so-called Statement of Concern, that's the title of the document, not one that I give it, the Law Society of Manitoba resolved to support this particular statement in principle and did so in the early part of this current year. They noted that it was of particular interest to that body that the appointment of provincial court judges be wholly independent to the influence and control of the Executive Branch of the Provincial Government.

I might in refreshing the Minister's memory note that at that time, when I asked the question in the Assembly, expressed some concern as to the main thrust of the paper and that was a fairly reasoned argument that the judiciary should be made more independent of the Office of the Attorney-General in order to preserve the important principle that there be judicial independence as between the judicial and the executive branches of government. The paper relied very heavily on the White Paper published in Ontario, that did in fact provide the basis for restructuring of the court administration in that province, and that recommended — and I am referring now to the Ontario Paper — that recommended a judicial council be appointed in order to administer and tend to the administrative requirements of that branch of government.

So I would ask the Honourable Attorney-General whether or not firstly, there have been any meetings pursuant to this Statement of Concern with the officers of the Provincial Judges Association, and if so, whether or not he can now report to Committee as to what has transpired in that respect.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I had one brief meeting very early after being appointed with one representative of the Judges Association. Since then the report is being considered by the Law Society and I believe by the Manitoba Bar Association, and I have advised the representative of the Judges Association that after the end of the Session we could meet and review their brief in detail. There have been no real decisions taken up to this point in time.

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed pleased to hear that there will, after this Session adjourns, there will be an opportunity given to the officers of the Provincial Judges Association to meet with the Honourable Attorney-General.

I might point out that I am very concerned, particularly with the reference to severe court backlogs, which was made in the statement. The judges indicated that this has been caused to a large extent by reason of fundamental management weaknesses of dividing between the judiciary and the government ministry the administration of the courts. They pointed out that this has created an inability to develop effective case-flow management.

I, for one, would think that this is a top priority, given the fact that we do in fact want to maintain the high qualities of justice that have well served the people of our province in the past, and it would seem that the provincial judges bring forward a very valid point. They point out the fact that it is the judge and the judge alone really that is in a sufficiently objective position to effectively regulate and exercise effective control over the action of all the people who come before the courts, and that would include lawyers, witnesses, police, jurors, and so on, and they feel that given that they have that special vested authority that they in their hierarchy are best suited to develop and apply policies that pertain to the administration of an efficient system of justice.

They point out also that the Attorney-General IN HIS OFFICIAL OFFICE, OF COURSE, IS THE CHIEF LITIGANT BEFORE THEIR COURT AND THEY FEEL THAT THERE IS AN ESSENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST BECAUSE OF THAT, AND BECAUSE SO MANY OF THE CASES INVOLVE THE Office of the Attorney-General in his capacity as Chief Prosecutor. Of course, there are private prosecutions which constitute a very small minority of cases before that court, but by and large

those courts are heavily burdened by actions initiated on the information of the Attorney-General's Department.

They point out that they feel very uncomfortable with the present situation whereby they are closely regulated respecting both their salaries and other employment benefits such as pension, in making any reference or recommendation respecting working standards for the administration of their courts.

So I would ask — I suppose it would be proper to ask the Attorney-General whether he, too, having had the opportunity to hear these concerns, and, of course, read the report previously himself I am sure — whether he too shares my concern in this respect, and whether this will be a matter which he will attempt to remedy and rectify when he deliberates with the judges.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concerns raised by the honourable member and by many of the comments made in that particular brief, and I can only at this time again undertake to the honourable member that I will be meeting and reviewing in detail the submission of the Judges Association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to only deal with one aspect of the brief, and that is in connection with the pension benefits. I do believe that we have been generally reasonable in connection with the salary benefits — if there is a comparison made — salary benefits provincial judges and senior members of the Department of the Attorney-General. Now I don't believe that our salary range for provincial judges can reach beyond the salary received by the Deputy Minister, if I might say, or the Associate Deputy Minister. I do believe the salary range has to be comparable.

There is one area, however, that I have some sympathy with — and I would like to also add that I have never found that salary was a problem in obtaining good provincial judges. I know that speaking for the appointments majoring during the particular tenure of office of 1973-77, I believe that the present Attorney-General would have to acknowledge, were of good calibre and certainly not one of them, I can say, was principally concerned about salary. They were anxious to accept the appointment so that they could provide a service through the role of being a provincial judge.

Pensions, however, I do believe is a problem, because so many of those that accept the appointment are already generally well into their 40s, 50s, not too many years left of service and the existing pension plan of the Civil Service generally is geared to one that joins the Civil Service young in years with many years left to serve. So to some extent the pension benefits received by the provincial judges are not really adequate, and I would ask the Attorney-General if he would pay some special attention to possibly looking at the pension plan system that is in effect for provincial judges, not necessarily slavishly tying himself to the Civil Service plan. We had it under review in 1976-77. I was not satisfied that we had brought it to a successful completion, and I think here probably certainly more than the salary range, there is a need for major improvement.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the views of the honourable member that it is a serious matter to be dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: A supplementary to the position and statement and the question made by my honourable colleague from Selkirk. I too would like to express my concern about the pension plans accorded to provincial court judges. I think that the Statement of Concern adequately sums up the problem. It points out that the very nature of the plan is, in fact, a deterrent to the experienced practitioner. In other words, the more experienced practitioner having to enter into judicial service at a time in his life when he is professionally quite mature would be penalized as a result of having to take a very small pension if he were to make an election to serve in that capacity.

Some statistics which I think bear consideration and I bring to the Honourable Minister's attention are those pertaining to provincial judges that would be appointed very late in their career. I note that right now there is an indication that a provincial judge would require a minimum of approximately 36 years of service to become entitled at the mandatory retirement age of 65 to a full pension. This, as I am sure the Honourable Minister will appreciate, is in most cases a virtual impossibility. Very few people of that sort of capacity are going to be able to fulfill that particular requirement is just not practical. That, I think, would effectively mean that a lawyer would have to be appointed a provincial judge by the age of 29 years of age, which would entail his or her being appointed only some 4 or 5 years out of law school normally, and that as a matter of practice would not

serve the judicial system and would be, I think, highly irregular.

So, given the fact that these people are being asked to make this sort of very significant contribution, and given the fact that may deter very capable and qualified practitioners from entering into the judicial service, I would strongly support the position taken by my colleague from Selkirk and ask that the — and the position taken by the Honourable Minister — and ask that the Minister give early consideration to revising that particular aspect of judicial remuneration employment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can't find any specific place in which to ask this question, and I may be out of order under this particular area and maybe the Minister then can advise me of such. But in previous years we have had a particular problem of arrested persons being on remand for a great length of time, and this has always been of considerable concern to myself and I am sure to a lot of other people. We have had people being on remand for as long as 18 months and sometimes even longer than that. I am wondering whether this situation has been corrected as yet or whether we have any people being on remand for that long a period of time?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any situation where a person has been on remand for 18 months. The current backlog of cases is approximately 6 months. Under The Bail Reform Act, an application can be made for bail. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if the member has a specific case or cases that he is concerned about. Perhaps he could mention them to me privately and we can make enquiries, because I too would be — I am sure all members of the committee would be very concerned if that were the situation.

MR. BROWN: I don't have any specific cases at the present time, but I know that this was the situation a couple of years ago, where this would happen from time to time, and I was just wondering whether this was still happening. But if the Minister is not aware of any situations such as this, then I am very pleased to hear this.

MR. CHAIRN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do have to speak to the honourable member's suggestion that this was a practice or it happened two years ago, because certainly I must say that I am not aware of any situations such as that during the period that certainly I held responsibility for, the department 1973-77. Again I say if there is particulars one would want to hear of those particulars, but to my knowledge there was never any such situation two or three years ago, and if the member is suggesting that there has been some point in the past where this was the practice, I must categorically deny that to the member. I think to the member I should suggest to him that sometimes remands are lengthy, but it is not always due to the Crown or backlog, it is often because remands are requested by defence counsel, and so it is a two-way street, where defence counsel keeps seeking remands. It is also my understanding that anyone that has not been successful in obtaining bail, that their case will be brought on earlier, earlier than the one that has obtained bail, so that there is no unnecessary delay in hearing the case simply because an accused has failed in his or her attempts to obtain bail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: That was my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that it was the counsel that were deferring cases from time to time, and these people were remaining on remand for quite a long period of time from time to time. I think that there possibly should be a limit on how these cases could be deferred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Attorney-General wish to comment? The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: What the member is indicating does remind me of a situation, when he says counsel kept remanding, is that there was a problem and I suppose it continues to exist as a problem, where a few lawyers who held the bulk of the Legal Aid business in the province, were compelled, due to the pressures upon them, to constantly remand cases, remand, remand, remand, to the extent that it caused, according to information that was given out by court officials, it caused a great deal of difficulty in having the cases dealt with as they ought to have been dealt with, because possibly ten lawyers commanded the attention of most of the criminal cases that were covered by Legal Aid, and I think that was a problem and it continues to this day. I suspect the Attorney-General would have to respond to that as a problem. I don't believe that at any time would the remands

have been such as to extend beyond a six-month period, I would think at the very most.

I would like to, and I know we covered this to some extent last night, but the pre-trial examinations — I am trying to recall whether the Minister indicated there would be an extension of the pre-trial hearings outside of the City of Winnipeg and the principle of the pre-trials would be extended elsewhere in the province.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the real backlog, of course, occurs in the City of Winnipeg. It was started off on a half-day trial period. It has been expanded to a full day per week, and may very likely in the future be expanded even further within the city limits. It is not contemplated at this point in time that it will be expanded outside of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: My question actually may well be — you know I have reviewed the various items — I think I better direct my question through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister now. It deals again with something that was broached initially in the Legislature. It was the question of provision of translation services or services — bilingual, I think would be better — bilingual court services in our courts. This was, I believe, originally raised by my colleague from St. Boniface on April 6th. This was in response to an announcement by the Federal Government that they were at that time considering the possibility of allowing, through their financial resources, bilingual services throughout the country, subject of course to the approval of the individual provincial jurisdictions.

At that time the Honourable Attorney-General indicated to my friend that he was not sure that this would happen in Manitoba, that Manitoba would, in fact, accede to the federal blandishment and allow bilingual services to go forward. I think this was possibly as a result of a misunderstanding, but that was certainly the interpretation that was made by my colleague from St. Boniface.

I was wondering whether there is any further information in that regard that could be relayed to committee at this point?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what I indicated was that there were certain administrative and additional costs involved in the implementation of a bilingual court system. It is to be a subject to be discussed during the next few days at an Attorney-Generals' Conference in Edmonton. I understand the bill is being passed by the House of Commons and we were assured at one point in time that we would have an opportunity to discuss the administrative problems and the question of cost with the Federal Government officials, and some discussions have already taken place. But the matter will be discussed further this week at the Attorney-Generals' Conference.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, thank you. In supplementary, Mr. Chairman, on April 6th the Honourable Minister in the Legislature did accept and undertook to file with the Assembly certain information in this respect. I posed questions at that time asking that. . .

MR. MERCIER: I answered those question. Perhaps the member was not present, Mr. Chairman, but I did answer those questions and we could undertake to look back and look up Hansard for him.

MR. CORRIN: Well, that is very nice and I certainly apologize, Mr. Chairman, if I wasn't present for the grand pronouncement, but perhaps the Minister in his wisdom can provide us with the figures again, just to assist those other members that may not have been present.

MR. MERCIER: We don't have the detailed reports; we will have to approximate the answers to those questions, but the answer covered the past two years and generally the number of instances in which interpreters were required. If I recollect correctly, we were talking about approximately 20 interpreters per year and the question related to the number of times interpreters were required for French-speaking people. I believe the information was that in one of those years it was required twice for French-speaking people and once in the other year for French-speaking people, and in all the other instances they were for other languages than French. —(Interjection)— We'll check Hansard, look back in Hansard and attempt to find the answer to that question for the honourable member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CORRIN: And most important of all, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know at that time whether the costs of those translation services were borne by the Minister's department or by the private citizen..

MR. MERCIER: They were borne by the department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CORRIN: That would include —(Interjection)— There seems to be a conflict in opinion; one of the Honourable Minister's colleagues is of the impression that it was by the individual citizen. I must say that I was of the impression . . .

MR. MERCIER: No, the fact of the answer I indicated was we were not aware of the number of cases where interpreters were employed by private individuals. These would be prosecutions.

MR. CORRIN: I was going to ask, then, whether or not the Minister was making a policy announcement to the effect that heretofore all citizens who necessarily must avail themselves, or feel they must necessarily avail themselves of interpretation services because of linguistic difficulties, could, when appearing in cases before our Provincial Judges' Courts, have those fees necessarily entailed by the retention of a translator or interpreter borne by the Department of the Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: I'm not sure I picked up the full question, Mr. Chairman. But in a criminal case the Crown has to be sure that an accused person understands the proceedings against him and that in essence is the rationale for the Crown having to incur the cost of the interpreter.

MR. CORRIN: I see. And would that extend and apply to witnesses and people who appeared, perhaps as a result of being summonsed to court by the accused?

MR. MERCIER: A witness called by the accused?

MR. CORRIN: By the accused, yes.

MR. MERCIER: Certainly it would apply to a witness called by the Crown. My understanding is that if notice is given to the Crown attorney by an accused's lawyer that an interpreter is required, the Crown will attempt to provide one.³

MR. CORRIN: That, then, is a matter of policy, that the Crown, you said, will attempt — I'm just trying to be more precise — will in fact and indeed make provision for the retention of these individuals and pay them from the government's purse?

MR. MERCIER: That's been the practice. We're talking about instances of approximately 20 times per year in each of the last two years.

MR. CORRIN: I was concerned, Mr. Chairman, because I thought that some people might be discouraged in their defence because they possibly couldn't afford to retain the services of interpreters to appear on behalf of themselves in the court proceedings, and I am quite pleased to hear that it is in fact the practice and will continue to be the practice that the Attorney-General will offer to accused people the opportunity to avail themselves of the services of interpreters, should their counsel or themselves deem that to be necessary.

A supplementary, Mr. Chairman, I think that probably I would have to recommend, in view of this revelation I was unaware of, frankly, beforehand, that the Honourable Minister is sure that his department sent a memorandum to the Manitoba Law Society and Legal Aid and other bodies representative of practising lawyers in the province in order to advise them of the existence of this policy in order that they can assure that their clients take full advantage thereof.

MR. MERCIER: I have noted the concern of the honourable member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass.
The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Perhaps I should have put more of the interrogatory into the question, the interrogative — will the Minister issue such a memorandum to bodies representative of the profession in order that they can be apprised of this policy?

MR. MERCIER: Well, perhaps we can, Mr. Chairman, undertake to review the matter to determine if there is any necessity to do that. If the honourable member was aware of any complaints or any situations that he felt someone had suffered a hardship of as a result of the policy in the department, perhaps it would be necessary.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I misunderstood the Minister, but I was sure, and I am certain the record will disclose, that the Minister indicated that this was a matter of practice in our courts right now and I indicated quite candidly that I was not aware of that but I was pleased to hear it, and if that were the case I would think that it would serve the ends of justice that bodies representative of practising lawyers be made aware of this internal regulatory policy in order that our people, the citizens of the province appearing before the courts, could avail themselves of the opportunity to obtain free translation services through the auspices of the Minister and his department. I simply asked him whether he would be willing to confirm this policy by way of a memorandum to the Law Society and other bodies representative of lawyers, the Manitoba Trial Lawyers Association, Legal Aid Lawyers Association.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that I have noted the concern of the member; we will make enquiries as to whether or not it is necessary to send a memorandum out. If it is, I am prepared to do that, but I am not prepared to commit myself here and now to sending out a memorandum when it may in fact not be necessary.

MR. CORRIN: I was wondering, perhaps — supplementary again, Mr. Chairman — perhaps the Minister could issue an Information Services release? I would say that I've seen far less important things sent out under the cover of Information Services releases and I would think that a matter so fundamental to the administration of justice in the province should receive at least equal priority, and I'm sure that the Information Services people with the resources available to them could prepare such a dispatch quite economically and cheaply and distribute it efficiently to all the various parties to which it might be of some interest.

MR. MERCIER: I might even go further than that and take out an ad in the Free Press.

MR. CORRIN: Did you invite me to — excuse me, was that an invitation for me to take out an ad in the Free Press?

MR. MERCIER: No, I might.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass, 5.(b) Court of Appeal—pass; (b)(1), (b)(2)—pass; 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass; 5.(d) County Courts, (1)—pass; (2)—pass; 5.(e)(1)—pass; 5.(e)(2) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: I would just like to bring up one small matter to try to get the Minister's opinion on. It has to do with (b), (c), (d) and (e), which I understand are federally appointed judges that function in these particular courts, others there are provincial judges.

During some research that I have been doing on the electoral system in Manitoba, I find that provincial judges are entitled to vote in provincial elections, but that federally appointed judges are not.

I would like to ask the Minister, given the similarity in function between these two types of judges, can the Minister tell the committee whether this state of affairs will continue whereby federally appointed judges are lumped in with inmates in jails and people deprived by means of mental incompetence from being able to vote in provincial elections?

MR. MERCIER: Well, I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's research into this particular area. I, in fact, wasn't aware of the discrepancy between federal judges not being allowed to vote and provincial judges being allowed to vote, and is something that could be reviewed in a review of The Election Act, which I hope will be done in the next two or three years.

MR. WALDING: Can the Honourable Minister suggest any reason why this should be in effect?

MR. MERCIER: The provincial judges — this would be a provision of The Elections Act I take it, not the Provincial Judges Act. I can't. I haven't been here for the past eight years. In fact, that may even be a stipulation of the time before the past eight or nine years, but I am not aware of the rationale for it.

MR. WALDING: It is probably a very old provision in that Act, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to give it some thought and possibly recommend to his colleagues that a change be made in The Elections Act to take federally appointed judges out of the particular company they

appear to be in in the The Elections Act.

MR. MERCIER: Or put the provincial judges in that company ' I suppose.

MR. WALDING: I wouldn't want to wish that on the judges.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the member that there should be some consistency, either all of them should be entitled to vote or all of them not entitled to vote, and I will review that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mine is not on that same particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, possibly the whole area of the role of the provincial judges should be reviewed again in the light of the change that was made by the previous government in regard to tenure. The police magistrates in the past were people who were free to practice law as they saw fit, and were called upon to act in provincial courts. They didn't have tenure, they were subject to the whim of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, as I recall it. Now there has been a change made, and possibly the entire question should be reviewed. What about the question of the practice of law?

A federally appointed judge does not have the right to practice law, as I recall it. The provincial judge may, and, of course, we have part-time judges in provincial courts, which we don't have in the federally appointed judges, except, I think a judge who has retired may be recalled to act.

So possibly this is the time, if the Attorney-General ever can get a Chairman of the Law Reform Commission functioning, he may well undertake a study of this, and I think the point made by Mr. Walding can well be worth reviewing, and the whole field of the differences between the two types of judges. Then I think there would have to be a review of the problem of part-time judges, and I don't know the extent to which a provincially appointed judge may practice, or what are the limitations on his practice. I assume there must be some, I don't suppose a provincially appointed judge may act in a provincial court, although I am not really sure of that. Possibly the Attorney-General could clarify that.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think the whole subject matter — and the Honourable Member for St. Johns I don't believe was here earlier when the Member for Wellington and the Member for Selkirk raised the brief of the Provincial Judges Association which concerns itself with some of the matters raised by the Member for St. Johns.

They, in fact, in that brief, if I am correct, and it has been some time since I looked at it, do point out, however, that they are not of the view that they do have full tenure and that it is possible under the provisions of the legislation for them to be removed. That is one aspect of the brief that they do point out. But I am certainly prepared to initially, as I indicated to the other committee earlier, review the brief with the Judges Association as early after the end of the Session as possible. It may be that a review with them could result in a reference to the Law Reform Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe if I recall correctly that their concern about tenure related to the ability that the Chief Provincial Judge had in determining the extent to which a part-time judge might serve, the extent to which that provincial part-time judge might be called upon to serve in the various courts, to the extent that a part-time judge, in fact, might be called not at all.

I would like to have the Attorney-General's views insofar as the further appointment of part-time provincial judges. The Provincial Judges Association has questioned the wisdom, I believe, of continued appointment of part-time provincial judges and I know that on the other hand there is another view that can be expressed as to the wisdom of appointing part-time provincial judges. So I would like to know just what direction the present Attorney-General intends to take us insofar as the appointment of part-time provincial judges.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it is probably somewhat premature to make any finalized statements with respect to that matter, but as the member is aware, there have been concerns expressed by

members of the profession that on one day they are appearing before a part-time judge and the next day they may have a matter dealing with that part-time judge in his capacity as a private lawyer, and some questions have been raised as to the difficult position that some people feel they may be put in as a result of that. At the same time, I believe the member would agree that in order to cover off periods of vacation, perhaps special court sittings, it is economical to have part-time judges available to sit part of the time, rather than to have a full-time judge not sitting full time. And, therefore, when it gets to the point, I believe, when part-time judges are sitting to the extent that it covers a full year, then obviously it's probably time to appoint another full-time judge. I believe that that's basically the extent to which part-time judges should be appointed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I feel, Mr. Chairman, that I should join this particular aspect of the debate, because I think the — I don't think we're losing sight of the principle. As a matter of fact, I think the Attorney-General has put his finger right on one of the most important aspects of this problem, and that is the essential conflict which arises not only, as he has related, between members of the bar, where two practicing lawyers may one day be dealing with one another respecting a matter of mutual concern, and the next day — and that I might point out, very often involving extensive negotiation and the need for clearly defined interests as between the clients — and the next day, the same lawyers may find themselves facing each other, one is judge of the cause, and the other one is advocate. This is a very very difficult situation for two members of the bar to be in. I don't think it's wholesome and I certainly don't think that it's one that would be supported by any part-time judge. I'm sure that if we were to poll them on this question that they probably would feel as uneasy about it as would members of the bar who do not have such appointments.

I should also point out that I'm most concerned in this regard because as I mentioned earlier, the chief litigant in the Provincial Judges' Courts, is the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General still has extensive control over appointments of judges, full-time appointments, salaries, pensions, and I'm quite concerned about the possibility of judges feeling that they're under undue pressures or strain, some sort of duress to please or satisfy the Minister or his government, although I'm sure that that would not be the intention of the Minister. I'm sure the Minister would look equanimously upon bad judgments or judgments against his department by part-time judges, and I'm sure he would in no way hold or bear any grudges against part-time judges who made such findings in their courts.

I'm concerned that people not be put in that position. I think the overriding principle has to be that of judicial independence, and that's obviously necessary for the protection of the interests of our people. We're getting into very perilous straits indeed when we have judges enjoying this sort of special tenure, quasi-tenure, at the will and pleasure of the government through the office of the Attorney-General. I don't believe that it's a factor which would affect impartiality, frankly I can't see an individual appointed to the bench who would allow that to weigh against his or her objectivity or impartiality, but I think one has to put this matter as it were on the table, and just thoroughly air it, in order to consider all the possibilities. They may not be probabilities, but there are certain and wholesome possibilities. I would think that speedy action is required in order to make some deliberate public policy in this particular area.

Perhaps I can ask again whether the Attorney-General, when he has the meeting he referred to after the Session with the officers of the Provincial Judges Association, will put this matter on the agenda in order that it can be thoroughly aired and discussed as between them, and perhaps, whether he would make a commitment to bring some definitive policy back to members of the Assembly and this committee, in the next session of the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(e)(2)—pass — the Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the whole brief of the Judges Association would be a subject matter for discussion, of which this forms a part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(e)(2)—pass; 5.(f) Provincial Judges' Courts (Criminal Division): 5.(f)(1)—pass; 5.(f)(2)— the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, I want to speak on (g), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(f)(2)—pass; 5.(g) Provincial Judges' Courts (Family Division): (1) Salaries — the Member for Selkirk then the Member for Wellington.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems that we faced, I think, insofar as the Provincial

Judges' Courts Family Division is concerned in the City of Winnipeg is the location of the court, out in Tuxedo. Certainly I was never happy with it and as a result of that unhappiness a court was established in the north end of Winnipeg in order to deal with the most extreme inconvenience that had been caused by the locating of the family court in Tuxedo.

I remember before the locating of the family court in north Winnipeg, instances were given to me of mothers who would have to sometimes travel by bus and transfer and re-transfer, sometimes taking an hour-and-a-half, two hours to reach the Tuxedo family court. I think the north end office minimized some of that inconvenience but I know that certainly I had hoped that in some way we would be able to locate more central courts, court facilities, because the bus connections are not good in Tuxedo. It's difficult to locate the court. It's not located in relationship to the geographic concentration of cases and seemed always that it would be beneficial to relocate family court somewhere in the central part of Winnipeg.

I'm wondering, (a), if the Attorney-General shares that view; (b), if so, if there is any effort being made to ascertain an alternative location?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I share the view that the present family court is badly located, that of course has gone on for some time. I don't remember when the family court started there but certainly I share the view that the location is not very accessible to all of the people of Winnipeg. It's not a central location and I would hope that within some time in the future we may be in a financial position where we could more centrally locate that facility.

MR. PAWLEY: And also — I believe it comes under this section — the support staff in the Provincial Judges Court, enforcement officers, etc., would that come under this section? You know, it's been often mentioned to us by different groups that have appeared before us in the Family Law that upwards to 70 percent of maintenance orders are not enforced in collection. It's always been my view that in Manitoba, because of the establishment of enforcement officers performing a more active role rather than a passive role, and that was done by Mr. Mackling when he was Attorney-General and I think it was a very positive move, that we have minimized that percentage that may be prevalent elsewhere in Canada. I had hoped that it might be possible to further beef up that operation and certainly that view has been strengthened by the many complaints that we have received over the last year, year and a half, from various women's groups, that relate to us some of the difficulties that they have encountered. So I'd like the Attorney-General to advise whether or not there are plans in the Estimates here for any beefing up of the operations which, as I mentioned, were commenced by my predecessor, Mr. Mackling.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there's no provision here for any increase of enforcement officers. I think I've indicated in the debate on the Family Law legislation that I hope to be in a position to deal with the question of enforcement prior to that debate being concluded.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, then I believe it would be timely to also ask the Minister because he has indicated that some type of in-house study, I believe about two months ago, was being undertaken in connection with maintenance orders within the Family Division. Is that in-house review complete?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. PAWLEY: Can he advise us as to when that in-house review will be completed and if he intends to make public the results of that review?

MR. MERCIER: I hope to have some material available, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, before the debate on the Family Law legislation is concluded, if the member could get me a more accurate estimate of when he thinks that debate can be concluded, I perhaps can be more specific.

MR. PAWLEY: Probably when you are in Edmonton. Again, I feel I would be neglecting my duties if I did not again complain under this division that the Unified Family Court project is not being proceeded with and we would, I think, feel much happier in voting this amount if we felt there was some real progress being made at least in the area of the Unified Family Court.

MR. MERCIER: I dealt with that matter yesterday, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, am concerned about the main location of the

Provincial Family Court being still located in the old Tuxedo-Osborne Barracks compound. I am particularly concerned, and have been for some time, about the lack of day care facilities at not only that particular court facility but at all the facilities that I have had the privilege of attending over the years. I was wondering whether the Honourable Attorney-General would consider the provision of some sort of day care facilities at these centres in order to assist the many women who, for lack, I suppose, of adequate resources are compelled, when attending court, to bring their children with them. I might add that it's a considerable hardship to the women in question because the courts exercising their discretion, generally speaking, do not allow the children to enter the courtroom during the proceedings, particularly if the children are of a sufficient age to understand the nature of those proceedings. I was hoping to elicit an affirmative, favourable response from the Minister on this question. I think the provision of such facilities could be made without resort to inordinate spending and would hope that the suggestion recommends itself to him.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the years that I had occasion to attend at Family Court, I don't recollect a situation where a mother was unable to place her children somewhere for the purpose of the court hearing. I suppose, however, that there does occur some instances where a mother, perhaps of very young children, does have some difficulty. We could undertake to make some enquiries from Family Court officials and forward that information to the Minister of Health and Social Development if it appears that there is a necessity or a demand for this kind of service.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, thank you. Having heard the Minister's response, I would certainly endorse that course of action. I think it's one that will better facilitate the proceedings in the Family Courts throughout the provinces; I'm not familiar with those centres outside of Winnipeg but I am sure that they are experiencing similar difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister another question pertaining to a special program that has been brought forward by the British Columbia government. It's a program that recommends itself to me, although it's only in its very early stages and perhaps — I'm not sure — but perhaps it's even on an experimental basis in that jurisdiction, but I think it's a lead that should be followed by other provinces because it holds out hope for change in an area where there is, I think, a very immediate need for redress, and that is the very thorny question, the very difficult question, the subject of wife-beating and abusive physical conduct as between spouses.

In British Columbia they have passed regulations and laws which enable provincial judges, as a condition or term of probation, to require that a husband who has been found to have been treating his wife abusively, physically abusing his wife, to require that such a husband attend therapy sessions which are designed to deal with the psychological aspects of that particular problem. Apparently the subjects in question meet on a regular basis with a psychologist who, in a group encounter session or in a series of group encounter sessions, try and get at the causal root, the origins of this particular problem. Early reports have indicated — and these are just very, very early reports — indicate that there has been a very affirmative response by individuals sent to these therapy sessions, that in some cases the therapy sessions have effected reconciliation as between the spouses. Presumably a person, once having understood the nature of the problem, is better able to cope with it and therefore better able to communicate the dissatisfaction that individual was feeling to his spouse, thereby presumably leading to a greater number of reconciliations in these sorts of affairs.

I would ask whether the Minister is willing to follow the British Columbia lead and bring forward either an experimental or perhaps a modest but permanent program designed after that province's lead.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. or Chairman, I'm not aware of the Vancouver British Columbia experiment, but we can undertake to investigate what is happening there. It may very well be that here, where there would be a conviction for assault, that the judge might now have the authority to make such an order, but we can undertake to review the experimental project in British Columbia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(g)(1)—pass; 5.(g)(2)—pass.

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

SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 68 in the Book of Estimates, Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. We are on Resolution 103, Clause 9, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets; (a)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I took three or four questions as notice yesterday and I have the answers to two of them and we're documenting the other two at the moment.

The Member for The Pas asked a question in relationship to an accident with an aircraft on one of the airstrips some time in the past, and the only one that we can find — I believe the record will show that I said I wasn't aware of any recent ones — but the only one we found was in December of 1971, where a plane did run off the end of the runway into some snow and there was a court case and the owners of the aircraft sued, unsuccessfully, appealed, and that was unsuccessful. I think the final decision was handed down in March of 1978, which I suspect initiated the question because it las this year.

There was a question as to whether the Island Lake Airport is receiving any support. It is not receiving any support from the DOT and will not, we believe, until it is completed and a subsequent application for subsidy will be submitted then to DOT.

The third question, Mr. Chairman. The location of the South Bay trailers: We have a number of 79 — now there's been 79, 88 and 89 mentioned. The number that I have now is 79. Hydro received 12 of them; Renewable Resources 16; Transportation 4; Highways 3; Highways are now in the process of taking five more; Parks are in the process of taking two; Frontier School Division had 13; Channel Area Loggers had 2; two of them were written off; Corrections have 4; Corrections are in the process of taking four more; the City of Thompson has 2; and we have 10 of a surplus, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Winnipeg Centre, I believe, is interested in one, and we've made a note of that, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister made available a written summary of some of his comments yesterday to the press, and if he did so I wonder if he could share a copy of that with us on this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: One of the press talked to me after the session here, 12:30 or 1:00 o'clock last night, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on this section that we're dealing with which shows a reduction from \$7.4 million to \$4.4 million, I wonder if the Minister could confirm that in fact they are operating with a carry-over from last year's Estimates and there is additional funds beside these here.

MR. MacMASTER: I was attempting to get them, I think, when the Member for The Pas got to his. So the question, I think, will be answered in a statement that we prepared, Mr. Chairman.

This appropriation displays the amount of \$7,474,500 which was included in the 1977 Loan Act. The amount of \$4,424,400 which is being requested for the 1978-79 period. In addition, there is an amount of \$3,546,900 which has been carried forward from the previous year and will be spent in the 1978-79 period.

The carry-over and the 1978-79 request amount to a combined total of \$7,971,300 which will be available for spending in 1978-79.

We have assembled the information on a project-by-project basis and can advise the House on the details of the expenditure of the carry-over in the 1978-79 requested amounts. The intent of most of the expenditures will be evident from the project name, but a finer breakdown could be provided on the larger programs such as airports and water systems.

There is a change in the display of cost-shared recoveries. I'd like the members to take note. The recoveries under 9.(a) should read: \$653,900, rather than the \$497,200.00. Do you want me to repeat that? And recoveries under 9.(XB) SHOULD READ: \$196,400, rather than the \$1,453,100.00. The total of \$1,950,300 remains the same.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. One of the problems that we have with the matter of the carry-over of capital amounts, is that the government, in its announcements early on, attempted to impress upon people that there was a large deficit and, Mr. Chairman, they threw all these figures into the pot to make that deficit look large, in their attempts to make the previous government look bad.

And then the funds that were possible to carry over, such as the Minister mentioned, \$3.5 million to be carried over from last year into this year in capital, they were able then to reduce their Estimates,

the expenditures of this government, by \$3.5 million. So, Mr. Chairman, it's clearly a case of, in terms of publicity, to have your cake and eat it too, to make it look as if the previous government expended \$3.5 million more than they did, and make yourselves look like you spent \$3.5 million less than you did. And, Mr. Chairman, this is not the case of this department alone; this has happened with numerous departments that have the possibility of capital carry-over, and I think it's been dealt with to some considerable extent in the Finance Estimates and in other debates and discussions in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister was going to outline for us, some of the Acquisition and Construction projects that were going to take place, what is being proposed in this amount.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I think the simplest way is if I make reference to the voted amount in 1977-78 and then the carry-over, and then our requested amount, and that gives the three figures that we can all relate to.

Under Fire Protection in 1977-78 there was voted \$250,000; there was a carry-over of \$119,400; we're requesting \$140,000 and the money available will be \$259,400.00. I repeat that because I possibly did that wrong.

Voted 1977-78 was \$250,000; the carry-over was \$119,400; and the request was \$140,000.00. The total available this year is \$259,400.00.

On Water Systems: Voted, 1977-78, \$1,246,000; carry-over, \$548,000; request for 1977-78 is \$501,800, for a total available this year of \$1,049,800.00.

Wood gasification voted 1977-78, \$102,600; carry-over \$83,200; total available \$83,200.00.

Access road construction, \$95,000 was voted in 1977-78, no carry-over, none requested this year.

Cormorant Bridge construction voted in 1977-78 was \$15,000 and there is nothing carried over and nothing requested.

Grading Whiskey Jack Road, there was \$8,400 voted in 1977-78, nothing carried through.

Minor airport construction, under that particular heading there was nothing voted in 1977-78; there was nothing carried over into 1978-79, and we have requested \$148,000 and there's \$148,000 available.

Winter works, \$104,800 is carry-over in 1977-78, we're requesting \$300,000; total available, Mr. Chairman, \$404,800.00.

Norway House roads upgrading, carry-over 1978-79, \$14,400, total available \$14,400.00.

That gives us a total this year of moneys available \$1,959,900.00.

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

MR. McBRYDE: And how does the Minister intend to spend the \$304,000 that he called "Winter Works?"

MR. MacMASTER: The \$104,800 is carry-over that we have a variety of commitments for, and that \$300,000, the new, which I would think the member is possibly more interested in, I can break it out for him.

North Whiskey Jack, complete the dock construction, \$20,000.00.

The Cross Lake Charlie Sinclair and cable docks, \$50,000.00.

Sea River Falls, docks, terminals, building, riprap, \$80,000.00.

Pine Creek Bridge, one and two, repairing to the south abutment, \$16,000.00.

Odie River terminal and landing, \$20,000.00.

Split Lake landing, \$10,000.00.

York landing, dock and causeway, \$35,000.00. Norway House base repair, septic system, \$18,000.00.

The Pas strip, Hydro access road and strip itself, \$20,000.00.

Channel, various channel markings of \$8,000, and a miscellaneous figure of \$23,000.00, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, is there any figure included here for the acquisition of equipment?

MR. MacMASTER: Not under 9.(a), Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the new airport construction, is there any intended for this coming year? Or major upgrading?

MR. MacMASTER: Major airport construction comes under 9.(b) and there is some, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOSTROM: I'm not sure if it's under this section or the following one, but the Minister did indicate to me earlier in the Estimates process, when I was questioning about the Norway House internal road system and also the Norway House external road system, that is the all-weather road which leads from the community of Norway House to Jenpeg, he indicated there would be funds in here and he would be prepared to discuss it under this item as to who will be doing the maintenance on the all-weather road, what work is planned for this year in terms of completing the all-weather road, and further to that, Mr. Chairman, what other major construction or reconstruction of either the road, the external road or the internal roads, are planned for this fiscal year under consideration?

MR. MacMASTER: The majority of it's under the next section, Mr. Chairman, but there is, as I outlined — Norway House roads upgrading, the \$14,400 is for internal roads themselves and there is other moneys for external under the next section.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question I had was with respect to much more serious upgrading than would be provided for under that minimal sum. As I understand it from the engineering people that did look at these roads while I was Minister, that the internal road system within the community of Norway House is really not up to the standard which it should be if it is to be able to handle the type of traffic that will now be coming into the community as a result of the all-weather road connection from the north through Jenpeg. Mr. Chairman, we had proposed a cost-sharing agreement with the Federal Government via the Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement to upgrade the internal road system within the community of Norway House and also to provide for internal connections in the community between the different parts of the community.

As the Minister and his staff may know, the community of Norway House is quite spread out and split up by rivers and islands and so on, and there is a desire in the community for certain internal connections to make the road system connect all parts of the community. For example, the people on Mission Island very much would like to have a connection across the Crooked Turn, as they call it in that community, to connect up their part of the community with the rest of the community by way of a bridge or cable ferry connection or whatever, preferably a bridge. The people that live on the west channel of the Nelson River are in the same situation, Mr. Chairman, where they desire a connection across the Nelson River to connect them up with the rest of the community. We had proposed this by way of discussion with the Federal Government before the change of office took place. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what happened with that discussion, if any attempt was made to follow that up after he became Minister or if the whole program has been deferred until a later date or if his intention is to defer it permanently.

I would remind the Minister that during the election campaign, his own leader, the leader of his political party, who is now the Premier, did make certain comments which were taken as promises by the people of Norway House that there would be bridge connections in their community and the candidate who was running on behalf of their party in Rupertsland, also made similar commitments to the people of Norway House. As I indicated before, in comments in this House, Mr. Chairman, the fact that people go around into these northern communities and make commitments which they do not live up to, simply intensifies the feeling of cynicism in the remote communities regarding the political process in Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I, as a candidate, did not promise those things to those people because I was acting responsibly knowing that I could not legitimately promise those things without knowing in advance whether or not it would be possible to carry out that promise. Mr. Chairman, that sort of hesitation did not seem to deter the Conservative candidate in that area nor the Leader of the Conservative Party in the way in which they made their commitments to the people in the North. I would like the Minister to indicate if the \$14,000 is his government's answer to the commitments that were made to those people during the last election campaign.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I've been hearing this for two or three days and I can just simply suggest to the Member for Rupertsland that what he might call a commitment or a comment I'm not wishing to debate with him here in this particular House. I'll give him the courtesy of what he said in the House that he believes to be true. I don't believe that there were bridges or whatever that was promised during the election but that's a belief that I have and he has his own comments and his own conclusions.

We have said here that there's 14.4. There is substantial monies under the (b) section of this particular item for the internal roads in Norway House.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister answer the question which I had asked earlier in the Estimates and that is, who will be doing the maintenance work on the external road system, what type of arrangement will be made, will it be government staff that will be doing it, if so, which government staff, and if not, if there will be contracting out of this work, who will be given the opportunity to contract this work and, Mr. Chairman, how much will be budgeted for the actual maintenance on the external road system on the 40 or 50 miles of road that connects up the community of Norway House, whether it's a per mile figure that he can give me or a total figure it would be desired here, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MacMASTER: Local government people will be doing the internal roads and the external roads will be dealt with under the next section, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under (b) I assume that the Minister would like to elaborate somewhat and when he's doing that, he might want to comment on the . . . there's always some disagreement between the Department of Highways and Resources and Northern Affairs, etc., on who should pick up the maintenance of a road that was built to highway standards. I believe that there are a number of roads still in that category of disagreement such as a road to Cormorant, the Highway No. 6, Highway No. 10 road via Easterville, the Norway House road and, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure there must be a couple of other routes that there was a question about who was responsible for the maintenance and the payment of the maintenance on those roads. Maybe the Minister could elaborate on that as well.

MR. MacMASTER: What the member says is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. It's been an ongoing battle for years between Mineral Resources, Northern Affairs and Highways and I'm endeavouring to . . . Well, a good question: Who wins? And I suppose you flip and if you win and you get it, you sometimes lose. I don't really know who considers winning. We've managed this particular year just as a comment and interest, that we have won — if that's what you call it — in relieving ourselves of some maintenance work in the southern part of the province and we will endeavour to follow that particular line of reasoning.

For breakdown on (b), Alternate Land Use: voted in 1977-78 was \$863,300; carry-over was \$414,800, for a total which is available this year of \$414,800.00.

Resources for Tomorrow: voted \$150,000 in 1977-78; carry-over \$35,000 in 1978-79; request \$250,200 for a total available in 1978-79 of \$285,600.00.

Urban Peripherial: Voted in 1977-78, \$150,000; nothing carried over; nothing requested.

Delta Marsh: same thing, voted in 1977-78, \$84,600.00.

Regional Equipment Purchases: \$60,000 voted in 1977-78; carry-over \$6,400; requested \$42,000; available 1978-79, \$48,400.00.

Forest Protection: VHF radios, voted 1977-78, nothing; carry-over, of course, nothing; request for 1978-79, \$50,000; total available \$50,000.00.

Regional Radio VHF network, voted 1977-78, nothing; carry-over nothing; requested 1978-79, \$100,000; total available for 1978-879, \$100,000.00.

Subdivision Development voted in 1977-78, \$300,000; carry-over \$154,500; request for 1978-79, \$100,000; total available 1978-79, \$254,500.00.

South Indian Lake Development \$150,000 voted 1977-78; carry-over \$91,400; total available 1978-79, \$91,400.00.

Resource Development: \$129,800 available in 1978-79.

Wild Fur Development: voted in 1977-78, \$694,400; carry-over 1978-79, \$14,100; request 1978-79 \$150,000; Total Available, 1978-79, \$164,100.00.

Fishermen's Freight Assistance: a carry-over of \$16,500; Requests for 1978-79, \$250,000; Total Available 1978-79, \$266,500.00.

Easterville Harvesting: voted 1977-78, nothing. There was a carry-over of \$102,000.00. There was no request for 1978-79. Total Available \$102,000.00.

Special ARDA: voted 1977-78, \$1,540,000.00. Carry-over 1978-79, \$609,900; Requests for 1978-79, \$540,000; Total Available 1978-79, \$1,149,900.00.

Airport Equipment: voted 1977-78, \$141,600; Requested 1978-79, \$6,000; Total Available \$6,000.00.

Resource Roads: voted 1977-78, nothing. Consequently, nothing of a carry-over. Requested for 1978-79, \$600,000; Total Available in 1978-79, \$600,000.00.

Aircraft Repair and Replacement: voted 1977-78, \$181,000.00. Carry-over 1978-79, \$14,100.00. Requests 1978-79, \$100,000; Total Available \$114,100.00.

Marine Services Repair and Maintenance: nothing voted, consequently no carry-over from 1977-78. Requested 1978-79, \$50,000; Total Available \$50,000.00.

Radio Repair and Replacement: \$29,000 voted. Carry-over \$4,400; Total Available \$4,400.00.

CL2-15 payment: nothing voted in 1977-78. Carry-over 1978-79, \$144,000.00. Request for 1978-79, \$144,000; Total Available 1978-79, \$294,100.00.

Capital Works Acceleration Program: nothing voted in 1977-78, Carry-over \$600,200; Moneys Available 1978-79, \$600,200.00.

Churchill Warehouse Facilities: Carry-over \$1,100; Moneys Available \$1,100.00.

Churchill Pre-Fab Plant: Carry-over \$56,300; Available \$56,300 in 1978-79.

Berens River Road: nothing voted in 1977-78, consequently nothing carried over. Requested in 1978-79, \$300,000; Available in 1978-79, \$300,000.00.

Airport Construction: voted 1977-78, \$1,300,000; Carry-over \$276,400; Request for 1978-79, \$649,300; Total Available 1978-79, \$925,400.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on the Airport Construction, could the Minister indicate what communities he is looking at, whether it's upgrading or new construction?

MR. MacMASTER: The carry-over, I can explain briefly and I will get the other in a second, Mr. Chairman. At Berens River, there is \$10,000.00. At Bloodvein to complete the drainage and the grading, there is \$120,000.00. Terminal buildings, renovations, gravel \$189,900.00. Matheson Island terminal building \$22,800.00. Little Grand Rapids rock removal \$7,000; rock coring and crushing and spreading \$35,000.00. That gives us a total of \$276,400; that's for the carry-over from 1978-79.

Red Sucker Lake tower completion and gravel \$78,000; York Landing gravel \$20,000; South Indian Lake gravel and seeding \$20,000; Poplar River \$10,000; Thicket Portage sub-grade and drainage \$40,000, gravel \$95,000 — \$135,000.00.

Pikwitonei sub-grading and drainage \$40,000, gravel \$60,000; Ilford sub-grade and drainage \$40,000, gravel \$15,000; Brochet gravel \$15,000; Pukatawagan gravel \$10,000; Lac Brochet legal surveying and engineering survey \$10,000; Island Lake engineering for water and sewer \$15,000; Gods Lake Narrows \$5,000.00. That's access to the fuel depot at Gods Lake Narrows. That's it.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on the resource roads \$600,000, I wonder if the Minister could give us a breakdown there.

MR. MacMASTER: Norway House, Jenpeg, second year of construction program is \$180,000.00. Norway House internal road repairs, alignment, drainage, etc., \$200,000.00. The Rice road 17 miles class 9 engineering, route survey, design, clearing and great grubbing out is \$66,100 and \$33,900.00. Road maintenance \$75,000 and there is a miscellaneous for various projects of \$45,000, for a total of \$600,000.00.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; I couldn't follow the Minister. He went kind of quickly there, and I thought he said rice road, I'm not sure. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if he could just fill us in on that and also tell us where the maintenance cost is going to come for the Highway No. 6, Highway No. 10 road by Easterville, and for the Cormorant road, and whether the Norway House, Jenpeg road here includes maintenance or just construction.

MR. MacMASTER: I think I have all the questions; there were four or five, but I will . . . The Easterville, Cormorant thing, Highways will be doing that.

The \$180,000 for the Norway House, Jenpeg road is a combination of construction and maintenance, and the Rice River Road is 17 miles. That's going north to Hole River, and that's your engineering and your route survey, and your design, and that type of thing.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on the Split Lake road, Thompson—Split Lake, the Ilford, Split Lake proposal, is there any funds for that road? And on the Thompson . . . —(Interjection)— We want to go along the Odei River and get to a community there, the name of which has slipped my mind, unfortunately. But I believe before Split Lake you come to another community and I wonder if there is any moneys to be spent on that road.

MR. MacMASTER: Highways are looking after the road into Split Lake, if that was the one the member was talking about, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Just while we're on that topic of the Split Lake road, Mr. Chairman, in the event that Highways are hooking up the community of Split Lake with a road, over the next two or three years. Does the Minister have, therefore, plans for the use of the ferry, the existing ferry, that's on Split Lake, to be utilized in connection further up along the river system to connect up with the road to Gillam, as that was the original intention of that ferry, that once it was no longer required for a community hook-up to Split Lake that it could be utilized as an alternative to a bridge crossing of the major river there, Nelson River, and provide, with a road connection, an all-weather connection to the Town of Gillam. Is the Minister considering this or does he have knowledge of the government's intentions in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: I would hope that the road into Split Lake is completed this year, Mr. Chairman, and the Joe Keeper Ferry, the one that the member is referring to, will continue to run from York to Split.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I have a number of other questions, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Minister, at one point, indicated a figure of \$200,000 for Norway House roads, and then a little later he said \$180,000, which was to include maintenance. Could he perhaps clarify that as to which is the correct figure, and if it does include maintenance how much is budgeted for maintenance? And, as I had requested earlier, could he indicate what procedure they will use, in terms of maintenance? Is he considering, in the future, contracting this out to local people in the area, or will it be utilized by way of government staff?

MR. MacMASTER: I mentioned Norway House for 180 and I mentioned Norway House for 200, the member is correct except that's just taking it out of context, it's not following right through, and maybe the member didn't hear the entire statement. The Norway House-Jegpeg road, second year of construction, construction and maintenance is \$180,000.00 — that's external. The internal roads at Norway House again, internal roads which requires, as the Member for Rupertsland knows, a great number of repairs and alignment and some drainage in there, is \$200,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I would like a bit more explanation on the item he mentioned as the Rice River road. Could the Minister perhaps elaborate as to exactly what the program is in this fiscal year? Is that simply a design engineering, or will there be some actual work done in the way of clearing a right-of-way or whatever, during this fiscal year?

MR. MacMASTER: Design engineering, route surveying and clearing and gravelling the right-of-way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; 9.—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Just before we leave this section I'd like to give credit where credit is due and that particular road that will be under design and engineering this year is a very much desired and needed piece of road which can connect up one of the major resource bases of that community area, and that is what is commonly called in the area, Shallow Lake. As I had mentioned earlier in the discussion on this department, Mr. Chairman, the advantage to that community of some elementary water control and seeding on that particular lake has resulted in them being able to harvest a major wild rice crop on the lake, providing a very substantial economic benefit to their community. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly want to put on the record that this move by the government is certainly welcome in that area, that there is a study under way to connect up the particular lake by road providing them with access for harvesting, for people to get in and out. As well, Mr. Chairman, it would provide a substantial saving to the people in that area in terms of transporting their wild rice product out of that lake.

I would certainly commend it to the Minister; I would hope that the study in this fiscal year will prove that that particular road is feasible in terms of it being built in the next fiscal year and I would hope that that would be one item that the Minister would push for in his Estimates in the

fiscal year to follow this one, Mr. Chairman.

While we're on General Roads, Mr. Chairman, I would wonder if there are any plans to put in place any study or any design for any future resource roads other than the one he mentioned. I believe there are a number of locations in northern Manitoba where potential road locations, road connections have been discussed in the past and the actual on-ground feasibility analysis has never been completed. One of those, for example, is the Ilford-York Landing connection which I believe has been pursued for some years, and if the ferry, the Joe Keeper, is to continue, Mr. Chairman, as a Split Lake connection to connect up the community of York Landing with the mainland road either at Odie or wherever, a connection between York Landing and Ilford would certainly appear to make sense. I wonder if the Minister's staff will be doing any feasibility analysis on the ground, feasibility design and survey work to determine whether or not that road is a feasibility in the future?

MR. MacMASTER: In operations there is some money for some surveys. I note what the member says about the 17 miles that we're going to be surveying in engineering, studying and grubbing out. There's also a very, very important resource up in that part of the country that we have more than a passing interest in, and that's the timber. I think the member is familiar with the lay of the land up there and he'll realize that there's possibly more than one reason why we're looking at that particular road.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, that certainly is well recognized and in that connection I am wondering if the Minister has had any discussions or his staff have had any discussions with the Abitibi Paper Company, since they had indicated to me at one point that they were interested in cost-sharing on such a road. And I would ask the Minister further to that if he could give us an idea where his staff are putting the priority in terms of location of that road, because the community of Hole River, as it's known in the area, Wanipigow, as some people call it, and Hollow Water, as Indian Affairs call it — it's all the same community — this community would be very interested in having that road commence where the present winter road crosses the Wanipigow River. Now, I understand this would necessitate a bridge crossing which could be of a greater expense than the alternative location which is up where the present Abitibi and Government road, which was cost-shared 50-50 between Abitibi and the government, some seven miles up the river at the Old Currie Landing.

If one were to go from that location, Mr. Chairman, that particular road would not be of much service to the community of Hole River, and Mr. Chairman, they would certainly desire that particular road, as I say, not to go from the Abitibi Road at Currie Landing but to commence at the community of Hole River and go north from there. It would still reach the wild rice lake that I mentioned earlier and it would travel through some of the most dense timber in the area, thereby providing access to those two resources, but furthermore, Mr. Chairman, and probably more importantly for the future development of the community of Hole River, it opens up an entire new area for them to expand in terms of their community residential area. It also opens up that immediate east shore of Lake Winnipeg, up along the coast there which extends up to a point immediately adjacent to the Black Island on Lake Winnipeg, which is a very attractive recreational island, recreational resource. Mr. Chairman, I would think that when all those factors are taken into consideration, the community needs, the forest resource, the wild rice resource, the community access across the river back and forth by way of bridge access if the road were to commence at Hole River, that that would be the desirable location for the road. The alternative location, as I mentioned before, to go from the existing cost-shared road between Abitibi and the Manitoba government, would not service the community's immediate needs nor would it provide the same service in terms of opening up that east shore potential recreation land — very valuable potential recreation land. And I would think that the Minister of Tourism would want to consult with his colleague, the Minister of Resources, in terms of looking at that and assessing it as to what would be the best long-term solution, the best long-term location for that particular road.

And certainly, Mr. Chairman, I would impress on the Minister and his staff that they take a look at those two locations in view of the fact that the alternative that the community desires would be, I believe, much more desirable in the long run in terms of the overall development of that particular area on Lake Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: All the comments that the previous speaker has made, Mr. Chairman, we're certainly maybe not aware of them all, but we are aware of the majority of them and they will be taken into consideration when we're looking for the route for that particular road.

MR. BOSTROM: Before we leave this section, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to get some elaboration on the improvements to the internal road system within Berens River. I understand that the Minister in his comments indicated a certain amount budgeted for the Berens River road and I am wondering if he could just elaborate as to what exactly the program will be, when it will commence and when it is expected to be completed?.

MR. MacMASTER: Grading and gravelling are the two major projects that we have in mind and I would suspect that it will commence in the near future, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to that, I would ask the Minister if there are any funds in this section of his department, or perhaps in another section of his department which we've already passed but which we did not know contained them at the time, for the potential winter road connection from Berens River to the community of Poplar River? Now, they have indicated to the Minister in a letter, I believe, last winter, which he had responded to in the positive, with one condition, that the Federal Government come up with 50 percent of the cost, and I believe that the community is certainly very desirous of that road being built with a commencement date of this winter. It would provide for access to that community, Mr. Chairman, provide them necessary transportation access over the winter months, as well as a surface link to the same benefits as other Manitobans enjoy.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would wonder if the Minister could indicate if there are any funds in his department to look at that possibility and/or cost-share that road with the Federal Government if the Federal Government does come up with their 50 percent of the funding to provide a necessary winter access to that community.

MR. MacMASTER: It's not being considered this particular year, Mr. Chairman. We would like to believe that we're going to review that entire network over the course of the next few months and sadly enough there is no money this year; possibly in years to come there will be something.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, to look a little bit further into the future, I wonder if the Minister is taking a look at the possibility of having some kind of all-weather road connection on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, which has been very much desired over the years and which I know is a very expensive undertaking, very expensive proposition, but one connection which I was promoting when I was Minister and which I believe to be the least expensive connection to the east side communities. And if you look at the east side of Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman, some of the most valuable recreation land and of course the two major centres of population, Bloodvein, Princess Harbour and Berens River are along a stretch of about 50 miles of Lake Winnipeg, and just by fortunate geographic circumstance the community of Bloodvein is only a distance of approximately eight miles from the west shore of Lake Winnipeg, and in fact at the narrowest point, at The Narrows on Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman, there's only a distance of about a mile separating one shore of the lake from the other.

One of the propositions I was discussing with the Federal Government was the possibility of providing a ferry connection at that narrowest point on Lake Winnipeg, and building an all-weather road from that Narrows on Lake Winnipeg to connect up the communities at Bloodvein, Princess Harbour and Berens River. Fortunately enough, in the initial analysis that has been done, that appears to be the least expensive area on the east side of Lake Winnipeg to build an all-weather road. And given that set of circumstances, I wonder if the Minister can give us any indication if he intends to pursue this possibility, to pursue it with his own colleagues, and if he gets concurrence there, to pursue it with the Federal Government, to see if the Federal Government would cost-share on an all-weather road connection between those communities, providing them with a ferry connection at The Narrows on Lake Winnipeg and thereby connecting up at least two of the major population communities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, opening up a very substantial portion of recreational land in Manitoba as well as access to other resources.

Now if anyone has ever travelled on Lake Winnipeg, of course they know that the east side of Lake Winnipeg is a very valuable recreation resource. There's miles and miles of virtually unused beach land there, miles and miles of lake frontage which could be a potential for cottage lots or whatever. It certainly would be a potential for those communities . . .

A MEMBER: You don't want an east development.

MR. BOSTROM: . . . in the future, Mr. Chairman. Rather than putting in a condominium development on a little lake in the Whiteshell where you only have a little teapot lake five miles long, Mr. Chairman, here we have a lake 300 miles long and we don't need to put up concentrated

condominium developments, we can spread out people so that there is reasonable access to the lakeshore and, at the same time, all the environmental factors can be taken into consideration when development takes place. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there's enough room there that we shouldn't ever have to be — at least in our foreseeable future — ever have to be concerned about overcrowding and having people elbow to elbow as you would have them in a condominium development.

So, Mr. Chairman, I may have digressed a bit from the point I was trying to make to the Minister given that I was interrupted by the Minister of Tourism but we will be getting to his Estimates very shortly and we can discuss that further. I would like to hear the Minister's opinions and comments on that possible connection.

MR. MacMASTER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the route that the Member for Rupertsland has mentioned has advantages, both immediate and certainly for the future. It's an excellent point and we'll be considered, I would like to assure him, under the third year review of your NORTHLANDS Agreement which is coming up for review this particular fall. Some of the routes that he's talked about and the hookups would appear to have some great advantages to them and will be taken into consideration.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, in previous years we had approximately \$8 million that was earmarked in the NORTHLANDS Agreement for northern road construction and the northern roads and transportation, Mr. Chairman, and the Federal Government had, along with the Provincial Government, established a criteria for the expenditure of that money and as far as the road portion of that money was concerned, as I understand it, the priority was on making initial connections to communities that did not, at the present time, have an all-weather road connection. The Norway House road, as the Minister is probably aware, was funded under that particular agreement and I'm wondering what northern roads he intends to fit into that program this year and how much of that \$8 million will be available to northern residents in terms of transportation access, in other words, how much of that total amount that we have been spending in the north over the last few years will be available this year. If he could give us a breakdown of those transportation accesses which will be put in place this year through that NORTHLANDS funding.

MR. MacMASTER: I've been advised, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Highways is using a great piece of that particular NORTHLANDS money. If he wished I could break out what I specifically have here if that's what he wants. Okay, I'll attempt to get that for him.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised to hear that the Department of Highways is taking some of that \$8 million because the criteria that was established under the previous arrangement between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government was that those funds were to be used for initial access as a first priority. In other words, the entire \$8 million should have been spent last year and if the \$8 million still existed in the budget this year, it should have been spent on things like airstrips and/or the initial access resource type road to a community that, at the present time, does not have access. Mr. Chairman, if those funds were still available for that purpose, some of these projects that I have identified such as the Berens River-Bloodvein connection via The Narrows on Lake Winnipeg, could possibly be in the works sooner than the Minister would indicate it would be his intention to bring it on stream, if at all. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know from him, seeing that his department is responsible for the NORTHLANDS Agreement, when the change was made to allow some of those funds to be used by the Department of Highways for regular highway work in Northern Manitoba or wherever?

MR. MacMASTER: Highways have always been involved in that particular project. The road into Split Lake is an example of that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have two questions, Mr. Chairman, pertaining to roads. The first one is the road to Sherridon. ManFor have gone up to Farewell Lake, I think they call it, and the distance is not that great. I wonder if the Minister has given any thought to that particular road?

The other road, and I notice the chamber of Commerce in Lynn Lake, Flin Flon and the Band and Chief in Pukatawagan are requesting a round-about road from Lynn Lake into Flin Flon. I wonder if the Minister has given this any thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm aware of the request from the Lynn Lake-Pukatawagan people. They've made that presentation to Highways and I don't know what Highways disposition of that particular subject is. I'll get an answer on the Sherridon in a second here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, while the staff are looking for the answers to the questions from my colleague, I wonder if they could perhaps give us a breakdown on what amount in total is available this year in the department for the kind of access that I was talking about via the Manitoba-NORTHLANDS Agreement and if they could indicate, since they are responsible for the Manitoba-NORTHLANDS, what portion of the total funds available are being spent by the Department of Highways. I note the Minister indicated the Split Lake Road is one of them and certainly that is because that is initial access type of road but I assumed from what the Minister had said earlier, that some of the money would have been spent on regular highway-type work, for example, perhaps the Highway to Thompson is now being cost-shared under NORTHLANDS. Mr. Chairman, they never used to cost-share on the regular standard PRs or trunk highways, only the ones that provided initial access to the communities.

So I wonder if the Minister could, first of all, indicate is there still a total of \$8 million or more available for access or, if not, how much and what is the proportion between Highways and his department?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll attet to get that figure from the Highways group over supper hour, Mr. Chairman, but one point I don't think we should forget is the fact that it may sound good, \$8 million or \$10 million or \$12 million or \$4 million or \$5 million, it doesn't really matter. That isn't money that's lost. If you don't spend it this year that money isn't particularly lost. That money can be picked up in the ensuing years, from the first to second, to third, to fourth, and we're in the midst this year of the exact type of study the members refer to in reference two or three times, the possibilities of different highway systems and the opening up of various parts of the country for various types of resources, be they (a) the resource of getting into the communities for fishing and wildlife and forestry, and this is the third year review of that transportation specifically. That's what the third year review is for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do note that the Minister is indicating that there will be studies made and yet in the question that I asked him earlier as to which particular roads would be potential new roads, would be under study this year, he did not indicate to me very many that were under consideration except for the one that I believe is definitely budgeted for and programmed for and planned for and that is the one to connect up the area north of Hole River.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask him if in this study that they will be doing, if it is just going to be an academic exercise or if they will be actually looking at some potential routes in terms of getting right down at the field level and checking out if, in fact, these routes are possible routes that can be built in the future. One, for example, that has come to mind is the one road which could hook up the community of Pukatawagan from the north, from 391. There is a possibility, as I understand it, or at least the suggestion has been made that that could be a possibility across there. I'm wondering if the Minister couldn't, over the supper hour, give us a definite breakdown of which areas, or communities even, that he is looking at in terms of potential all-weather road hookups in the years ahead and which ones they will be actually looking at on the ground in this fiscal year, not only to do an overall transportation academic type study but what type of actual on the ground design, survey, clearing, line and so on will they be doing in this coming fiscal year?

MR. MacMASTER: Four that we have identified at the moment and there will be more during the course of the summer as we proceed. There's the Cross Lake area and the Ilford-York Landing area. The Sherridon one, in answer to the Member for Flin Flon, I think most of the engineering is done on that and we'll attempt to complete that in the South Indian Lake area. Now there will be others as the summer progresses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.7

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 17 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

brandon general hospital

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under Private Members' Hour, Adjourned Debates on Second Reading of Private Bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, Bill 17, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Brandon General Hospital. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned the bill for the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, Bill 17 was introduced for second reading on the 13th of June and since that date I have had an opportunity to review the comments made by the sponsor, the Honourable Member for Brandon East, and to read the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the changes which are proposed are of a minor nature. The bill tends to bring up to date and include in one statute a number of amendments that have been made over a long period of time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the bill might now properly proceed to Committee, where it could be examined on a clause-by-clause basis and I'd be prepared to support the bill at second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prevent or delay the bill going to Committee. However, I would want to make a few comments about the bill itself.

I recognize that it's many years since the first bill setting up the Brandon General Hospital came into being and I don't doubt that the Corporation Act has to be amended to reflect more modern times. That's why I'm speaking on the bill itself, because I notice one of the things about the bill which is perpetuated, is the method by which the board is elected annually and through which board members can be introduced as directors.

In years gone by when hospitals came into being as a result of the interest and the work and effort and the funds of private individuals or organizations or perhaps a local municipality, particularly in the case of the private ones, whether they were religious organizations or other, I could understand that it was sort of a closed shop affair. But we've gone a long way since then. With the hospitalization which now exists in Canada, and the method of financing capital construction and operation of hospitals in Manitoba, it is basically a public enterprise. Therefore, in my opinion, the boards should not be chosen or selected from a very select group in a sort of self-perpetuating way, which is what this bill continues to do.

Although I recognize that it should go to Law Amendments where we can deal with it, it would be my intention and my desire in Law Amendments to make some changes in the Act itself which would make it possible for the larger community to participate in the affairs of the Brandon General Hospital, and to serve as members of the Board of Directors.

I haven't a copy of the Act with me at hand, but I believe it indicates that the Board of Directors can be elected from people who make contributions to the hospital. I don't believe that that makes any sense at all in this day and age because every citizen makes a contribution. He makes it by virtue of the fact that it is the public funds which go into it for capital now and certainly for operating it's 100 percent. The Guild may raise a few dollars, and some other organizations attached to the hospital may raise a few dollars for some amenities, but by and large without public input, without public funding, this hospital like any other, just couldn't exist.

So I would like to see a much broader base for the representation to the board, similar to what was done in the Health Sciences Centre. Some members may recall in 1972, I think, where the Health Sciences Centre bill was brought in. The Act was amended, or was introduced at that time, to make it possible for the government to appoint a certain number of people, for the municipality to appoint a certain number of people, for the medical staff to appoint a certain number of people in the case of the Health Sciences Centre and because it is a teaching hospital, for the University of Manitoba Medical to appoint members, and as well from various committees within the hospital itself, the Children's committees, I recall, was an example.

So that gave it a much broader base and overcame a problem which had existed for decades, and I am not critical of it because of the history of it, whereby in the old Winnipeg General Hospital it was a self-perpetuating board, from father to son in many cases. In the Children's Hospital, too, I believe it was the same way. And this, as I say, may have stood us in good stead in the years when hospitals pretty well had to raise their funds on their own, contributions direct by individuals

or tag days or by the fees they charged or what have you. Those days are behind us, and as a result the community at large, all citizens, are participants in the running of that hospital, the funding of that hospital and, therefore, they should have an opportunity to sit on a board and not simply because they made a contribution of I don't know how many dollars, it could be even \$25.00. But in a sense, it's a limiting factor and I don't think, in this day and age, it should be considered.

I believe there was a bill introduced recently with regard to another hospital, I think the Member for Rock Lake introduced it. The Member for Rock Lake introduced a bill with regard to a hospital in this Session. I liked that approach because it assumes that every one in the community has an interest in a hospital, can serve on the hospital board, can participate as a Director of the Board, can be elected to the board, that's the kind of approach I'd like to see. Whereas the Brandon General Hospital still carries forward all of the introduced amendments, they still carry the old concept of the small clique, the self-perpetuating body from which the directors can be chosen.

So, with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to hold up the bill because I recognize a new Act is needed but that in Committee I would certainly hope that as I bring in some amendments which would modernize the Act itself and modernize the operation of the running of Brandon General Hospital that members opposite and members this side will be able to support it.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this may be one of the shortest speeches that I've made. I just wanted to put on the record, for those who are interested in reading the speech made by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the bill he referred to that was brought in by the Member for Rock Lake, is Bill 37, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital Association.

I mention that in the hope that the persons who represent the Brandon General Hospital will refer back to that bill as well as to the Health Sciences Centre constitution, to see other approaches that have been made to the election of members of the board.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden, Bill No. 34, An Act to exempt the OO-ZA-WE-KWUN CENTRE INCORPORATED from certain provisions of The Liquor Control Act.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, Public Bill, and the amendment moved by the Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I'd like to have this matter stand, unless somebody wishes to speak, which I have no objection to.

BILL NO. 6 — THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks . . . St. Johns, I'm sorry.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's quite all right, Mr. Speaker, no need to apologize. I'm honoured when I am mistaken for the Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Speaker, I had reviewed my position on the six-month hoist at the end of the Private Members' Hour last Friday, I think it was. I did take the trouble today to review some of the debate that took place last year on the same bill and I noticed that the then Member for — well, one of our members moved a six-month hoist and I spoke after that, I'd been the seconder of it, and I spoke after that to indicate that I believe that we had not yet achieved the ultimate in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I indicate to the member, he had eight minutes left.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, thanks, Mr. Speaker, I won't need the eight minutes.

Yes, as I was saying, it was the Member for Radisson last year who moved the hoist and I said that I supported the hoist because I felt that the last word had not been said on access of information to people, to citizens of Manitoba. And I had hoped then, Mr. Speaker, that there would be an opportunity for the then government to make further studies and investigations into the problem and into proposed methods whereby access could be improved, but unfortunately for most of the people of Manitoba, the then government did not have an opportunity to continue in office and to carry out the study.

I did suggest last Friday, that it would be worthwhile, in my opinion, for an inter-sessional all-party legislative committee to be instructed to hear submissions, to hear representations, and then to make a recommendation on improvements that could be made in the field of access to information.

I say that because I do not believe that the protection that can be offered need be offered through the courts. I would like to see it kept in the Legislature and in committees of the Legislature.

However, I did state, unequivocally, that I did not believe that the system we now have was the best system. I believe that there can be additional means provided for the review of an arbitrary decision by government to refuse to give information.

I note that the Ombudsman Act, for example, provides for the Ombudsman to be able to make certain investigations as a result of complaints made to him, but that the Attorney-General could stop his investigations at any time by a mere certificate that he believes it is not in the public interest that the Ombudsman should proceed. The Ombudsman then is compelled to stop his investigation and may make a comment of it in his annual report, to the effect that he had been stopped by the Attorney-General.

I think now that we've had an occasion to deal with the Ombudsman's report, from time to time, I believe that he has been a great asset to the system of government within this province. I, frankly, would like to have an opportunity to sit with him and discuss the problem posed by the mover of the motion on this present bill I would like more discussion to be held. On that basis, I would urge honourable members not only to support the six-month hoist — I think the Member for St. James is volunteering support; I hope I am interpreting his vigorous nodding of his head correctly — but then I would urge further that I would like to see that the government itself propose an inter-sessional committee to study the question, or a referral to an existing standing committee, since all of them may sit inter-sessionally. I would like very much to hear some support for that proposal from the government side so that we can ensure that not only — if the six-month hoist passes — not only have we not voted against the principle of this bill, but also we will have had an assurance that there will be further study and investigation by politicians in the realm where I believe such matters belong, and that is within this building. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION carried.

QUESTION put on Bill No. 6 as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Bill No. 32 — the Honourable Member for Pembina. Stand? (Stands)

BILL NO. 33 — THE VENTURE INVESTMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION REGISTRATION ACT

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

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with this bill I am going to be rather brief, because there are several things that I think I would just like to draw to the attention of members with regard to this bill.

First of all, I think we all share a concern for a certain amount of investment capital being available to the people of Manitoba, to entrepreneurs who wish to start a venture but find it hard to get the necessary funds, the necessary capital, the necessary operating money to start up their particular enterprise. The particular venture capital concept was studied, I believe, by the predecessors, the gentlemen opposite. We have had another look at it in the last number of months and also had contact with Ontario and Quebec, who, I might add, have similar legislation and really a large majority of this particular Act is almost exactly the same as the Ontario legislation is.

However, Mr. Speaker, in talking to people in Ontario, since that Act has been passed they have not had any applications for companies that wish to form venture capital companies. One of the

problems with this particular bill is that it deals only with the provincial jurisdictions and not with the federal and, as a result, it is of limited tax benefit to the different venture capital companies that are getting involved.

The Federal Minister in charge of small business has issued a discussion paper, Mr. Speaker, and he is asking for public input from the provinces as well as the public at large, and deals with several of the concepts which are related to this bill. The Federal Government is looking at a possible establishment of certain venture capital companies, the province then could blend in legislation which would complement that particular bill. We will be making representation to the Federal Minister after we have had a chance to do a detailed study of the paper that he has put forth. In other words, to try and see what direction we feel the particular venture capital corporation should take.

We have, as I mentioned, no quarrel with trying to attract different venture capital, whether it be research and development or the expansion of business in this province. However, seeing what has happened in Ontario with the passing of that particular bill and the problems that they have encountered — in other words, the lack of response for that particular type of legislation — we feel at this time that it would be proper to deal with the federal authorities, who have certain ideas with regard to forming venture capital companies, to putting provincial input into that particular decision-making process and then hoping to come up with a comprehensive package which would then be of benefit at the federal and provincial level, and hopefully deal with some of the problems of venture capital in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I'd like to say that it has been studied by ourselves, we have looked at it. Until the Federal Government decides to move and enter this field and will be accepting dialogue from the provinces, we feel it would not be productive at this time to go ahead with putting this bill on the books and then later on making certain changes, which might not even be compatible with the legislation involved in this particular bill.

So, having said those few words, I would say that I cannot support the bill and would encourage members in the Legislature not to support it until we are clear what direction the Federal Government will take on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the member will answer a question. Is the Minister in agreement with the principle of this legislation, which would provide a public subsidy to a private corporation?

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have provided certain reductions in income taxes to small businesses. I think we all recognize there is a need for investment capital in the field of small businesses. DREE has been involved in that, our Industrial Development Agreement, which has a major component dealing with research and development, the Federal Government has undertaken some initiatives to allow a larger percentage, 150 percent, write-off on research and development. So there is definitely a need and if it can be done by a system of tax breaks rather than direct involvement as far as the government is concerned, I would be in favour of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act — the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOMINO: Can we let that stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading, Public Bills, Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Milk Control Act — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Stand? (Stands)

BILL NO. 60 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT (2)

MR. STEEN presented Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (2), for second

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill, Bill No. 60, to revise The Liquor Control Act, for special provisions for sports centres, etc., I'd like to take a few moments and explain the reasoning behind moving such a bill.

There are, in Winnipeg, a number of sports and recreation centres. For example, two: The Unicity Racquet Club Tennis Club on Taylor Avenue and the Courts Sports Club, a squash and racquet ball centre over on Taylor Avenue, that don't come under the present Liquor Control Act in the way of getting a licence. For example, the Court Sports Club, which is the particular group that has been asking myself to move such a bill, is owned and operated by a holding company named the Hampton Court Properties Limited. Hampton shareholders consist of a number of people involved in squash-racquet ball in Winnipeg and from across Canada. The President of that particular holding company is a Mr. Michael Nesbitt, who has served as President of the Winnipeg Squash Racquet Club, another club in the City of Winnipeg area not owned by a holding company but owned by all of its members equally. The Secretary of the particular club in question is a Mr. Ian MacMillan, a Winnipeg barrister and solicitor, who also is the President of the Manitoba Squash Racquet Association and a member of the Canadian Association's board of directors, and a leader in the Junior Development Committee for young people taking up such a sport.

The Courts Sports Centre opened its doors on November 1st, 1976, and is a successful venture in the terms of the quality of its operation and the use made of its facilities by its members and the public. That club, by the way, Mr. Speaker, does offer a variety of memberships and is also open to the public for casual play. The Courts Sports Centre is, however, severely restricted in the services which it can provide to its users in respect that it cannot operate a suitable food and liquor facility because none of the licences under the present Liquor Control Act are available or are appropriate for this particular facility.

With the exception of occasional permits under Section 45, the classes of the licences available under the Act are set forth in Section 73 of the Liquor Act.

The only licences which would appear to be appropriate to an athletic or sports and recreation centre, such as the Courts Sports Club, would be the dining room liquor licence and cocktail room licence, the club licence, and perhaps also a restaurant and beer licence, and the restaurant and wine licence. The dining room and liquor licence, which is known as the cocktail room licence, would give rise to all sorts of difficulties because of the provisions under a number of the subsections pertaining to it.

Subsection 124(2) is one of the areas that raises a difficulty, and that is the character of a cocktail premises, which says that a cocktail premise and a dining room must be adjoining. And to a facility that is already constructed and in operation, this poses a problem of putting a dining room and a cocktail lounge side by side.

Other areas that pose some problems to such a licence is 131(1) where it says minors are forbidden in a beverage room or dining room. Many of these clubs, such as the Sports Courts Centre, do have young players under the age of 18 who do participate at the facility, and they do, in their course of travel within the facility, travel through the dining room or the licensed area and this poses a problem if they are forbidden to go into such an area.

Most of us have been in golf and country clubs, or curling clubs, in the past and have seen minors under the age of 18 having dinner with their families and this does not pose a problem at non-profit orientated clubs, but it would in this particular case.

Other areas of problems that come before the particular club under question is that it creates major problems, especially in the case of the Courts Sports Club, which has placed an emphasis on family involvement. It features a recreational facility that children can do with their parents.

The time restriction imposed by Section 161 of the Liquor Act poses a problem because it gives rise to a difficulty such as is not uncommon for tournaments, especially where there is a large entry, to continue well into the early hours of the morning. Well, under most licenses, when a facility is no longer licensed and in operation, that facility in total must close down, whereas most of you, I'm sure, have heard of curling clubs who have a licensed cocktail lounge or dining room, can have that facility closed down at 11 o'clock at night, for example, yet there could be a weekend bonspiel that goes throughout the night and carries on in the curling facility section of the building. Well that would be what the Court Sports Centre would want, is to be able to operate weekend tournaments round the clock yet still comply with the The Liquor Act. Currently they cannot do that.

Another area that would create problems, Mr. Speaker, is that many people using the Courts Sports simply want to have an occasional bottle of beer or drink after a game and then proceed

on home. The problem would be that under the current regulations they must have a meal or consume food at the time they have that beer after the game, so this is where this particular organization would not comply with the Act. It creates major problems for recreational facilities such as the Courts Sports Centre.

Sunday is another area, Mr. Speaker, which is usually one of the busiest days for any recreational facility, and this particular organization cannot get licensed on a Sunday and be able to meet the Liquor Commission's hours of operation on a Sunday. The reason why the Courts Sports Centre has not been able to meet the normal club licenses and regulations is the Courts Sports Centre is operated for pecuniary gain and the facilities are available to members of the public. It is a privately-owned and held corporation that owns the facility but does offer memberships to the general public to come and use it on a renter-user basis.

So the consensus of opinion appears to be that the appropriate method of resolving the problem is to amend The Liquor Act to exempt athletic or sports and recreation centres, such as the one I have been using as an example, from the problematical sections of the Act in its present form. For that reason, it is contemplated that the premises certified by the Commission as an athletic or sports and recreation centre would be exempt from compliance with Sections 124(2), 131(1) and (2), 161(3) and (5), 163(l)(b) — I suggest also Section 133(1).

Mr. Speaker, the reason that I am pleased to attach my name to the bill is, I believe that in Winnipeg, like most cities, we do not have enough recreational facilities for the people, and whenever persons from the private sector come forward and invest their own dollars into erecting such a facility as I've been outlining, I believe that they are not only serving their own personal interests because most of the owners are participants at such facilities, but they are also affording an opportunity for other persons who could not afford to have their own private facility to come along and rent space or time from the particular owners and make use of the facility. In this particular case, the Courts Sports Centre on Taylor Avenue would be served better and make it a more viable operation if they were able to get a dining-room license so that they could serve proper meals and snacks for persons that are available to go in the day-time and perhaps have a game of racquet ball at noon hour and have a sandwich prior to going back to work. To make such a dining facility pay its own way in this day and age one needs to have a liquor license to accompany the dining room area.

So that is the purpose, Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill, and I would hope that the majority of the members of this Assembly would see their way clear to supporting it because I believe, as I've said before, that Winnipeg, like any other city, can use all the sports and recreation facilities that it possibly can get its hands on.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to know if I can address a question to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Could he indicate whether this proposed amendment would not make it possible for any pool room, bowling alley, the Winnipeg Stadium, or any other facility where there are athletic or sports events taking place, would they not then be able to qualify if the Commission so certifies them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: To the Member for St. Johns, Mr. Speaker, I had thought of originally naming the actual institution or the building right into the bill. On the advice of the Liquor Commission and others, they felt that the licensing department of the Liquor Commission could likely handle any such problems and they feel, as I do, that they are empowered to do the licensing and to do the investigating into whether a facility should be licensed or should not be licensed. I can tell the Honourable Member for St. Johns that one of my greatest fears was that the massage parlours in the City of Winnipeg might come along and want to be licensed. The licensing department of the Liquor Commission said: No way, leave the control within our hands and we will pick the appropriate facilities which we think can meet the Act or could not meet the Act.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am now prompted to speak and suggest to the honourable member that the — Winter Club, is it? — is a massage parlour. They have a massage parlour there. I think that I've had occasion to speak to the chief masseur there and he's rather proud of the facility they have and of the fact that they do offer it. It is a recreational facility therefore, I am beginning to be concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the Commission having the kind of authority that is being suggested in this bill. The Commission will now be faced with decision after decision of an undefined character because there is nothing really that gives the definition to the broad powers that are given to the Commission. I can just visualize debates going on between applicants who

think they can build a case. The question I asked, I asked advisedly I don't see why there's any difference between a bowling alley operation — and there are several in my constituency — or a billiard parlour coming along and saying, just like any other of the institutions mentioned by the honourable member: We provide a facility for family recreation. We would like the opportunity to make it more attractive to families to come. We have bowling tournaments that last all night so we want to the right to serve liquor all night as is proposed by the honourable member.

It opens it up to very wide powers being given to the Commission, and I can also see the members of government, whichever government is in power at any time, being besieged by applicants to appear on their behalf before the Liquor Commission. There's no provision here for public hearings. There's, I believe, very wide authority, and I now learn, from what the member has said, that the Commission said: Leave it to us and we will be able to control it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well to have clearly defined — I'll use the word "parameters" within which a discretionary decision may be made. It might even help if the speech of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood were made a preamble to this bill. At least it would give some kind of definition that would in some way define for the Commission what limitations there are on this exercise of power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I don't really think there's anything wrong with the concept of the member's proposal except that I XWOULDN'T LIKE IT TO BE ELITEST IN CHARACTER. I would want to make sure that this kind of facility that would be granted would be available in many places in Manitoba, to many types of organizations, and profit-making, if necessary, although it seems to me that the proponents of the concept that there should be a restricted availability of profit-making out of liquor which historically was assigned to taverns and to hotels that operate such taverns in order to make hotels more economically feasible — that they would have the right to come to the Member for Crescentwood or to the members who voted in favour of this and say, "You are creating more competition for us. You're damaging our economic viability." And then they would say, "Well, we are next door to a recreational facility that is operating 24 hours a day at a bonspiel or a tournament of some kind and we would want to serve the people that are there."

It's a problem, Mr. Speaker, and yet I favour any effort that is made to civilize and make even more civilized the consumption of alcohol in public places. I see nothing wrong with parents being able to take their children with them to a restaurant that serves liquor. That is now permissible. But the proposal is that there should be a beverage room in one of these organizations or institutions where children can be permitted. I don't object to that, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the parents should be involved very much in making a family atmosphere for the entire family. So I'm not really opposed to the concept that I'm concerned about the discretionary powers given to the Commission without any form of definition. I would hope that there would be some way where committee could work towards a proper description and a broad one so that indeed it is not elitest in nature, that we don't have to hear that it is only the private clubs of a certain nature that can take the advantage of this legislation. I think that it's worth further consideration and I would urge that it be given that consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I wanted to ask a question of the proposer of the bill before the member spoke. Is it still possible to ask the member? —(Interjection)— Well, may I ask leave of the House to ask the —(Interjection)— No, to ask the Member for Crescentwood a question.

MR. SPEAKER: We're into a bit of a procedural problem here. Does the member have leave? (Leave) The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I thank members of the House for their acceptance. I wanted to ask the Member for Crescentwood, because he hasn't yet stated his position in proposing this bill, what his position is on the other Private Members' Bill concerning the raising of the drinking age.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The purpose in questioning a member who is proposing a piece of legislation is to ask for clarification on that legislation. What my honourable friend is asking is no way related to this particular bill.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order, the purpose of the question is that the member, in proposing the bill, is asking our acceptance based upon a certain idea that

Tuesday, June 27, 1978

there would be a family use of alcohol inside these premises, and yet I would like to know, in terms of the consistency of presenting this bill, what the stand or the position is of the member generally on the question of a drinking age which relates to the applicability of this bill.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that anything can be done by unanimous consent; I've sat in the House since 1966 and never have I heard a question asked of a previous speaker, but that doesn't mean it can't be done. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that sometimes, when you go ahead and do it, it gives you some reason why it shouldn't be done, and the fact is that the member has leave, but surely now we are asking a question, trying to obtain a position on another bill, which the honourable member will be able to get if the Member for Crescentwood enters the debate, but this is the first time in 12 years that I have heard this kind of procedure adopted; it was done with leave, that's perfectly in order. But it's a good indication of why leave shouldn't be given and why it hasn't been done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's my opinion that a question of that nature is out of order. We are now — are we ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I'll move the adjournment. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that debate now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be agreeable to call it 5:30 at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.